

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

7 July 2015

Report of the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL SERVICE (HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE)**

(1) **Purpose of Report** To report to Cabinet the outcome of the recent consultation on proposed changes to the School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service and to seek approval to implement these changes with effect from the start of autumn term, September 2015, or as soon as is practically possible after this date following completion of appropriate staff consultation processes.

(2) **Information and Analysis**

Background

At its meeting on 20 January 2015, Cabinet approved consultation on proposed changes to the SCP service (Minute No. 13/15 refers), as part of a range of proposed budget reduction measures included in the five year provisional financial plan, considered by Cabinet on 15 July 2014. These budget reduction measures have been put forward to help mitigate against cuts to the Council's budget of £157m over the next five years.

Current Service

The SCP service is a long established service that helps children to cross the road on their way to and from school. It is a non-statutory service provided by Derbyshire County Council on a discretionary basis. The responsibility of getting children to and from school safely lies with the parents and carers of those children.

Derbyshire's SCP service currently operates at 189 sites throughout Derbyshire. Many of the sites are directly outside schools (usually serving an individual school). Other sites are on routes to schools and may assist children from a number of schools in the area.

Proposed Changes to the SCP Service

A full and comprehensive assessment of all Derbyshire's current sites was undertaken during 2014. These assessments were conducted in line with the recently updated School Crossing Patrol Guidelines, issued by The Royal

Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA), on the SCP service and were used to inform the Council's work in preparing the proposals put forward to Cabinet on 20 January 2015.

The proposed changes to the SCP service, approved by Cabinet to consult on, were as follows:

1. That any individual SCP site served by a light-controlled or zebra crossing facility be withdrawn, with effect from the end of the summer term, July 2015.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal is 35.

2. That lunchtime cover, currently provided at a limited number of sites, be withdrawn from the end of the summer term, July 2015.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal is 7.

3. That current vacant sites, not meeting the specific national criteria from RoSPA, referred to above, are not recruited to and therefore cease to have provision made by the Council.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal, at the time of the original Cabinet report, was 19.

4. That any sites currently staffed but becoming vacant as a result of staff leaving, or requests for new sites, will be reviewed against the RoSPA national criteria, referred to above, to inform whether that site should be recruited to or not.

The total number of sites currently affected by this specific proposal is 42 although it is expected that this will increase over time, as potentially more staff leave in the future.

There are currently 93 sites meeting specific national criteria, as detailed in the guidance referred to above, and it was proposed that these will continue to be retained and operated by the Council.

Feedback from Public Consultation

Public consultation took place over a 12 week period, ending on 21 April 2015. The consultation was promoted widely, including to the general public, Derbyshire County Council staff, young people, schools, colleges, local parish/town councils and district/borough councils, Youth Forums and hard to reach groups such as looked after children and disabled young people.

A variety of media was used to ensure people had the opportunity to comment on the proposals. This included press releases through a variety of

publications, social media, promotion through the Council's own website and face-to-face meetings with specific action groups. Questionnaires were available in printed form and also online. A summary of the consultation activity is included in Appendix 1 and a copy of the consultation questionnaire is available in Appendix 2 (this also details all sites affected by each individual proposal).

There was a good response to the consultation and, by the closing date of 21 April 2015, a total of 1,511 completed questionnaires (both online and paper copy) had been received. In addition, the County Council received 28 petitions together with artwork and letters from pupils from five individual schools. The County Council also received 114 individual letters and other correspondence (emails, etc).

An analysis of the completed questionnaires has been conducted on the specific proposals approved by Cabinet to consult on. A summary of this analysis appears below and, in addition, examples of the consultation responses are provided in appendices 3-6 attached. It is open to Members to access the full file of responses should they wish to do so:

1. On the proposal to withdraw the service from sites served by either a light-controlled or zebra crossing facility, 18% of respondents agreed with the proposal and 82% opposed the proposal.

Respondents were also provided with a list of sites affected by this proposal and asked to comment on how the removal of this service would affect them, their family or their school. A summary of examples of these responses can be found in Appendix 3.

A varied and complex array of answers were received from the (approximate) 687 people who commented on this question and the two key common themes associated with these responses were child safety and congestion. Members will be aware that the issue of child safety, in particular, was at the forefront of the County Council's thinking when drawing up the original proposals referred to in this report. These proposals were based on site assessments that took into account specific risk factors enabling the Council to put forward the proposal recommending the retention of those sites deemed to be in higher risk locations. It is important to highlight again that the overall responsibility for children's safety in terms of getting to/from school lies with parents and carers.

2. On the proposal to withdraw the service from those sites where lunchtime cover is currently provided, 41% of respondents agreed with the proposal and 59% opposed the proposal.

Respondents were provided with a list of sites affected by this proposal and asked to comment on how the removal of this service would affect them, their family or their school. A summary of examples of these responses can be found in Appendix 4.

Of the (approximate) 260 people who commented on this question, the majority responded by stating this particular proposal would have little or no effect on them.

3. On the proposal not to recruit to current vacant sites that do not meet specific national criteria, 28% of respondents agreed with the proposal and 72% opposed the proposal.

Respondents were provided with a list of sites affected by this proposal and asked to comment on how the removal of this service would affect them, their family or their school. A summary of examples of these responses can be found in Appendix 5.

As with (1) above, a varied and complex array of answers were received from the (approximate) 212 people who commented on this question and again the common themes of child safety and congestion were the predominant factors.

4. On the final proposal that, should any sites become vacant as a result of staff leaving or any requests for new sites, these sites be reviewed against specific national criteria to inform whether that site should be recruited to or not, 20% of respondents agreed with the proposal and 80% opposed the proposal.

Respondents were provided with a list of sites that would be potentially affected by this proposal and asked to comment on how the removal of this service would affect them, their family or their school. A summary of examples of these responses can be found in Appendix 6.

As with (1) and (3) above, a varied and complex array of answers were, again, received by the (approximate) 335 people who commented on this question, with the common themes of child safety and congestion being the predominant factors.

The survey also offered respondents the opportunity to make additional comments on any alternative suggestions they may have, including suggestions for alternative sources of funding for those SCP sites affected by the above proposals. Of the (approximate) 388 people who responded with suggestions, a number of common themes were evident and these are summarised below:

- The main suggestion was that should the SCP be withdrawn from a site with a zebra crossing facility, a light-controlled crossing should be installed.
- That schools should look to provide the funding for an SCP.
- That parish/town/district/borough councils should look to provide funding for an SCP.
- That funding could be provided via parking fines/council tax.
- Also a limited number of comments have been received supporting the withdrawal of the SCP from sites located at zebra crossings and/or light controlled crossings. Comments such as “Does it really take a paid employee to press the button and tell people to cross?” and “I would rather see these staff redeployed to other areas which do not currently have a member of staff” being two such examples.

Other Consultation Responses

As detailed above, a total of 28 petitions were received from a variety of sources (these can be found listed in Appendix 7). All the petitions were in general opposition to any proposed changes to the SCP service although it is worth noting that of the 28 petitions received, 7 related to specific schools that are not actually affected by the proposed changes. The 5 schools that submitted pupil artwork are also listed in Appendix 7 and, again, were opposed to any proposed changes to the SCP service for their specific school.

All petitions have been handled in accordance with Council procedures.

A total of 114 letters and e-correspondence were also received from a variety of sources, including children and parents and, similar to the above, were in general opposition to any proposed changes to the SCP service.

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken (Appendix 8 refers) and this has identified that the proposals may have a disproportionate effect on young people and women in particular, the latter as they would appear, from the analysis, to be the predominant parent or guardian who walk their children to school. The mitigation that the Council has identified is at Paragraph 7 of the Equality Analysis and in the Action Plan at Paragraph 9.

Proposed Way Forward

Although the majority of respondents were opposed to the proposed changes to the service, it should be borne in mind that the County Council has no statutory duty to provide a SCP service and that ultimately, it is a parent/carer's responsibility to ensure their child reaches school safely. The proposals were formulated following the detailed gathering of evidence of the number of pedestrians crossing the road and the number of vehicles in each location at the busiest time of the day, and also factored in a number of local adjustment factors such as the age of children crossing, proximity to a bend in the road or junction, and poor visibility due to parking, for example.

It is interesting to note that, from the variety of responses received via petitions, letters and email, there is no evidence of a challenge to the methodology used in the assessment of each site, although this was referred to in the original report to Cabinet on 20 January 2015 and the criteria was referred to in the consultation process. All of the objections are based on general opposition to any proposed change to the service. It is felt this lack of evidential challenge is important as these assessments formed the basis of the proposals submitted for consultation.

It is also important to note that the proposals, which were subject to consultation, sought to retain as many sites as possible not served by a light-controlled or zebra crossing facility, with a diminution of the service over time proposed only at those sites where the number of children crossing and the number of vehicle movements no longer justified provision, subject to a re-assessment of the site as and when the incumbent member of staff leaves their post.

In light of the above, therefore, it is proposed to implement the changes to the service as outlined in the consultation with one exception set out below:

Pinxton Primary School

The proposal to withdraw the service from this site has been reviewed following confirmation that the site sits on a dogleg with one part of the crossing served by a zebra crossing facility and one part not served by this facility. The element of the site not served by the zebra crossing is located on a busy stretch of highway where the specific national criteria would be met. Following a re-assessment of the site it is proposed to maintain a SCP service at this location.

