



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

An Extraordinary Meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** will be held in David Hicks 1 - Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham RG40 1BN on **MONDAY 3 SEPTEMBER 2018 AT 7.00 PM**

Manjeet Gill
Interim Chief Executive
Published on 23 August 2018

The role of Overview and Scrutiny is to provide independent “critical friend” challenge and to work with the Council’s Executive and other public service providers for the benefit of the public. The Committee considers submissions from a range of sources and reaches conclusions based on the weight of evidence – not on party political grounds.

This meeting may be filmed for inclusion on the Council’s website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council’s control.



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Vision

A great place to live, an even better place to do business

Our Priorities

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

The Underpinning Principles

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

MEMBERSHIP OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Councillors

Parry Batth (Chairman)

Lindsay Ferris

Mike Haines

Malcolm Richards

Philip Houldsworth (Vice-Chairman)

Guy Grandison

Ken Miall

Bill Soane

Andy Croy

Kate Haines

Ian Pittock

Shahid Younis

Substitutes

Alistair Auty

John Jarvis

Rachel Burgess

Clive Jones

Carl Doran

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
31.		APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for absence.	
32.		DECLARATION OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest	
33.		PUBLIC QUESTION TIME To answer any public questions relating to the Call-In item on the Agenda. A period of 30 minutes will be allowed for members of the public to ask questions submitted under notice. The Council welcomes questions from members of the public about the work of this Committee. For full details of the procedure for submitting questions please contact the Democratic Services Section on the numbers given below or go to www.wokingham.gov.uk/publicquestions	
34.		MEMBER QUESTION TIME To answer any Member questions relating to the Call-In item on the Agenda.	
35.		CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION - SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL SERVICE - CONSULTATION REPORT 2018 To consider the Call-In of the Executive decision (26 July 2018) relating to the termination of the School Crossing Patrol service and its replacement by permanent crossings.	
35.1		Background In accordance with the Council's Constitution, five non-Executive Members of the Council have submitted a	

formal notice “calling in” the Executive decision to remove the School Crossing Patrol service from seven sites across the Borough once permanent crossing facilities were installed.

The full decision made by the Executive was as follows:

That:

- 1) WBC continue with its proposal to provide safe, permanent crossings at the seven locations that currently have a school crossing patroller, and, following their installation, remove the school crossing patrol service once the permanent crossings are complete as set out in Option 2, Appendix 1 of the report;
- 2) all affected schools are reminded that they have access to the Council's road safety and My Journey teams who can facilitate further road safety training for pupils if requested.

The decision has been called in on the following grounds:

- 1) The decision has contravened Section 1.4.2 a) of the Council's Constitution, in that the action being proposed is not proportionate to the desired outcome.
 - a) A blanket decision has been made to replace all remaining School Crossing Patrols (SCP) with pedestrian crossings, despite the different characteristics and requirements of the locations.
 - b) The desired outcome appears to be to save money yet the costs both of the crossings and the school crossing patrol have not been fully or correctly stated. None of the other options quoted had any costs provided.
 - c) The decision was made on the basis of costs for crossings which have not yet been designed – as a redesign is taking place at four sites due to the first design not being suitable; it is therefore unclear whether a crossing is actually the right answer for those locations, as well as the costs being unknown.
- 2) The decision has contravened Section 1.4.2 b) of the Council's Constitution, in that due consultation and the taking of professional advice from Officers

has not occurred.

- a) The consultation was not complete at the point at which the decisions to withdraw the service were made.
 - b) The consultation was not carried out at an early stage, and was not meaningful, and contravened the Council's own rules on consultation.
 - c) There was no consultation with ward Members on the withdrawal of the service.
 - d) The replacement crossings were designed without reference to ward Members and before the consultation was carried out – and ward Members were not even informed until mid-July that the crossings had been designed.
 - e) Wokingham Town Council's consultation response has not been taken into consideration.
 - f) Letters putting the staff at risk of redundancy were issued before the consultation was concluded.
 - g) The Council's responses to the points made by respondents are inadequate.
 - h) At least one crossing was scheduled to be installed before the decision on the outcome of the consultation took place.
 - i) At least one safety audit was done during the school holidays.
 - j) No Equality Impact Assessments accompanied the information in the report.
 - k) It is not clear that all guidelines for the provision of safe crossings have been observed.
 - l) It is not clear that all the evidence comparing the appropriateness of SCP versus crossings has been taken into account.
- 3) The decision has contravened Section 1.4.2 d) of the Council's Constitution, in that openness has not been observed.
- a) At least one of the crossings was designed in February but this was not communicated to ward Members.
 - b) Some information was shared with individual members of the public but was not made available to all.
 - c) No overall plan for the removal of SCP was made available following the removal of the funding in the 2015 Medium Term Financial Plan.

