1. Proposal Overview	
Proposal title:	Review of the road safety service
Reference:	HRPR_SAV_02_Road Safety Review
Lead officer:	Zahur Khan
Ward/s affected	Multiple
Cabinet portfolio	Environment and Climate
Scrutiny committee/s	CYP & Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route		
Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
Υ	N	Y

3. Contextual Information

Which service area/s are in the scope of the cuts proposal?

The Road Safety Service carries out a range of education, training, publicity and engineering measures to improve road users' road safety awareness and behaviours in the aim to reduce the numbers of people killed and injured on the road.

The service currently provides the following programmes to encourage active and safer travel - school travel plans, cycle training and maintenance, School Streets programme, road safety education, specific road safety education and training for vulnerable road user group and the school crossing patrol service.

There are currently 3 full time officers (1x PO6, 1 x PO3 & 1x SO1) and 21 term time/part time school crossing patrol officers in post. A further 7 school crossing patrol posts are currently vacant.

The current salary costs for the road safety team are approximately £320k per annum.

The proposal is to carry out a review of the service to identify where efficiencies can be made. The review will balance the need to continue to provide a statutory level of service against any areas where non-statutory services or activities can be reduced.

No consultation has yet been carried out with staff concerned and this would be undertaken once the review has been undertaken and the proposals drafted. Areas for efficiency savings will be based on the outcome of these consultations.

What is the controllable budget of the service area/s?

Budget Type	Spend (£000)	Income (£000)	Net Budget (£000)
General Fund	140	0	140
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
TOTAL			

What is the staffing profile of the service area/s?

	Number Of		Vacant Posts		
Grades	Posts	FTE	Agency / Interim Cover	Not Covered	
Scale 1 - Scale 5	21			7	
Scale 6 - SO2	1				

PO1 – PO5	1		
PO6 – PO8	1		
SMG1 - SMG3			
JNC			

4. Cuts Proposal

What changes are proposed to the service area/s?

A service saving of £140,000 over 2 years is proposed.

There has been no consultation with staff at this time, so details of the types of saving cannot be provided.

Current vacancies within the service consist of 7 school crossing patrol posts. Potential savings from releasing the vacant school crossing patrol officer posts is £42,000 (based on an average £6,000 annual salary).

For any reduction in service assessment work will be undertaken to consider mitigation measures should these be necessary.

The detailed programme of removal will also need to consider the HR implications, including redundancy costs if required.

The full saving of the £140,000 will be spread over two financial years to accommodate the estimated cost of any redundancy payments, which will need to be agreed as part of the HR process.

Are there any specific staffing implications? What level of saving will be achieved? (NET OF ANY CAPITAL OR REVENUE INVESTMENT)

Proposal strand	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL
If funded from capital				
If funded through revenue	70	70	0	140
TOTAL	70	70	0	140
% Net Budget				
Does proposal	General Fund	HRA	DSG	Health
impact on:	Y	N	N	N
If yes, please				

What are the potential delivery risks and mitigation?

Reputation is a risk; road safety is a visible and respected service; any reduction would likely generate negative publicity and increased correspondence. Clear communication to the public and schools will be needed to address concerns and perceptions.

Are there any specific legal implications?

describe impact:

In taking a decision to cease to continue to provide such a service the Council must consider all relevant matters and disregard irrelevant matters. For a successful challenge to

be made against the Council, the decision would need to be outside the limits, which any reasonable local authority would operate. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need

eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who

It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, or to promote equality of opportunity or foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. It is a duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the goals listed above.

The weight to be attached to the duty will be dependent on the nature of the decision and the circumstances in which it is made. This is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. The Mayor must understand the impact or likely impact of the decision on those with protected characteristics who are potentially affected by the decision. The extent of the duty will necessarily vary from case to case and due regard is such regard as is appropriate in all the circumstances.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled "Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice". The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-codes-practice

https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-technical-guidance

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
- Engagement and the equality duty: A guide for public authorities
- Objectives and the equality duty. A guide for public authorities

Equality Information and the Equality Duty: A Guide for Public Authorities

The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:

https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance#h1

Is public consultation required (formal/statutory)?	N

5. Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

The reduction of the service is likely to have an impact on service users who currently are used to using it.