In addition, as part of the consultation, the SCP service was approached by Morton Primary School, who was keen to explore the possibility of the site being funded by alternative, external sources. Whilst it would not be possible for the school to employ a SCP itself, as powers to stop traffic only rest with the Highways Authority, discussions are ongoing to assess the viability of this proposal in the hope that a solution can be found which would allow the school to retain the SCP at this site.

More sites may emerge that could be funded from alternative, external sources and it would be the Council's intention to assess each request on its merits with a view to retaining as many sites as possible. Cabinet is requested therefore to delegate authority to the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment in liaison with the Cabinet Member, Highways, Transport and Infrastructure, to agree any such proposals with individual schools as and when they arise.

It is also intended that all sites will be regularly reviewed against the national criteria to ensure the assessment is up to date. Any new request for a service would also be assessed against the national criteria.

Finally, those sites currently operating a zebra-crossing facility, which it is recommended would lose their SCP, would also be kept under review with a view to making any capital improvements to upgrade these sites if appropriate. Any enhancement to an appropriate light-controlled facility, for example, would only be considered following an individual site assessment by highway's engineers, who would determine whether the site meets appropriate demand. This would be based on an assessment conducted throughout the day as oppose to at specific times of the day, as normally conducted for a SCP site.

Next Steps

If the recommendation to implement the proposed changes to the service is approved, a number of key actions will need to be implemented with immediate effect, as outlined below.

Staff Consultation

Informal consultation has already commenced with employees and Trade Unions. Formal consultation with staff and Trade Unions regarding the proposed changes will commence should the recommendations in this report be approved.

Publicity

If the recommendations are accepted, publicity will be needed to ensure people most directly affected by the proposed changes are made aware of the decision.

(3) **Financial Considerations** It was previously reported to Cabinet, on 20 January 2015, that the cost of providing a reduced service, based on the proposals detailed earlier in the report, is estimated to be £540,000 per annum i.e. a total of 135 sites at an approximate cost per site of £4,000. However, with the proposed retention of Pinxton, in light of the consultation responses received, this figure will increase to £544,000 per annum i.e. a total of 136 sites at an approximate cost per site of £4,000.

In line with the previous report to Cabinet, it is proposed this sum be sourced from the following:

- £225,000 from the Public Health Resource Fund. This will be used to support the 93 sites the Council is proposing to retain i.e. those that meet specific national criteria.
- The remaining £319,000 will be met from existing departmental budgets and will be used to fund the remainder of the 93 sites plus those sites that are currently staffed but do not meet specific national criteria.

However, as reported to Cabinet on 20 January 2015, pressures on departmental budgets are such that, going forward, it is this element of the service that would need to diminish over time by implementation of the proposal to only fund vacancies for current, future or new sites that meet the national criteria.

- Members need also be aware that should any requests for new sites be approved, the estimated cost per site per annum will be approximately £4,000.
- The savings to the Economy, Transport and Environment budget for 2015-16 is £321,000 and will be offset in 2015-16 by £225,000 from the Public Health Resource Fund. Members are requested to note that approval for resources from the Public Health Resource Fund, beyond 2015-16 have, as yet, not been secured.

(4) **Legal Considerations** The Authority has no statutory obligation to provide a SCP service.

When making a decision about these proposed recommendations, the Authority will need to take account of the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and of human rights legislation. The former requires the Council to have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality and diversity, and foster good relations in the exercising of its functions. This need for 'due regard' specifically applies to all nine protected characteristics set out in the Act, including age and disability.

An Equality Analysis has been undertaken and is attached to this report (see Appendix 8). Cabinet is required to give careful consideration to the Equality Analysis and its findings before arriving at a decision.

(5) **Human Resources Considerations** If the proposals outlined in this report are implemented, there are likely to be a number of voluntary and compulsory redundancies, unless alternative methods of funding can be found or re-deployment opportunities identified for those employees affected by the proposals.

Any formal staff consultation will be in accordance with Section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 (as part of the Council-wide consultation on redundancies) and will be covered by the Council's corporate notification to the Secretary of State of potential redundancies under Section 193 of this Act.

The Council will seek to mitigate the number of redundancies and find alternative employment in line with the provisions set out in the Council's Policy for Redundancy, Redeployment, Protection of Earnings and Buy Out of Hours. To avoid compulsory redundancies, it is proposed that, if required, the employees involved in this review be treated as a "pocket of difficulty" in order

that they may be offered voluntary redundancy/voluntary early retirement as a last resort.

Informal consultation has already commenced with employees and Trade Unions.

Formal consultation with staff and Trade Unions regarding the proposed changes will commence upon approval of this report. In order to facilitate the consultation process it is proposed, subject to Cabinet approval, that the report be released to affected employees and Trade Unions.

The schedule shown at Appendix 9 provides details of where changes have occurred with associated savings for the proposals.

(6) **Equality and Diversity Considerations** As referred to above, an Equality Analysis has been completed (see Appendix 8) in accordance with the duties set out in the Equality Act 2010. Under this Act, local authorities are under a legal duty to pay “due regard” to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality with regard to race, disability and gender, including gender reassignment, age, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, religion and beliefs. It also covers relevant human rights issues.

In summary, a greater proportion of younger people and women are potentially adversely affected by the proposals, however, the Council will arrange to keep all sites under review and, where appropriate, look to explore other funding options should these become available.

Other Considerations

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, environmental, health, property and transport considerations.

(6) **Key Decision** Yes.

(7) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

(8) **Background Papers** Held on file within the Economy, Transport and Environment Department. Officer contact details – Richard Lovell, extension 38192.

(9) **OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATIONS** That Cabinet:

9.1 Notes the outcome of the recent consultation and equality impact assessment process.

- 9.2 Approves the implementation of the changes to the School Crossing Patrol service from the start of autumn term September 2015, or as soon as is practically possible after this date following completion of appropriate staff consultation processes:
- That all individual School Crossing Patrol sites served by a light-controlled or zebra crossing facility be withdrawn with the exception of Pinxton, for the reasons set out in the report.
 - That lunchtime cover, currently provided at a limited number of sites, be withdrawn.
 - That current vacant sites, not meeting specific national criteria, are not recruited to and therefore cease to have provision made by the Council.
 - That any sites currently staffed, that become vacant as a result of staff leaving, or requests for new sites, be reviewed against specific national criteria to inform whether that site should be recruited to or not.
- 9.3 Delegates authority to the Strategic Director, Economy, Transport and Environment in liaison with the Cabinet Member - Highways, Transport and Infrastructure to retain school crossing patrols which would otherwise cease where alternative sources of funding can be secured.
- 9.4 Approves the use of voluntary release schemes, if necessary, as a “pocket of difficulty” for the affected staff.
- 9.5 Approves the implementation of the Council’s Policy for Redundancy, Redeployment, Protection of Earnings and Buy Out of Hours, if necessary.
- 9.6 Approves the commencement of formal consultation with staff and Trade Unions, to include the release of the Cabinet report as part of the consultation process.

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

APPENDIX 1

Media used - School crossing patrol consultation promotion

Action	
Questionnaire online	
Paper questionnaire to print	
Press releases – when decision to consult was made, when consultation opened, part way through consultation and then one week to go.	
Social media – at start, several times mid-way through consultation period, one week to go and then in the run up to close of consultation.	
Website home page feature	
Email to parish councils	
Email to all schools	
Your Derbyshire eNewsletter	
Letter to schools affected	
Letter to school crossing patrol employees	
Dnet homepage story	
Schools extranet	
Members news	
Pre-school groups	
Parents of disabled children via colleagues in CAYA	
Youth forums via colleagues in CAYA	
Printed copies to libraries	
Printed copies to district and borough councils	
Your Derbyshire Magazine	

The Derbyshire Challenge

Making difficult decisions together



Have your say on possible changes to the school crossing patrol service

We're facing budget pressures like never before and need to cut £157m by 2018. Reductions in Government grants, inflation and greater demands on areas of the county council's budget for adult social care and vulnerable children mean we must rethink the way we deliver services. It means some services will remain, some will be run differently but some will have to stop.

This questionnaire asks for your views on changes to the school crossing patrol service. On 20 January 2015 our Cabinet agreed to consult on proposals to change the school crossing patrol service. The Cabinet report on the proposed changes is available on our website at www.derbyshire.gov.uk/schoolcrossings

There is a school crossing patrol at 189 sites in Derbyshire. We are consulting on:

- Ending the service at 35 sites where there are either zebra or lightcontrolled crossings
- Ending the lunchtime service – currently only at 7 sites
- Keeping the service at 61 sites that don't meet specific criteria, but not replacing employees at these sites if they leave. There are currently 19 of the 61 sites not meeting the criteria that have become vacant following employees leaving their jobs.

Deadline for responses: 21 April 2015

For further information on this consultation please contact Bridey Greenway on 01629 538063 or bridey.greenway@derbyshire.gov.uk

* We will treat all information that you give in the strictest confidence. Your identity will never be revealed, or passed to another agency outside the Council.

