

Supporting Information and Impact Assessment

Proposal:	Road Safety Services
Executive Lead:	Cllr Excell
Director / Assistant Director:	Fran Hughes

Version:	3.0	Date:	February 2017	Author:	Fran Hughes
----------	-----	-------	---------------	---------	-------------

Section 1: Background Information

1.	<p>What is the proposal / issue?</p> <p>The proposal is to reduce the Road Safety budget by £68,000 if additional income cannot be generated to fund this service.</p> <p>If additional income cannot be generated then this would result in the cessation of funding to the Road Safety Officer posts (2FTE). There is no statutory duty to provide Road Safety Officers and the Council can choose the level at which it provides road safety services.</p> <p>Road Safety Officers provide a range of road safety education and early interventions to reduce the risk of serious injury and deaths on the road.</p> <p>The Road Safety staff also line-manage the school crossing patrol service, therefore as a result of this proposal an alternative management structure would be required.</p> <p>School Crossing Patrols for Academy Schools are currently paid for by the academies and it was agreed that this would be at full cost recovery during the 2016/17 budget. However, the management costs had not been included in the costs to academy schools. This will now be remedied and the service to academy schools will operate at full cost recovery as previously agreed.</p> <p>Each local Highway Authority has a legal requirement under s39 of the 1988 Road Traffic Act (9) to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to improve road safety for all road users and to carry out evidence based interventions to reduce collisions. This can be delivered through engineering works and signposting to other information.</p>
2.	<p>What is the current situation?</p> <p>The Council currently employs 3 staff in Road Safety (2FTE). These staff deliver Road Safety interventions to the public and schools to provide a range of education and early interventions to reduce the risk of serious injury and deaths on the road. These staff also line manage the school crossing patrol service.</p> <p>There is no statutory duty for the Council to provide the service in this way.</p>

3.	<p>What options have been considered?</p> <p>The Council can chose the level at which is provides road safety services.</p> <p>In order for the service to be sustainable the primary consideration is to identify a source of income for this service so that it can continue. In order to be sustainable the service will also need to prioritise the interventions which it delivers to ensure that it is focused on tangible, measurable outcomes. One of the income options would be for schools to buy back this service from the Council, at full cost recovery.</p>
4.	<p>How does this proposal support the ambitions, principles and delivery of the Corporate Plan 2015-19?</p> <p>Ambitions: Prosperous and Healthy Torbay</p> <p>Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use reducing resources to best effect • Reduce demand through prevention and innovation <p>Targeted actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting all children and giving them the best start in life • Promoting healthy lifestyles across Torbay • Protecting and supporting vulnerable adults
5.	<p>Who will be affected by this proposal and who do you need to consult with?</p> <p>Those affected by the proposals will be the general public, schools, community groups and other stakeholders involved in a variety of road safety partnerships.</p>
6.	<p>How will you propose to consult?</p> <p>The consultation will include specific key partner/stakeholder consultation. This proposal will also be consulted upon as part of the wider budget setting process. Online and paper questionnaires will be made available to members of the public.</p>
<p>Section 2: Expected Implications and Impact Assessment</p>	
7.	<p>What are the <u>expected</u> financial and legal implications?</p> <p>If external funding cannot be secured from schools, or other stakeholders then the implications will be that the 2FTE posts will be at risk of redundancy, and Road Safety interventions by the council will cease.</p>

8.	<p>What are the <u>expected</u> risks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputational damage • Risk of road safety performance being eroded • Cost recovery model not achievable • Loss of road safety staff 															
9.	<p>Public Services Value (Social Value) Act 2012</p> <p>N/A</p>															
10.	<p>What evidence / data / research have you gathered in relation to this proposal?</p> <p>Staff consultation, the Mayors overall budget consultation and direct approaches to schools who are beneficiaries of the service.</p>															
11.	<p>What are key findings from the consultation you have carried out?</p> <p>There was no sustainable source of funding found for this service within the timescales given. The staff consultation clearly identified that reducing the budget by the full amount would create an operational problem in the management of the school crossing patrols.</p> <p>Feedback from the general budget consultation is shown below:</p> <p>Q23 Road Safety Services:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="563 1339 1190 1608"> <thead> <tr> <th>Do you support this proposal?</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Percent</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>226</td> <td>54.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>163</td> <td>39.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No answer</td> <td>28</td> <td>6.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>417</td> <td>100.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Do you support this proposal?	Number	Percent	Yes	226	54.2%	No	163	39.1%	No answer	28	6.7%	Total	417	100.0%
Do you support this proposal?	Number	Percent														
Yes	226	54.2%														
No	163	39.1%														
No answer	28	6.7%														
Total	417	100.0%														
12.	<p>Amendments to Proposal / Mitigating Actions</p> <p>It is recommended that to in order to ensure continuity in management that the 0.5 FTE Road Safety Assistant Post is retained within the structure specifically to manage school crossing patrols and that the costs of this service is recharged to the Academy Schools who use the service in line with the decision made in 2016/17. This will be an increase of £720 per Academy School.</p>															

Equality Impacts

13	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups			
		Positive Impact	Negative Impact & Mitigating Actions	Neutral Impact
	Older or younger people		There would be less capacity to deliver road safety education and early interventions to children and young people.	
	People with caring Responsibilities	No differential impact.		
	People with a disability	No differential impact.		
	Women or men	No differential impact		
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME) <i>(Please note Gypsies / Roma are within this community)</i>	No differential impact.		
	Religion or belief (including lack of belief)	No differential impact.		
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual	No differential impact		
	People who are transgendered	No differential impact		
	People who are in a marriage or civil partnership	No differential impact		
	Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave	No differential impact		

	Socio-economic impacts (Including impact on child poverty issues and deprivation)	No differential impact		
	Public Health impacts (How will your proposal impact on the general health of the population of Torbay)		There will be no early intervention delivered by the council on road safety issues which may have an impact on public health outcomes.	
14	Cumulative Impacts – Council wide (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)	None identified		
15	Cumulative Impacts – Other public services (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)	None identified		