The reduction of the service will be seen as a road safety risk to some users.

Road collisions/incidents may drive perception links to the cessation of this service.

Potential negative media coverage.

May be seen discouraging more walking and cycling as part of our efforts to improve the mode shift and health of residents. May encourage more driving children to school.

Some users may see this proposal as contradictory to supporting the Mayoral target of 'Vision Zero'.

Staff

Staff to be consulted on proposals.

Other Council Services

None

Partners

None

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age	Negative			
Disability	Negative			
Ethnicity		Negative		
Gender				Neutral
Gender reassignment				Neutral

Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive /	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
How do the propose	d changes align	with the Council	's Corporate Stra	itegy?
Is a full EAA require	d?		Y	′
Socio-economic inequality				Neutral
Sexual orientation				Neutral
Religion and belief				Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity				Neutral
Marriage and civil partnerships				Neutral

	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
Corporate Priorities	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Open Lewisham				Neutral
Tackling the Housing crisis				Neutral
Giving children and				
young people the			Negative	
best start in life				
Building an				
inclusive local				Neutral
economy				
Delivering and				
defending: health,				Neutral
social care &				. todtidi
support				
Making Lewisham greener				Neutral
Building safer		_	Mogativo	
communities			Negative	
Good governance and operational effectiveness				Neutral

6. Delivery Plan			
Milestones	Key Steps	Lead Officer	Timescales
Initiation	Complete a full project plan and identify risks, including financial and reputational. Initiate talks and consultation with affected staff.	Paul Boulton Support from HR	4 weeks
Planning	As part of the org change process undertake an equality impact assessment.	Paul Boulton Support from HR	6 – 8 weeks

Implementation Subject to outcome of consultation. Paul Boulton Support from HR Monitoring outcome.				
	Implementation			16 weeks
Review Paul Boulton Support from HR 4 weeks	Review	Monitoring outcome.	Paul Boulton Support from HR	4 weeks

Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

Author	Paul Boulton	Director	Public Realm
		ate	
Date	25 November 2022	Service	Strategic Transport
1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken			

for

The proposal is to carry out a review of the Road Safety service to identify where efficiencies can be made. The service currently provide the following programmes to encourage active and safer travel - school travel plans, cycle training and maintenance, School Streets programme, road safety education, specific road safety education and training for vulnerable road user group and the school crossing patrol service.

The service establishment consists of 3 full time road safety officer posts and 21 term time only school crossing patrol officers. A further 7 school crossing patrol posts are currently vacant.

No consultation has yet been carried out with staff concerned and this would be undertaken once the review has been carried out and the proposals drafted. Areas for efficiency savings will be based on the outcome of these consultations.

The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision				
⊠ Age	⊠ Ethnicity/Rac e	☐ Religion or belief	☐ Language spoken	☐ Other, please define:
□ Gender/Sex	☐ Gender identity	□ Disability	☐ Household type	

☐ Income	☐ Carer	☐ Sexual	⊠ Socio
	status	orientation	Economic
☐ Marriage	☐ Pregnancy		☐ Health &
and Civil	and Maternity	Refugee/Migra	Social Care
Partnership		nt/ Asylum	
		seeker	
□Nationality		□ Veterans or	
	Employment	reservists	

3. The evidence to support the analysis

The Lewisham Road Safety service is responsible for a range of services aimed to reduce the number of people injured on the road and to increase active and sustainable travel modes.

This includes road safety engineering, enforcement, education, cycle training, school travel planning and school crossing patrol service.

As a local highway authority, Lewisham has a statutory duty to undertake studies into road traffic collisions, and to take steps both to reduce and prevent them. The duties are not prescriptive and give Lewisham scope to realign the service to meet the current needs and challenges facing the borough. The outcome of the review would ensure that Lewisham continued to provide a statutory level of service.

When considering the protected characteristics or other equality factors that may be affected by this decision, the review will carefully consider the impact of those protected groups, in particular those with age, disability and socioeconomic factors, and put in place mitigation.