Your Views

Q1 Are you answering the questions as...(Please select all that apply)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/guardian | <input type="checkbox"/> School governor | <input type="checkbox"/> Member of the public |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Headteacher | <input type="checkbox"/> School staff | <input type="checkbox"/> School crossing patrol |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pupil | <input type="checkbox"/> Parish Council | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) | | |

Q2 If answering as a headteacher, member of school staff or school governor, please say which school:



Q3 Please find below a list of schools and the location of a crossing patrol. These sites are on either a light-controlled or zebra crossing. We are proposing to stop these services.

From this list, please indicate which will affect you: (please select all that apply)

- ☐ Belmont Primary School - Springfield Road, SWADLINCOTE
- ☐ Belmont Primary School - Newhall Road, SWADLINCOTE
- ☐ Belper School - Whitemoor Lane/Alfreton Road, BELPER
- ☐ Brampton Primary School - Ashgate Road, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Brockwell Junior School - Ashgate Road, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Charlotte Infant and Nursery School - Cotmanhay Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Charlotte Infant and Nursery School - Charlotte Street/Trinity Close, ILKESTON
- ☐ Charlotte Infant and Nursery School - Cotmanhay Road/Ebenezer Street, COTMANHAY
- ☐ Cotmanhay Infant School - Beauvale Drive, ILKESTON
- ☐ Cotmanhay Infant School - Bennerley Avenue/Cotmanhay Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Cotmanhay Junior School - Beauvale Drive, ILKESTON
- ☐ Cotmanhay Junior School - Bennerley Avenue/Cotmanhay Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Creswell CE (Controlled) Infant School - Elmtown Road, CRESWELL
- ☐ Creswell Junior School - Elmtown Road, CRESWELL
- ☐ Granby Junior School - Cotmanhay Road/Ebenezer Street, COTMANHAY
- ☐ Granby Junior School - Cotmanhay Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Granby Junior School - Charlotte Street/Trinity Close, ILKESTON
- ☐ Grange Primary School - Nottingham Road, LONG EATON
- ☐ Grassmoor Primary School - Main Road, GRASSMOOR
- ☐ Hady Primary School - Hady Hill, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Hague Bar Primary School - Hague Bar Road/Hague Bar, NEW MILLS
- ☐ Harpur Hill Primary School - Trent Avenue, HARPUR HILL
- ☐ Hasland Junior School - The Green, HASLAND
- ☐ John King Infant School - Church Street/Victoria Road, PINXTON
- ☐ John Port School - Repton Road/Twyford Road/The Castleway, WILLINGTON
- ☐ Kilburn Infant and Nursery School - Highfield Road, KILBURN
- ☐ Kilburn Junior School - Highfield Road, KILBURN
- ☐ Killamarsh Infant and Nursery School - Sheffield Road, KILLAMARSH

- ☐ Killamarsh Infant and Nursery School - Rotherham Road, KILLAMARSH
- ☐ Killamarsh Junior School - Rotherham Road, KILLAMARSH
- ☐ Killamarsh Junior School - Sheffield Road, KILLAMARSH
- ☐ Kirkstead Junior School - Church Street/Victoria Road, PINXTON
- ☐ Longwood Community Primary School - Church Street/Victoria Road, PINXTON
- ☐ Loscoe Primary School - High Street/Denby Lane, LOSCOE
- ☐ Newhall Infant and Nursery School - Bretby Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ Newhall Infant and Nursery School - Main Street/Higgins Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ Newhall Community Junior School - Bretby Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ Newhall Community Junior School - Main Street/Higgins Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ Norbriggs Primary School - A619, Mastin Moor, STAVELEY
- ☐ North Wingfield Primary School - Chesterfield Road/Draycott Road, NORTH WINGFIELD
- ☐ North Wingfield Primary School - St Lawrence Road, NORTH WINGFIELD
- ☐ North Wingfield Primary School - Chesterfield Road, NORTH WINGFIELD
- ☐ Park House Primary School - Rupert Street/Locket Road, LOWER PILSLEY
- ☐ Pottery Primary School - Whitemoor Lane/Alton Road, BELPER
- ☐ Ridgeway Primary School - Main Road, RIDGEWAY
- ☐ Spire Infant and Nursery School - St Augustine's Road/St Augustine's Avenue, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Spire Junior School - St Augustine's Road/St Augustine's Avenue, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Springfield Junior School - Springfield Road, SWADLINCOTE
- ☐ Springfield Junior School - Newhall Road, SWADLINCOTE
- ☐ St George's CE (Controlled) Primary School - Church Street, CHURCH GRESLEY
- ☐ The William Allitt School - Main Street/Higgins Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ The William Allitt School - Bretby Road, NEWHALL
- ☐ Tibshelf Infant and Nursery School - High Street, TIBSHELF
- ☐ Tupton Primary School - Queen Victoria Road, TUPTON
- ☐ Willington Primary School - Repton Road/Twyford Road/The Castleway, WILLINGTON
- ☐ Woodville Infant School - High Street, WOODVILLE
- ☐ Woodville Junior School - High Street, WOODVILLE

Q4 Do you agree with this proposal?

☐

Yes

☐

No

Q5 Please say how the removal of this service would affect you, your family or your school



Q6 Please find below a list of schools and the location of a crossing patrol. These sites currently have a school crossing patrol at lunch time. We are proposing to stop these services.

**From the following list, please indicate which will affect you:
(please select all that apply)**

- ☐ Matlock All Saints CE (Controlled) Infant School - Ashton's Corner, MATLOCK
- ☐ Matlock All Saints Junior School - Ashton's Corner, MATLOCK
- ☐ Grange Primary School - Station Road, LONG EATON
- ☐ Granville Community School - Burton Road, WOODVILLE
- ☐ Newhall Community Junior School - Main Street, NEWHALL
- ☐ Newhall Infant & Nursery School - Main Street, NEWHALL
- ☐ Newton Primary School - Hall Lane, NEWTON
- ☐ Pilsley Primary School - Station Road/Church Street, PILSELY
- ☐ The William Allitt School - Main Street, NEWHALL
- ☐ Tupton Primary School - Nethermoor Road/Wingfield Road, TUPTON

Q7 Do you agree with this proposal?

☐

Yes

☐

No

Q8 Please say how the removal of this service would affect you, your family or your school

Q9 Please find below a list of schools and the location of a crossing patrol. These sites do not currently have a crossing patrol because the member of staff has left. These sites also do not meet specific criteria for a crossing and we are proposing that these employees are not replaced.

**From the following list, please indicate which will affect you:
(please select all that apply)**

- ☐ Abercrombie Primary School - Sheffield Road/St Helen's Street, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ All Saints Catholic Primary School - Church Street/Thorpe Street, OLD GLOSSOP
- ☐ Bamford Primary School - Main Road, BAMFORD
- ☐ Chaucer Infant and Nursery School - Gresley Road/Flamstead Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Chaucer Junior School - Gresley Road/Flamstead Road, ILKESTON
- ☐ Clowne Infant and Nursery - Creswell Road/Harlethorpe Avenue, CLOWNE
- ☐ Clowne Junior School - Creswell Road/Harlethorpe Avenue, CLOWNE
- ☐ Darley Dale Primary School - Chesterfield Road/Oddford Lane, TWO DALES
- ☐ Dovedale Primary School - Dovedale Avenue, LONG EATON
- ☐ Hartshorne CE (Controlled) Primary School - Repton Road, HARTSHORNE
- ☐ Heage Primary School - Tenter Lane, HEAGE
- ☐ Langley Mill Junior School - Gregory Avenue/Bailey Brook Crescent, LANGLEY MILL
- ☐ Melbourne Infant - Derby Road, MELBOURNE
- ☐ Melbourne Junior School - Derby Road, MELBOURNE
- ☐ Model Village Primary School - Central Drive, SHIREBROOK
- ☐ Morton Primary School - Main Road, MORTON
- ☐ Scargill Primary School - Hallam Way/Scargill Road, WEST HALLAM
- ☐ St Anne's CE Primary School - School Lane/Church Street, BASLOW
- ☐ St Giles CE (Aided) Primary School - Sheepcote Road, KILLAMARSH
- ☐ Stanton in Peak CE (Controlled) Primary School - Main Street, STANTON IN THE PEAK
- ☐ The Duke of Norfolk CE (Controlled) Primary School - Church Street/Thorpe Street, OLD GLOSSOP
- ☐ Unstone Junior School - Sheffield Road/The Green, UNSTONE
- ☐ Unstone St Mary's Infant School - Sheffield Road/The Green, UNSTONE
- ☐ William Rhodes Primary School - Hunloke Avenue, Boythorpe, CHESTERFIELD

Q10 Do you agree with this proposal?

☐

Yes

☐

No

Q11 Please say how the removal of this service would affect you, your family or your school



Q12 Please find below a list of schools and the location of a crossing patrol. These sites do not meet our specific criteria, but are currently staffed and operational. It is proposed that, should any of current school crossing patrol employees leave their site that site would then be re-assessed, and if they still do not meet specific criteria the member of staff would not be replaced.