- 4) The decision has contravened Section 1.4.2 e) of the Council's Constitution, in that clarity of aims and desired outcomes has not been achieved.
 - a) The recommendations refer to a proposal to provide safe, permanent crossings – yet four of the crossing proposals have been rejected in the period shortly before the Executive meeting that made the decision, and therefore the decision has been made before there is certainty that the recommendation can be delivered, or that the costs are as given in the report.
 - b) Due to the failure to present all costs for all options it is not possible for the Executive to have come to a properly informed decision.
 - c) Due to the failure to present the Equality Impact Assessments it is not possible for the Executive to have come to a properly informed decision.
- 5) The decision has contravened Section 1.4.2 f) of the Council's Constitution, in that the details of all the options and reasons for the decision have not been recorded.
 - a) A set of options has been laid out but it excludes the most obvious option of replacing some but not all of the patrollers with crossings.
 - b) There was a presumption that no funding was available for the service to continue, whereas a supplementary estimate could have been used to find the money, but was not considered.

36.

REFERENCE INFORMATION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE

9 - 50

- 1) Extract from the 2015/18 Medium Term Financial Plan;
- 2) WBC Consultation Approach;
- 3) Questions and Minutes from the Council meeting held on 19 July 2018;
- 4) Report on the School Crossing Patrol Service submitted to the Executive on 26 July 2018;
- 5) Questions and Minutes from the Executive meeting - 26 July 2018;
- 6) Report by the Director of Locality and Customer Services on the issues raised by the Call-In **(to follow)**

37.

LIST OF WITNESSES AND INDICATIVE TIMETABLE

51 - 52

38.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee consider the Call-In and either:

- 1) Confirm the decision of the Executive, or
- 2) Recommend that the decision be reconsidered by the Executive, setting out the reasons for its recommendation.

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent

A Supplementary Agenda will be issued by the Chief Executive if there are any other items to consider under this heading.

CONTACT OFFICER

Neil Carr

Tel

Email

Postal Address

Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

0118 974 6058

neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk

Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Medium Term Financial Plan 2015/2016

**(Including Revenue Budget Forecast & Capital Budget
Forecast to 2017/18)**

This page is intentionally left blank

THREE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST

	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Environment			
School crossing patrols - investigate alternative sources of funding	(85)	(85)	(85)
Waste - removal of amenity waste service	(76)	(76)	(76)
Acceleration of road maintenance programme	(206)	(206)	(206)
Introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy charge	(201)	(201)	(201)
Capitalisation of staff budgets against infrastructure projects	(100)	(100)	(100)
Communities staff restructuring - delete posts currently vacant	(77)	(77)	(77)
Reduced spend with WSP - a highways alliance contractor	(50)	(50)	(50)
Reduced park & ride costs following closure of Showcase site	(50)	(50)	(50)
Waste - cease separate collection of offensive waste	(30)	(30)	(30)
Car parking income - increased usage	(25)	(25)	(25)
Utilities works on highways - permit income	(25)	(25)	(25)
School crossing patrols - delete posts currently vacant	(20)	(20)	(20)
Waste - reduce frequency of litter picking A329M	(19)	(19)	(19)
Car parking income (country parks) increased visitors	(15)	(15)	(15)
Berkshire Record Office - savings across Berkshire wide contract	(11)	(11)	(11)
Stock purchase costs - moving from books to audio and e-books	(11)	(11)	(11)
Dragonfly Café - increased income from increased visitors	(10)	(10)	(10)
Bus shelter advertising	(10)	(10)	(10)
Winnersh parking security - savings following closure of Showcase site	(10)	(10)	(10)
Management charge to Building Control account	(8)	(8)	(8)
Safer roads costs - reduced contribution to initiatives	(5)	(5)	(5)
Waste - introduce an annual tag/sticker to verify waste payment received	(4)	(4)	(4)
Householder pre application planning fee increase	(3)	(3)	(3)
Libraries printing	(1)	(1)	(1)
Finance & Resources			
Information and communication technology consolidation of applications	(185)	(185)	(185)
Superannuation Fund - Early payment to attract higher interest	(150)	(150)	(150)
Extending debt repayment (MRP) following technical review	(100)	(100)	(100)
Lean efficiencies	(90)	(90)	(90)
New printing and printers contract	(60)	(60)	(60)
Operational Property - economies of scale from centralisation of facilities management, and removal of vacancies	(58)	(58)	(58)
Reduction in ineligible claims for Single Person Discounts	(85)	(85)	(85)
Retrospective invoice audit and validation project	(50)	(50)	(50)
Shared Legal Services - increased income from external clients, team development to reduce externalisation of specialised work	(49)	(49)	(49)
Human Resources - restructure will reduce salary budgets and contract management will reduce costs	(47)	(47)	(47)
Income generation web advertising and registrars	(35)	(35)	(35)
Bank tender - cost reduction	(30)	(30)	(30)
Administration - removal of vacancies due to automation and service efficiencies	(30)	(30)	(30)
Amalgamation of telephony contracts	(25)	(25)	(25)
Court costs revised charges for summonses	(20)	(20)	(20)
Central consultancy budget reduction	(15)	(15)	(15)
Introduction of fixed credit card transaction fee	(10)	(10)	(10)
Increase management fee to schools for traded services	(10)	(10)	(10)
Reduce overdraft facility from £2m to £0.5m - more effective cash management	(7)	(7)	(7)
Central publications and subscriptions budget reduction	(5)	(5)	(5)

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE	WBC Consultation Approach
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Background information on the Council's approach to consultation will assist Members in considering the 26 July Executive decision relating to the School Traffic Control Service.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee consider the report as part of the Call-In process relating to the Executive decision on the School Traffic Control Service.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

Wokingham Borough Council is committed to effective consultation with residents and stakeholders to ensure that they have a voice in the delivery, scrutiny and improvement of service delivery.