The risk of being injured in a road collision increases in areas with higher deprivation indices.

There are more road traffic collisions recorded in the most deprived neighbourhoods in London than the least deprived; the 10% of areas with the highest deprivation saw nearly 3,000 casualties in 2019, more than double the 1,400 in the 10% of areas with the lowest deprivation.

A recent report cites Britain's poorest people and people from ethnic minority groups already bear the brunt of traffic congestion and air pollution. This important new report shows that they are also more likely to be a casualty. Deprivation doubles the risk of becoming a pedestrian casualty. People from an ethnic minority (excluding non-white minorities) are 25% more likely to be a casualty than white pedestrians. However, the research, which looked at ten years of collisions reported to the police across Britain, cannot tell us why some groups are more at risk. It is likely to be due, in part, to the amount of time spent as a pedestrian. The National Travel Survey shows that people from ethnic minorities and deprived backgrounds are more likely to walk and less likely to have a car. Road traffic and Injury Risk in Ethnic Minority Populations Report, Agilysis and Living Streets May 2021.

Any mitigation would be based on a risk managed approach using a range of indices including average speeds, volume of pedestrians, traffic flows, road collision history and other mitigations already in place. Following use of a consistent risk assessment formula will ensure that those with protected characteristics and other impacted groups and not adversely impacted.

4. The analysis

The proposal is to carry out a review of the service to identify where efficiencies can be made. The review will balance the need to continue to provide a statutory level of service against any areas where non-statutory services or activities can be reduced.

No formal consultation has yet been carried out with staff concerned and this would be undertaken once the review has been carried out and the proposals drafted. Areas for efficiency savings will be based on the outcome of these consultations.

It is proposed also that to reduce the impact on staff the efficiency savings would be taken over a two year period. This will also ensure that any mitigation required to off-set the impact on those with protected characteristics and other groups can be put in place.

5. Impact summary & 6. Mitigation.			
Protected	Impact	Mitigation	
characteristic			
Age	Negativ e	Introduction of School Streets to reduce traffic volume in the vicinity of schools.	
		Create School Safety Zones to create a version of a School Street that can be used where a traditional school street is not feasible in order to slow traffic, improve pedestrian space, encourage walking and cycling.	
		Improvements to existing pedestrian crossings points, including introduction of controlled crossings such as Zebras and Toucans. Improve advanced warning signs and road markings near pedestrian crossing points and schools.	
Ethnicity/Race	Negativ e	Introduction of School Streets to reduce traffic volume in the vicinity of schools. Create School Safety Zones to create a version of a School Street that can be used where a traditional school street is not	

		feasible in order to slow traffic, improve pedestrian space, encourage walking and cycling. Improvements to existing pedestrian crossings points, including introduction of controlled crossings such as Zebras and Toucans. Improve advanced warning signs and road
Diochility	Nogotic	markings near pedestrian crossings and schools.
Disability	Negativ e	Introduction of School Streets to reduce traffic volume in the vicinity of schools.
		Create School Safety Zones to create a version of a School Street that can be used where a traditional school street is not feasible in order to slow traffic, improve pedestrian space, encourage walking and cycling.
		Improvements to existing pedestrian crossings points, including introduction of controlled crossings such as Zebras and Toucans.
		Improve advanced warning signs and road markings near pedestrian crossings and schools.
Socio-economic	Negativ e	Introduction of School Streets to reduce traffic volume in the vicinity of schools.
		Create School Safety Zones to create a version of a School Street that can be used where a traditional school street is not feasible in order to slow traffic, improve pedestrian space, encourage walking and cycling.
		Improvements to existing pedestrian crossings points, including introduction of controlled crossings such as Zebras and Toucans.
		Improve advanced warning signs and road markings near pedestrian crossing and schools.

7. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts?

Areas for efficiency savings will be based on the outcome of consultations with affected staff. Following this process any impacts to service users will be formally communicated through corporate and service level channels.

As part of the communications strategy the council will promote alternative solutions to the services provided by the Council including the mitigation measures that will be introduced to off-set any impact.

Signature of Director

Zahur Khan 25/11/2022