**From the following list, please indicate which will affect you:
(please select all that apply)**

- ☐ Abercrombie Primary School - Higher Albert Street/Brunswick Street, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ All Saints CE Junior School - Ashton's Corner, MATLOCK
- ☐ All Saints CE Junior School - Hurds Hollow, MATLOCK
- ☐ Bakewell Methodist (Controlled) Primary School - Yeld Road/Stoney Close, BAKEWELL
- ☐ Brimington Junior School - Station Road/Rother Avenue, BRIMINGTON
- ☐ Brockwell Infant School - Purbeck Avenue, Brockwell, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Brockwell Junior School - Purbeck Avenue, Brockwell, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Chapel en le Frith CE (Controlled) Primary School - Warmbrook Road, CHAPEL EN LE FRITH
- ☐ Clowne Infant & Nursery School - Church Street, CLOWNE
- ☐ Clowne Infant & Nursery School - Mill Street/Rectory Road, CLOWNE
- ☐ Clowne Junior School - Church Street, CLOWNE
- ☐ Clowne Junior School - Mill Street/Rectory Road, CLOWNE
- ☐ Crich Junior School - Market Place, CRICH
- ☐ Deer Park Primary School - Lydgate Drive/Longedge Lane, WINGERWORTH
- ☐ Fairfield Endowed CE (Controlled) Junior School - Queen's Road/Bench Road, Fairfield, BUXTON
- ☐ Fairfield Infant & Nursery School - Queen's Road/Bench Road, Fairfield, BUXTON
- ☐ Fairmeadows Foundation Primary School - Oversetts Road, SWADLINCOTE
- ☐ Furness Vale Primary School - Station Road/Buxton Road, FURNESS VALE
- ☐ Gorseybrigg Infant School - Gosforth Drive, DRONFIELD
- ☐ Gorseybrigg Junior School - Gosforth Drive, DRONFIELD
- ☐ Grindleford Primary School - Main Road, GRINDLEFORD
- ☐ Hady Primary School - Hady Lane, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ Herbert Strutt Primary School - Park Road,/Lime Crescent, BELPER

- ☐ Hodthorpe Primary School - Queen's Road, HODTHORPE
- ☐ Hollingwood Primary School - Private Drive, HOLLINGWOOD
- ☐ Holmegate Primary & Nursery School - Valley Road, HOLMEGATE
- ☐ Ironville & Codnor Park Primary School - Victoria Street/Bullock Lane, IRONVILLE
- ☐ Matlock All Saint's CE (Controlled) Infant School - Ashton's Corner, MATLOCK
- ☐ New Bolsover Primary School - New Station Road, BOLSOVER
- ☐ New Mills Primary School - Meadow Street/Spring Bank, NEW MILLS
- ☐ Newbold CE Primary School - St John's Road/Cranbourne Road, NEWBOLD
- ☐ Newtown Primary School - A6015/Albion Road, NEW MILLS
- ☐ Repton Primary School - Springfield Road, REPTON
- ☐ Sawley Infant & Nursery School - Wilmot Street, SAWLEY
- ☐ Sawley Junior School - Wilmot Street, SAWLEY
- ☐ Simmondley Primary School - Pennine Road, SIMMONDLEY
- ☐ Speedwell Infant School - Middlecroft Road/Musard Place/St John's Place, STAVELEY
- ☐ Spire Junior School - Jawbones Hill/Baden Powell Road, CHESTERFIELD
- ☐ St Andrew's CE Methodist (Aided) Primary School - Gosforth Drive, DRONFIELD
- ☐ St Mary's Catholic Primary School - Gladstone Road, GLOSSOP
- ☐ Staveley Junior School - Middlecroft Road/Musard Place/St John's Place, STAVELEY
- ☐ Stonebroom Primary & Nursery School - High Street, STONEBROOM
- ☐ The Meadows Primary School - Wirksworth Road, DUFFIELD
- ☐ Thornsett Primary School - Aspenshaw Road, Birch Vale, Thornsett, NEW MILLS
- ☐ Thornsett Primary School - Doctor's End, Birch Vale, Thornsett, NEW MILLS
- ☐ Tupton Primary School - Nethermoor Road/Wingfield Road, TUPTON
- ☐ Whitwell Primary School - Southfield Lane, WHITWELL
- ☐ Whitwell Primary School - Station Road, WHITWELL
- ☐ William Gilbert CE Endowed Primary School - King Street, DUFFIELD
- ☐ William Levick Primary School - Carr Lane/Wentworth Road, DRONFIELD WOODHOUSE
- ☐ Woodthorpe CE Voluntary Controlled Primary School - Woodthorpe Road, NORBRIGGS

Q13 Do you agree with this proposal?

☐

Yes

☐

No

Q14 Please say how the removal of this service would affect you, your family or your school

Q15 Do you have any other comments to make on the proposed changes, for example, suggestions on how the service could be funded differently. (You may wish to specify a particular site in your comments)

About You

We are asking about you to understand the views of different groups of people. Please answer all questions as fully as you can.

Q16 What is your home postcode:

Q17 What age were you on your last birthday?

Q18 Are you...

☐

Male

☐

Female

Q19 A disabled person is someone who has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial or long term effect on their ability to carry out day to day activities. Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

☐

Yes

☐

No

Q20 If you answered 'Yes' what type of disability do you have?

☐

Disability affecting mobility

☐

Disability affecting vision

☐

A learning disability

☐

Other (Please state below)

☐

Disability affecting hearing

Q21 What is your ethnic group?

☐

White

☐

Black/Black British

☐

Chinese

☐

Asian/Asian British

☐

Mixed race

☐

Other (Please state)

Please return your survey, free of charge, to:

Derbyshire County Council

FREEPOST

Business reply services DY76

County Hall


Matlock

DE3 3AG

Putting our own house in order

We're saving money by:

- Making sure every penny is spent where it's needed most
- Reviewing senior management structures
- Selling off redundant land and buildings.

 **DERBYSHIRE**
County Council
Improving life for local people

APPENDIX 3

Light Controlled and Zebra Crossings

Variety of responses covering 7 main categories – Personal & Financial, Safety and Congestion, School Community, Fewer Services, Parents/Family, No Personal Effect and School Specific comments.

Personal & Financial

- Firstly I will be losing a job that I love and enjoy doing. Secondly I have family and friends that go to this school and if there is no crossing patrol there I can see an accident happening as it is on a busy roundabout and there are 3 crossings
- Financial loss of income and job. Dangerous for children and families as even though it's on a crossing cars drive fast and cars do not stop endangering young children. Some children have disabilities meaning they run off from parents and if crossing patrol not there they could easily run out in the road. Personal reasons - Enjoy job, gets me up in the morning, socialise and bond with children and keeps me motivated
- I would be worried that children would not take enough care when crossing the road around these schools. There is heavy traffic at school times especially. The money I earn as a school crossing patrol is not much, but it helps our household income and I do not relish the idea of looking for another job at the age of 59. I think I would struggle.

Safety & Congestion

- I drive to work past three local primary schools. It's bad enough with crossing patrols, it will be awful without. For example, children running/walking out in front of traffic as they 'think' cars will stop just for them. Or, parents/carers with several small children trying to cross busy roads. Patrol staff are essential
- I know that a zebra crossing should be a safe place to cross any road but put it near a school, you open a whole different can of worms, traffic build up because two or three children wish to cross the road and a inconsiderate parent has parked opposite the school gates, all this puts children, siblings in pushchairs and parents in danger from angry drivers late for work. Twice a day the school buses have to be accounted. As crossing patrol I try to keep the traffic moving while keeping my "customers" safe, although I have had a near miss which was reported to my supervisor and to the police, they said they would have a word with the driver????? "some good that'll do". If the crossing patrols are removed, what measures will be in place to protect people at school starting time and leaving to go home?
- Our crossing man keeps us safe. I know when and where to cross

safely. Without him our crossing man it would not be so safe. It is really busy on the road outside school. if John wasn't there people might cross between cars and if late just run out. There might be an accident if we don't have a crossing patrol man. Please don't stop our crossing service. You will put us in danger if you do

School Community

- My daughter and son both use the crossing and if it is removed it will be a big danger. Cars don't always stop when children are waiting at the zebra crossing and having Jan the patrol lady is a life saver
- First, our lollipop lady is kind, gentle, friendly, lovely and she is always very happy. She is very good at her job because she watches everyone cross the road. Without her the road outside our school would be unsafe at the end at school. She is not just our lollipop lady but she is also a part of our school family
- My daughter has used this crossing from been in the infants and now in the juniors. Cars don't always stop at the crossing but they do when they see the lollipop lady in her bright coat. We have built up a good friendship with the lollipop lady as have many other. She also helps the elderly to cross

Fewer Services

- Compromising safety of children should never be to save money. One injury or death can never be recovered. This is highly unethical
- This is a valuable service that should not be removed. The safety of children should never be neglected, I'm sure cuts could be made in other ways, we all know how much money is wasted in the cost of evaluating services for example. Our school needs the service and the fact that it could be removed is a sign of the times unfortunately, where the cost of a life seems of little value, I hope the people making these difficult decisions get to sleep at night
- It is an accident waiting to happen on a crossroad with a shop placed on the left. We want children to become more independent especially our Y6 children who will be going to secondary school. Parents will not feel safe letting their children try and cross and the Green Lane, Wingfield Road junction. Cars are parked on all sides, visibility is poor. Jill has been the lollipop lady for years and it is wrong that this service is being cut. If a child is knocked over which is a good possibility you will need to hang your heads in shame. How much money are you saving?? Is it worth it?

Parents/Family

- I feel that infant school aged children should be accompanied by a parent to school, so if there is a crossing of some description there is no need for a school crossing patrol
- The young children living near-by already have difficulty in crossing one

of the busiest main roads in Long Eaton - Is MONEY more important to Derbyshire County Council Councillors' than LIVES!

- If there is no crossing patrol at the school my daughter is in danger of being knocked down seriously injured or killed. The location has a zebra crossing however when there is no crossing patrol vehicles do not stop to allow people to cross the road despite it is an offence under the traffic law to fail to stop for pedestrians. The crossing patrol is that added insurance that children cross the road safely. What price do we and the council place on the life of a child!!!!

No Personal Effect

- I think this is a justified removal as there is a traffic light control in place already
- As there is a crossing there anyway and this is not directly linked with our school, it is less necessary than the main crossing patrol on Purbeck Avenue - which is invaluable
- Crossings with lights or marked crossings do not need patrolling. It affects schools like ours (Gilbert Heathcote infant) as we really need a crossing patrol and there is no staff

School Specific

- I have witnessed a few times cars going straight through the zebra crossing even with a lollypop lady there at Springfield the school is on a roundabout so cars come from all directions I believe getting rid of the lollypop lady's would make crossing very dangerous
- Removal of the lollypop lady affects the children and parents of Grassmoor a great deal. The zebra crossing isn't safe alone, the cars don't stop for the children to cross. A lot of parents try to give their children some independence going to school alone from Y5 but take away the lollypop lady and you're going to take away kids independence. Without their lollypop lady there will be an accident, is saving a few pounds worth more than our children's lives. I think not!!
- The school is situated on the busiest roads through Church Gresley. The pavement is very narrow and another road situated opposite the school means that it is positioned on a dangerous junction. The current crossing warden ensures safe crossing of both the main and side roads. Many parents have pushchairs, toddlers in addition to children walking to school. They rely on the crossing warden to safely negotiate this busy and dangerous area outside the school. Council cost cutting should not come before pedestrian safety

APPENDIX 4

Lunch time cover

Variety of responses covering 5 main categories – Personal & Financial, Safety and Congestion, Fewer Services, No Personal Effect and School Specific comments.

Personal & Financial

- I have been a school crossing patrol at this school for 21 years now. I know all the kids and parents as its 2 roads to cross it's a very busy site therefore making it a dangerous site for children to cross alone. If I lose dinnertimes it means my wages will be halved and therefore I don't know whether I will be able to carry on doing the job or not. It's a busy enough road when there is me to cross the children so I don't know what will happen when I'm not there. It will make it a dangerous place to be!!
- As a crossing patrol affected by this proposal, I feel that there are not only financial implications for myself but more importantly a safety concern for parents and pupils. The school is built on a busy road with a blind bend at each end. Unfortunately, many vehicles travel too fast along it, despite already having flashing lights to warn of the upcoming school. This frequently results in vehicles struggling to stop in time and on occasions failing to do so. Although only a few children use the crossing during lunch at this time, (mainly nursery children) it is impossible to predict how many children will use it in the future. How long will it be until a child is injured trying to cross an unmanned road?
- Was surprised to learn that there was a service. When my children were at the school nursery we picked them up from school and had no need of a crossing patrol. I do not think there would be children leaving school without parents in the day so surely there is no need.

Safety & Congestion

- My younger brother is at a school that has lunch times crossing patrol. I would like to know that he is safe and able to cross the road in a safe way with someone there to help as it's on a really busy road
- Children who go home for lunch are going to be greatly affected as there has always been someone there to cross them. As motorists children waiting at the side of the road are liable to dash across the road, it is a nightmare scenario
- Children whom are going out for lunch do not have any supervision without the lollipop lady they are vulnerable to all sorts of road related accidents

Fewer Services

- This school has a nursery where preschool children attend either the morning or the afternoon sessions. As such the SCP is needed so that parents and children can cross the road safely for both the morning and afternoon sessions. There is a T junction opposite the school and bus stops within 30 meters of the T junction. Child safety should not be risked to save a few pounds
- Children's lives will be put at risk. Our youngest Nursery children (52 in total) and their parents will be affected. This is a busy crossing point with a range of large and small vehicles using the roads near school
- Even though it is lunchtime doesn't mean that the need isn't there. Many young pupils leave the schools at lunch - part time attenders, pre-schoolers etc. The roads that are there already known to be dangerous as they are narrow with cars parked and buses and cars struggling to get through. The crossing patrols enable the roads to be safer for all

No Personal Effect

- It would not affect me at the moment because I do not have children, however when I do have children, this again will not affect me because I will not be used to having the crossing patrol there. People who are complaining are complaining because they are used to this service and so they feel they have a right to have it
- It doesn't directly affect me, but stopping lunchtime services seems reasonable as few children leave school at this time.
- I don't know the location of these schools so I can't say for sure whether it's a good or bad idea. It depends how highly the crossings are used at lunch-time

School Specific Comments

- From September my eldest child will be attending William Allitt I would be happier to know that there will be crossing patrol if he should be off campus

APPENDIX 5

Current Vacancies not meeting criteria

Variety of responses covering 5 main categories – Personal & Financial, Safety and Congestion, School Community, Fewer Services, No Personal Effect and School Specific comments.

Personal & Financial

- By not replacing patrols at these sites (often dangerous crossing points) this will indirectly impact on my job as mobile school crossing patrol

Safety & Congestion

- Crossing the road with my two children (aged 6 and 8) is a complete nightmare without a crossing patrol. Some cars do not slow down even though the 'slow school 20 mph' signs are flashing. There is no other form of crossing, e.g. zebra, at this school and I am fearful that a child or group of children will be injured, or worse, due to this very busy road NOT currently having a crossing guard!
- As previous answer - early morning and late afternoon are dangerous times, people rushing to work and dark evening in winter means a service to help control traffic in these bottlenecks is vital
- There are 2 areas of concern. 1. The crossing between over road to School Lane. Illegal parking severely restricting views in order to safely cross. However yellow lines do not extend far enough along school lane for this area to be safe ie if no cars parked illegally, safety remains poor. I would not be happy to allow my children when they become juniors to cross alone. 2. Crossing between main road and school lane. An extremely busy main road. Difficult for everyone to cross not just children. Urgently needs attention re safety of crossing at school times.

Fewer Services

- It will affect all the schools listed, surely the safety of children is more important than saving money?
- As stated previously school patrols are for the safety of children! I appreciate budgets need to be met, but not to the detriment of children's safety. I would suggest bonus cuts would be the most sensible area to meet the budget
- What price can be put on children's lives? According to DCC none

No Personal Effect

- If someone has left then it is fair that they are not replaced if the road is not a busy one. However, each school should be looked at on a case by case basis. This is not a situation where one size fits all. Use your brains people!
- Abercrombie Primary School has been served by 2 SCPs in the past.

This one on Sheffield Road/St Helen's Street has already been cut due to the retirement of the previous employee. I support this, as there is a light controlled crossing on Sheffield Road which can be used by children. My concerns are regarding the other SCP which serves Abercrombie Primary School, which I feel is more vital given the traffic situation and road layout

- If there is not a requirement for a patrol then yes I agree

School Specific Comments

- Hunloke Avenue is a "rat run" with cars parked on both sides of the road. As a driver I find it difficult to navigate along this road and with the prospect of children crossing unsupervised; I believe this should be a crossing patrol. The issues I have just raised are probably the reason why William Rhodes is unable to replace their crossing staff
- My children attend Field House Infant School which should be on the list above as the crossing patrol position has not been replaced following retirement. This road is VERY busy and is very difficult to cross. If the crossing patrol is not going to be replaced the road requires a zebra crossing
- As stated earlier, the lack of lollipop person at the main road on Morton is extremely dangerous. The road is very busy and it's rare that cars will stop to allow children and parents to cross safely so it's a free-for-all.

APPENDIX 6

Sites becoming vacant but not currently meeting criteria

Variety of responses covering 6 main categories – Personal & Financial, Safety and Congestion, School Community, Fewer Services, No Personal Effect and School Specific comments.

Personal & Financial

- I've been the school crossing patrol at Hollingwood Primary School for almost 8 years and I think it will be a big mistake if the council don't replace me when I retire. Most of the traffic on that road exceeds the 20 mph limit and I've stopped children wandering in the road countless times. Some parents have 3 or 4 children and can't control all of them at the same time that's why it's vital that a crossing patrol is there. I understand that the council needs to make cuts but what price do you put on a child's life
- If this patrol was removed, I would be out of a job which I have been doing for just over 9 years in term time (only taking 1/2 day sick in this time), a job that I love, I would miss being involved with the local community in this patrol. The school and local families would be affected as a number of children that cross are unaccompanied and I feel privileged that parents trust me with the safe crossing of their children. The children of both schools in the village have recently carried out a speed survey with help from the Police and PCSO's on the stretch of road where I work. It has been found by both schools that cars that take that corner have no regard for the speed limit or pedestrian's trying to cross, and this would endanger the school children that are crossing if no patrol was there. Local organisations have even donated funds for the purchase of a speed gun for the 2 schools to use, this would be a good indication that they too are concerned with the speed of cars and safety of the children.
- It would affect me as I would lose my job. Affect the family as there would be worry as to whether the children got to school safely. Crossing over such a busy road

Safety & Congestion

- There would be serious risk of a serious injury to a child as they are not mentally able at this age to calculate traffic speeds etc and safely cross themselves. We are trying to encourage independence and this would prevent it. There is so much inconsiderate parking and poor driving outside the school that the situation would be too risky
- A lot of children have to cross a busy main road to get to the school. If the member of staff left then he would have to be replaced with at least a zebra crossing
- Although responsibility lies with me as a parent. DCC also has a duty of care in the safe keeping of my child. Although when 'number crunched' it doesn't fall into the 'let's save' category, it has to be noted that it is a very busy road at school drop off/pick up time as there are 2 schools on the same site, on a very regular (every 8-10 mins) bus route. I've seen many instances when cars coming the other way to the bus, accelerate

to get past the school (cars are parked on the road making it one vehicle only able to travel approx. 100 metres) before the bus passes. I can't believe these drivers are demonstrating due care and attention and worry that a child running between the parked cars to cross the road will get knocked down. Many of the children that walk home unattended are year 5/6, the age whereby they should be allowed to start being independent of parents/carers chaperoning them from the school gates in readiness for the reality of reaching secondary school. It seems a high risk to wager a child's life for a paltry £4000 spend

School Community

- It would place my Children and others in danger, it will also damage community spirit
- My 3 year old daughter cycles to preschool while I walk alongside her with my 2 year old in the buggy. We know our lolly pop lady by name and always say hello, she is an important part of the school community. I can let my daughter cycle a little way in front as I know she will stop at Rose and wait for her to make it safe to cross. It is a busy road at school drop off time and school crossing patrol is essential to prevent accidents
- Very busy road, not all children are taken to school and rely on the school crossing patrol. Some cars park inconsiderately and the school crossing patrol makes sure the children cross safely. Our lollipop lady is friendly, polite and the children know her and look for her nice words and smile in the morning and home time

Fewer Services

- Cost of patrols is worth every penny as it keeps our children safe. If they were needed in the first place then what has changed apart from budget? You are effectively putting a price on child safety
- Safety first always not only for young children but for anyone who has a disability who takes a child to school having the crossing patrol is more important than saving money
- Why do these schools get a free pass? If you need to save money that badly then the axe should fall on everyone and you shouldn't be playing favouritism. All sites should be treated equally. Either we all stay or we all go

No Personal Effect

- Overall I do agree that the school crossing patrol should be abolished in a lot of areas. I do however believe that a junior school benefits from crossing patrol as many of these children are just beginning to take themselves to school independently. I believe that the crossing patrol should be removed for all infant and nursery schools as parents are still taking their children to school at this age and therefore there is already a responsible adult to ensure the road is crossed safely
- Whilst these changes do not affect me personally, it may affect young children in particular, headed towards school, access is very important, and students should have a safe journey to and from school.
- If they do not meet the criteria then just remove them. Unless as I said above the roads are not safe enough to do so. Is there any reason any of these couldn't be manned by volunteer parents in the correct uniform

every time they are needed?

School Specific Comments

- I take my children to Speedwell Infants and Staveley Juniors School we have to cross a really busy road so we rely on the lollipop lady, there is loads of children whose parents do not take their children and send them to school on their own so removing the school crossing is only going to lead to a accident. It is hard enough trying to cross this road as it is!
- My two granddaughters went to Hollingwood School, they school as two exit sites one is manned the other is not, the exit on private drive is usually quite busy and with children as young as 5 coming out onto a main through road THIS WOULD BE VERY BAD.
- Queen's Road is dangerous and needs a crossing patrol. All children who attend the school must cross this road to access the entrance, whether travelling on foot (as most do) or by car or bus. It is a bus route; a narrow road which also has many lorries and cars travelling along it. The housing is such that not all houses have driveways and so cars are always parked where the children need to cross to access the school. In addition there is a narrow, hump-back bridge over the railway, which is on a bend where visibility is extremely poor. The children currently know that the safest place to cross is with the crossing patrol. If this was removed, they might be more inclined to cross anywhere, including the bridge on the "blind" bend. Our crossing patrol is essential for the safety and well-being of our children. I would suggest that the reason there have been so few accidents on this road is because we have a safe place to cross with our crossing patrol man. If this service is removed, not only would children's lives be in danger but also parents in the future might not choose Hodthorpe for their school, if they can find one with safer access. This could seriously affect the future of the school.

Appendix 7

PETITIONS

LOCATION	SIGNATURES
Save Swanwick School Crossing Service	692
Thornsett School, New Mills – Save Our School Crossing Patrol	67
Wirksworth Junior School – Save Our School Crossing Person	507 (85 ipetition and 422 paper petition)
Save the Hasland Schools Crossing Patrol	482
Save the Old Hall Junior School Crossing Patrol	48
Save Our School Crossing Patrols in Derbyshire – Countywide	10,857 Countywide (23, 9644, 620, 98, 334 and 14)
St George's C of E Primary School, Church Gresley - Save The School Crossing Patrol	188
Save the Handley Road Infant School Crossing Patrol (New Whittington Community Primary School)	460
Save Hague Bar Primary School, New Mills School Crossing Patrol	26
School Crossing Patrol Service - Ashgate Road, Chesterfield	290
Keep Our School Crossing Patrol in Pinxton	768
Save Our School Crossing Patrol at Grassmoor Primary School	632
Save Our School Crossing Patrol at Norbriggs Primary School	71
Save Our School Crossing Patrol Service - Springfield Junior School	161
Save Our School Crossing Patrol Service - St Edward's Primary School	39
Save Our Lollipop Lady - Tibshelf Infant and Nursery School	278
Save The School Crossing Patrol - Abercrombie Primary School	327
Save The School Crossing Patrol in Derbyshire - Charlotte Infant and Nursery School	50
Save Our Lollipop Lady - Willington	241
Save Our School Crossing Patrols - Newhall	268
Save Our School Crossing Patrol - Turnditch C of E Primary School	48
Save Our School Crossing Patrol in Derbyshire - Bolsover	124

28 Petitions in total

PUPIL'S ARTWORK

Ridgeway Primary School	210 pieces of art work and pupil letters – 1 piece of work from each pupil
Grassmoor Primary School	155 pieces of art work and pupil letters
2 x sites that serve Spire Infant and Spire Junior Schools	24 pieces of art work
Charlotte Infant and Nursery School	111 pieces of are work

5 schools in total

Derbyshire County Council

Equality Impact Analysis



Department	Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE)
Service Area	Transport & Environment
Changes or proposals	Reduced service provision for School Crossing Patrol Service
Chair of Analysis Team	Richard Lovell
Date of Analysis	May 2015
Version	3

1. Prioritising what is being analysed

a. Description of current service arrangements

A long-established service that helps children to cross the road on their way to/from school. It is also available to other users who wish to cross at specific points.

The service currently operates 189 sites throughout Derbyshire, many of which are located directly outside schools. Other sites are on routes to schools and may assist children from a number of schools in the area.

Children of all ages, from nursery through to secondary use the service. Many younger children are accompanied by adults but a significant number are also unaccompanied.

The service is non-statutory.

b. Details of proposals or changes

The following proposals were put to Cabinet on 20 January 2015 with a recommendation that these be put out to public consultation. At this meeting cabinet agreed to this recommendation.

The proposed changes to the SCP service, approved by Cabinet to consult on, were developed following a full and comprehensive assessment of all Derbyshire's current sites, during 2014. These assessments were conducted in line with the recently updated

nationally approved guidance, issued by RoSPA, on the SCP service and, as referred to above, were used to inform the Council's work in preparing the proposals put forward to Cabinet on 20 January 2015. The proposals put forward are as follows:-

1. That any individual SCP site served by a light-controlled or zebra crossing facility be withdrawn with effect from the end of the summer term, July 2015.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal is 35.

2. That lunchtime cover, currently provided at a limited number of sites, be withdrawn from the end of the summer term, July 2015.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal is 7.

3. That current vacant sites, not meeting specific national criteria, are not recruited to and therefore cease to have provision made by the Council.

The total number of sites affected by this specific proposal, at the time of the original Cabinet report, was 19.

4. That any sites currently staffed but becoming vacant as a result of staff leaving, or requests for new sites, will be reviewed against specific national criteria to inform whether that site should be recruited to or not.

The total number of sites currently affected by this specific proposal is 42 although it is expected that this will increase over time, as potentially more staff leave in the future.

There are currently 93 sites meeting specific national criteria and it was proposed that these will continue to be retained and operated by the Council.

The criteria referred to above is PV i.e. number of pedestrians versus number of vehicles (squared), taken at the busiest period both am and pm over a 30 minute timeframe, the criteria also takes into consideration a number of local adjustment factors such as proximity to a bend; ages of children crossing and whether they are accompanied or not and speed limits. Those sites that meet the national criteria of 4 million will be deemed suitable for continued support under this service, providing there are no other mitigating factors, for example the site is situated on or close to a pelican/zebra crossing or other light-controlled facility.

C. Rationale for proposed changes

To help contribute towards the Council's required budget savings of £157m over the next 5 years.

2. The team carrying out the analysis

Name	Area of expertise/ role
Richard Lovell	Line manager of SCP Project Officer/Chair
Rob Bounds	Equalities/active travel
Bridey Greenway	SCP Project Officer/Operational knowledge
Sandra Taylor	ETE HR
Neill Bennett	Data Analysis

3. Existing information and consultation based feedback

a. Sources of data and consultation used

Source	Reason for using
DCC Archives and records	Historical data e.g. no. of sites etc
School Travel Plans	Active travel data
Actual Site Assessments	Up to date information to assess criteria implications
Official July announcement from Council re cuts	Initial assessment of public feedback
Other local authorities	Benchmarking
Road Safety Casualty Report	Assessment of success levels re child road safety
Road Safety National Survey Report 2013	Benchmarking
Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy (SMoTS)	Statutory duty on the local authority and includes audit of safer routes to schools and the promotion of walking as a mode of travel.
Bristol City Council	Academic study on the effectiveness of School Crossing Patrols

4. Known impact on different protected characteristic groups

- a. From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?

Protected Group	Findings
Age including children and families, older people	Impact on children but specifically younger children/parents and carers who rely on this service. Removal of service could impact on health of children if resulting impact is to use the car to get to/from school as oppose more physically active methods of transport or through exposure to increased risk whilst travelling on foot. Older generation who utilise the service and also School Crossing Patrol staff of all ages who could be affected by any cut to the service.
Disabled people including mobility, sensory, learning, mental health, HIV, and also include carers and relatives	Adverse impact on independence of a variety of users who rely on the service not least vulnerable children with learning difficulties whose cognitive skills in terms of road safety awareness may not be as responsive.
Gender (Sex) including men and women, boys and girls	Potential greater impact on women who are, anecdotally, still recognised as the predominant factor in terms of carer/parental responsibilities. This is re-enforced by findings in the National Travel Survey.
Gender reassignment – including impact if any on Transgender people	Impact considered low.
Marriage and civil partnership – also include impacts on lone parents and unmarried couples	Potential for adverse impact on married couples, those in a civil partnership and lone parents as it could affect daily routine and impact negatively on work and/or other family.
Pregnancy and maternity – including new mothers/ parents	Potential impact on daily routines. The service generally supports parents.
Race – including all racial groups, including impact if any on Gypsies and Travellers	Low impact considered although language barriers could be an issue in terms of consultation process and potentially where mitigation is in the form of road safety training.
Religion and belief including non-belief, including religious minority communities, Humanists	Impact is deemed to be low.
Sexual orientation – including the impact if any	Impact considered to be low.

on LGB people	
---------------	--

Non-statutory

Poorer and disadvantaged communities and groups, including people who experience financial exclusion	Real or perceived lack of alternatives. Increased risk to children from certain communities who do not have access to other methods of transport and are put at higher risk without the service.
Rural communities	Lack of potential alternatives similar to above. Increased use of car to transport children to/from school resulting in increased obesity, higher congestion, greater road safety risk through increased traffic and decreased air quality.

Impact on employees of Derbyshire County Council or prospective employees

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School Crossing Patrol staff – potential redundancies/re-deployment issues, loss of income, reduced social activity. 2. Traffic & Safety – Increased workload through increase in demand for measures associated with Safer Routes to School. 3. Public Health – increased levels of obesity due to reduced levels of physical activity through a reduction in active travel and reduced air quality due to higher levels of pollution caused by increased congestion. 4. Schools – Greater pressure on schools staff to potentially mitigate against loss of service. Pressure from parents and carers. 5. Sustainable Travel Team – increased demand on a limited resource. 6. Road Safety Team – increased demand on a limited resource 7. ETE and Corporate HR – expected to deal with potential redundancy issues. 8. Civil Parking Enforcement – increased congestion outside schools caused by increased use of the car. 9. Members – Potential for constituency fall out

b. From existing customer and other feedback – who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?

Protected Group	Findings
Age	<p>Age 1 – 15: 11% of respondents to the consultation were in this age group indicating a potentially greater impact on younger children.</p> <p>Age 26 – 50: 31% of respondents spanned two age groups (26 – 35) and (36 – 50) indicating a potentially greater impact on younger parents and grandparents.</p>

Disability	Analysis of the data show that there is not a greater proportion of people with a disability who disagree with the proposals.
Gender (Sex)	Analysis of the data show there is a greater proportion of identified females who responded to the consultation. This would indicate there is a greater impact on females than males – out of 881 respondents who gave their gender 42% were female and 16.3% were male with a further 41.7% not identifying a gender
Gender reassignment	Not asked specifically in consultation as considered to be of low impact
Marriage and civil partnership	Not asked specifically in consultation as considered to be of low impact
Pregnancy and maternity	Not asked specifically in consultation as considered to be of low impact
Race	The results show 97% of respondents to the consultation were of white origin, only 25 respondents were of non-white ethnicity. This is considered too small a number to analyse further in cross referencing.
Religion and belief including non-belief	Not asked specifically in consultation as considered to be of low impact
Sexual orientation	Not asked specifically in consultation as considered to be of low impact

Non-statutory

Poorer and disadvantaged communities	No evidence has been identified from the consultation suggesting the proposals would have a greater, or lesser, impact on poorer and disadvantaged communities.
Rural	As above.

Employees or prospective employees

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat of redundancy and potential loss of income to School Crossing Patrol staff. • Potential for reduced levels of social activity. • Reduced opportunities for prospective employees. • Loss of income/fall in standard of living

c. Are there any **other** groups of people who may experience an adverse impact because of the proposals?

- Families and households of School Crossing Patrol personnel due to reduced levels of income.
- Other road users who could be affected by increased congestion affecting daily working routine.
- Local communities affected by increased and inconsiderate levels of parking in the vicinity of schools.
- Local communities due to increased pollution and reduced air quality.

d. Gaps in data

What are your main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your policy and services? Please indicate whether you have identified ways of filling these gaps.

Gaps in data	Action to deal with this
N/a now that consultation has been completed?	N/a

6. From the consultation you have carried out specifically in relation to proposed changes, what views or issues have been raised by those who have responded? (Include both their views and any issues they have raised which alludes to the likely impact)

a) Please summarise the consultation which has been carried out

The consultation process began on 28th January and ran through until 21st April 2015, a period of 11 weeks and 5 days. The focus was on completion of on-line questionnaires, although paper-based questionnaires were also publicised and available through a variety of outlets such as libraries and district and borough councils.

The consultation was widely publicised through the County Council's website, press releases, social media and youth forums. All schools were asked to inform parents to alert them to the proposals and encourage their response.

There has been a good response to the consultation, having received at the close of consultation:-

- 1424 on-line questionnaires
- 87 hard copies

In addition the County Council received 28 petitions together with artwork and letters from pupils from five individual schools. The County Council also received 114 individual letters and other correspondence (emails etc).

- b) Please summarise the feedback received. This should make clear where those who have responded have highlighted any potential adverse impact as well as their opinions on the proposals.

1511 individuals responded to the consultation and the majority of concerns were with regard to child safety, and congestion around schools, causing poor visibility and speeding traffic. There were 4 elements to the proposal:-

1.To remove SCPs from zebra crossings and light controlled crossing – overall 82% disagreed with the proposal

2.To remove SCPs from lunch time cover – overall 59.5% disagreed with 40.5% agreeing to this proposal

3.To not recruit to current vacant sites that do not meet the national criteria – 72% disagreed with this proposal

4.Not to re-recruit to current staffed sites when they become vacant but do not meet the national criteria – 80% disagreed with this proposal

Please see attached (Appendix 8 - Continued) for a more detailed analysis of the consultation.

In summary there is no greater proportion of people with protected characteristics who disagree more with the proposals. However, for proposals 1, 3 and 4 (above) a greater proportion of young people and parents/carers disagreed with the proposal as did a greater proportion of women

With regards proposal 2 (above) 59.5% overall disagreed with this proposal however of this figure it is worth noting that 71% were pupils.

There appears to be no difference between whether people agree or disagree with any of the proposals above in relation to whether they have a disability.

Predominant suggestions from individuals who responded to proposal 1 (above) was to replace zebra crossings with light controlled crossings.

Note: Please read this analysis in conjunction with Cabinet Report Appendices 3,4,5 and 6 which also provide examples of some of the open ended responses received as part of the

consultation process.

7. Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing likely possible adverse impact on any groups of people, what are those actions, and how will they assist?

A number of mitigating actions could be employed (subject to appropriate funding and resources being available):-

1. Enhanced road safety awareness campaigns, where appropriate (resource implications ie possible need to recruit more road safety staff to deliver training and resources)
2. Enhanced active travel awareness campaigns (resource implications ie funding for campaign materials)
3. Enhanced hardware improvements i.e. from zebra crossings to light-controlled crossings points (capital implications – in the region of £35,000 per site + maintenance costs). This would be dependant on appropriate criteria being met.
4. The promotion of greater parental responsibility (resource implications)

Resource implications include finding additional staff time to deliver these mitigating actions and associated costs which could offset against potential savings.

8. Main conclusions and Recommendations

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis the following is believed to be of importance and should be noted by decision-makers:

This would appear to be a generally unpopular series of proposals which potentially could have a greater impact on young people and women. From the responses received, however, there would appear to be no evidence of a challenge to the methodology used to objectively assess each SCP site, rather it was the broad principle of the proposed reduction in service which was of primary concern.

In the feedback there were also a number of suggestions that if the zebra crossing was to go it should be replaced by a light controlled crossing which could possibly have high cost implications. The Council would need to make sure that such requests were assessed against relevant Council policies.

RECOMMENDATIONS (if any)

It is recommended that:

1. A publicity and communications programme is developed and implemented to inform key stakeholders of the proposed changes.
2. Officers continue to work with school communities affected by the proposed changes to assess any future potential mitigation. This to include continuing to explore alternative funding sources to assist in this mitigation and could include possible enhancements to light-controlled crossing points, subject to relevant Council policies being met.
3. Officers continue to review all sites through periodical site assessments and that these are updated on a regular basis.
4. Officers continue to promote greater parental responsibility (resource permitting)

9. Action planning

Objective	Planned action	Who	When	How will this be monitored?
What you want to achieve	What you intend to do	Responsible person or department	Timing of action	Monitoring and review arrangements
Ensure all key stakeholders are informed of proposed changes and timescales	Develop a publicity and communication programme to explain proposed changes, for example letters to Schools and all School Crossing Patrol Staff	Corporate PR – Jennie Hodgkinson	July – October 2015	Through Corporate PR procedures
Assist those school communities, affected by the proposals, to explore ongoing future potential mitigation measures.	Regular reviews of sites affected including exploring alternative funding sources where appropriate.	ETE officers from Sustainable Travel Team, Road Safety, Civil Parking and Highways.	–From September 2015 and ongoing	Through regular individual site assessments.
To conduct an annual review of appropriate sites to assess status of sites against nationally approved criteria and guidance.	Annual site assessments of appropriate sites	School Crossing Patrol Team	From January 2016 and ongoing on an annual basis	Robust site assessments submitted to School Crossing Patrol Project Officer.
To promote to school communities the key issue of greater parental responsibility in terms of getting children to/from school.	Road Safety and Sustainable Travel awareness campaigns where appropriate (resources permitting)	ETE officers from Sustainable Travel Team, Road Safety and Civil Parking.	From September 2015	Through regular engagement with schools and appropriate communities.

10. Monitoring and review arrangements

Please outline what steps will be taken to monitor and review the implementation of proposals if they are agreed here:

If the recommendations are approved regular site assessments will be undertaken at sites affected by the proposals. For example:-

1. When a site becomes vacant it will be subjected to a full site assessment and, if the desired criteria isn't met, the site will not be recruited to unless alternative sources of funding can be secured.
2. Any request for a new site will be subjected to a full site assessment as above.
3. Where SCP facilities have been withdrawn, because of the proximity to a zebra crossing facility, a site assessment, where requested, will be conducted to assess potential for possible capital enhancement to a light-controlled crossing facility, in association with Highways procedures and timetables.
4. Accident statistics will be monitored at sites where SCP facility has been removed.

11. Conformation that equality impact analysis (EAI) completed and read

Name of officer signing off EIA as completed Richard Lovell

Date: 9th June 2015

This Equality Impact Analysis has been read by

Name	Date	Position

Where and when published e.g. with Cabinet Report, on DCC website

--

Decision-making processes

Attached to report (title):

Date of report:

Author of report:

Audience for report e.g. Cabinet:

Web location of report:

Decision in relation to report

--

Details of follow-up action or links to further EIAs

--

Updated by:

Date:

APPENDIX 8 (continued)

Following analysis of the consultation, 1511 surveys were returned:

Age – 841 respondents gave their age:

age	1-15	16-20	21-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	not given
%	10.7%	1.6%	0.9%	9.6%	21.4%	8.1%	3.4%	44.3%
Count	162	24	14	145	323	121	51	670

Disability - 845 respondents answered the question

	Disability declared	No disability	No information
%	4.5%	51.4%	44.1%
Count	68	777	666

Gender – 881 respondents gave their gender

	male	female	No information
%	16.3%	42%	41.7%
Count	247	634	630

Gender reassignment – this was not asked in the consultation.

Marriage & civil partnership - this was not asked in the consultation.

Pregnancy and maternity - this was not asked in the consultation.

Race - The results show 97% were off white origin, only 25 respondents were of non-white ethnicity. This is too small a frequency to analyse further in cross referencing.

Religion and belief - this was not asked in the consultation.

Sexual orientation - this was not asked in the consultation.

The survey asked in what capacity respondents were answering.

The results are:

Parent	Head teacher	pupil	Governor	School staff	Parish council	Member of public	SCP	other
738	40	379	61	57	24	281	50	71

Note total exceeds number of surveys returned due to multiple roles.

Q4 – relating to removing patrols from zebra & light controlled crossing

Age – 738 respondents gave their age across all ages 82% disagree with the proposal

Looking in more detail the proposals appear less agreeable to those in the age groups shown below which mostly likely are those who are children and parents/carers:

age	1-15	26-35	36-50	65+
% who disagree with proposal	75%	85%	86%	89%
count	84	117	252	39

This is further validated by analysis of question 1 of the survey which shows that 87% of parents and 73% of pupils disagree with the proposal to remove patrols from zebra and light controlled crossings. Similarly 82% of head teachers disagree with this proposal.

Disability

Regarding the removal of patrols from zebra crossings – 742 people made a declaration of whether they were disabled or not (66 declared a disability). Overall 82% disagreed with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that there is not a greater proportion of people with a disability who disagree with the proposal.

	Disability declared	No disability
% who disagree with proposal	76%	82%
Count	50	557

Gender

Regarding the removal of patrols from zebra crossings – 771 people gave their gender. Overall 82% disagree with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that 12% more woman disagree with the proposal than men which potentially reflects the fact that more women take children to school.

	male	female
% who disagree with proposal	73%	85%
Count	156	473

Q7 – relating to removing patrols lunchtime services

Age – 532 respondents gave their age across all ages 59% disagree with the proposal – with 41% agreeing.

Looking in more detail this is consistent across the age groups – although it is 12% higher among the 1-15 age group which mostly is children using this service at lunchtime possibly unaccompanied by parents.

age	1-15	26-35	36-50	65+
% who disagree with proposal	71%	54%	55%	77%
count	82	50	100	20

This is further validated by analysis of question 1 of the survey which shows that 70% of pupils disagree with the proposal to remove patrols from lunchtime services.

Similarly 70% of head teachers disagree with this proposal.

In comparison 56% of parents disagree with removing the service at lunchtime with 44% agreeing and 57% of parish councils. (NB only 7 Parish councils responded to this question)

Disability

Regarding the removal of patrols lunchtime services – 539 people made a declaration of whether they were disabled or not (55 declared a disability). Overall 60% disagreed with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that there is not a greater proportion of people with a disability who disagree with the proposal.

	Disability declared	No disability
% who disagree with proposal	62%	59%
Count	34	287

Gender

Regarding the removal of patrols from lunchtime services – 560 people gave their gender.

Overall 59% disagree with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that there is no difference between the percentage of male or females objecting to the proposal.

	male	female
% who disagree with proposal	59%	59%
Count	105	226

Q10 – relating to vacant sites which do not meet the national criteria

Age – 492 respondents gave their age. Across all ages 72% disagree with the proposal.

Looking more depth this is consistent across the age groups – although it is 5% higher among the 1-15 age group.

age	1-15	26-35	36-50	65+
% who disagree with proposal	77%	73%	73%	75%
count	82	58	124	21

By comparison 65% (53 individuals) aged 51-65 disagree with the proposal.

89% of head teachers (16 individuals) disagree with this proposal.

In comparison 56% of parents disagree with removing the service at lunchtime with 44% agreeing and 57% of parish councils. (NB only 7 Parish councils responded)

Disability

Regarding the proposal not to recruit to vacant sites which do not meet the national criteria – 499 people made a declaration of whether they were disabled or not (55 declared a disability).

Overall 73% disagreed with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that there is not a greater proportion of people with a disability who disagree with the proposal.

	Disability declared	No disability
% who disagree with proposal	73%	73%
Count	40	323

Gender

Regarding the not to recruit to vacant sites which do not meet the national criteria – 518 people gave their gender.

Overall 73% disagree with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that 10% more woman disagree with the proposal than men, which potentially reflects the fact that more women take children to school.

	male	female
% who disagree with	66%	76%

proposal		
Count	108	271

Q13 – relating to staffed sites which do not meet the national criteria

Age – 566 respondents gave their age. Across all ages 80% disagree with the proposal.

Looking more depth this is consistent across the age groups – although it is higher among the 26-50 who have been identified as the potential parent/carers

age	1-15	26-35	36-50	65+
% who disagree with proposal	79%	84%	86%	88%
count	84	80	186	30

By comparison 67% (57 individuals) aged 51-65 disagree with the proposal.

86% of head teachers (18 individuals) disagree with this proposal.

In comparison 88% of parents disagree with not recruiting to staffed sites that become vacant which do not meet the national criteria.

94% of school governors (31 individuals) also disagree with this proposal

Disability

Regarding the proposal not to re-recruit to sites which do not meet the national criteria – 572 people made a declaration of whether they were disabled or not (54 declared a disability).

Overall 80% disagreed with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that there is not a greater proportion of people with a disability who disagree with the proposal.

	Disability declared	No disability
% who disagree with proposal	72%	81%
Count	39	419

Gender

Regarding the not to re-recruit to sites which do not meet the national criteria – 594 people gave their gender.

Overall 80% disagree with the proposal.

Analysis of the figures show that 12% more woman disagree with the proposal than men, which potentially reflects the fact that more women take children to school.

	male	female
% who disagree with proposal	73%	85%
Count	156	473