The report outlines the legal requirements for effective consultation and the commitments made in the Council's Constitution.

The report also reminds Members of earlier consideration of the Council's approach to Consultation via a Task and Finish Group and subsequent recommendations to the Executive in 2011/12.

Background

Consultation is a dynamic process of dialogue, based on a genuine exchange of views, with the objective of influencing a decision or policy.

In short, any organisation which undertakes consultation should let residents and stakeholders know what they are proposing and why, give them an opportunity to comment, and take their responses into account with an open mind before deciding whether or not to do what was initially proposed. When consultation takes place it should follow some key principles. These are set out below.

Legal Principles

The legal requirements for an effective consultation process were set down following a court case, *R v Brent London Borough Council* (1985) and can be summarised as:

- Consultation must be carried out at a time when proposals are at a formative stage;
- Sufficient reasons for the proposal must be given to allow intelligent consideration and response;
- Adequate time must be given for responses to be considered and submitted;
- The product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any decisions.

These points are all aspects of an overriding requirement for “fairness”. The consultation process must be substantively fair and have the appearance of fairness.

WBC Constitution

The Council’s approach to consultation is set out in the Constitution:

Citizens’ Rights - Para 3.1.5

Local authorities have a statutory obligation to consult on a range of specific issues of local and national interest.....Wokingham Borough Council is keen to exceed its statutory obligations and consult effectively with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders on issues which affect them, to ensure they are involved in the planning, implementing and monitoring of the services offered by the Council.

The following statement, taken from the Consultation Strategy, sets out the Council’s commitment to consultation:

“Wokingham Borough Council will consult with its residents and stakeholders to ensure that they have a voice in the delivery, scrutiny and improvement of service delivery. These consultations and their results will be open and inclusive, and undertaken in accordance with the Council’s publicised protocols and service standards.”

The Executive – Para 5. 4. 42

All reports to the Executive from any Member of the Executive or an Officer on proposals relating to the Budget and Policy Framework must contain details of the nature and extent of consultation with stakeholders and the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the outcome of that consultation. Reports about other matters will set out the details and outcome of consultation as appropriate. The level of consultation required will be appropriate to the nature of the matter under consideration.

Task and Finish Group

In 2010 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee established a Task and Finish Group to review the Council's consultation process. The Group agreed the following Terms of Reference:

- To establish why the Council undertakes consultation and to understand the statutory and local requirements the Council is subject to with regards to consultation;
- To research common consultation methods used by the Council and to determine whether any improvements can be made;
- To establish how the Council interprets and analyses consultation results;
- To consider how the outcomes of consultation are used to inform decisions and policy.

The Task and Finish Group produced a number of recommendations which were submitted to the Executive at its meeting on 31 May 2012. The Executive agreed the following points:

- That the Consultation Strategy be updated;
- That guidance be provided on how and when to consult;
- That individual service areas take responsibility for consultation exercises with reference to corporate Consultation Officers as necessary;
- That consultation information be clear and easy to respond to;
- That the views expressed during consultation and the Council's responses be published, the "we asked – you said – we did" principle.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Council faces severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of the austerity measures implemented by the Government and subsequent reductions to public sector funding. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions in excess of £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context.

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

Any costs relating to consultation on key decisions and service changes are met from existing budgets.

Cross-Council Implications

Effective consultation underpins the work to achieve the Council's Vision and Priorities and lets residents know that their views are being listened to.

List of Background Papers

None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Democratic Services
Telephone No (0118) 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 23 August 2018	Version No. 1

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE COUNCIL
HELD ON 19 JULY 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 10.30 PM**

Members Present

Councillors: John Kaiser (Mayor), Bill Soane (Deputy Mayor), Keith Baker, Parry Batth, Laura Blumenthal, Chris Bowring, Prue Bray, Rachel Burgess, Jenny Cheng, Gary Cowan, Andy Croy, Richard Dolinski, Carl Doran, Lindsay Ferris, Guy Grandison, Mike Haines, Charlotte Haitham Taylor, David Hare, Emma Hobbs, Tim Holton, Graham Howe, John Jarvis, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Dianne King, Abdul Loyes, Julian McGhee-Sumner, Ken Miall, Philip Mirfin, Stuart Munro, Barrie Patman, Anthony Pollock, Helen Power, Malcolm Richards, Angus Ross, Daniel Sargeant, Imogen Shepherd-DuBey, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, David Sleight, Chris Smith, Wayne Smith, Simon Weeks, Oliver Whittle and Shahid Younis

19. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Mayor invited members of the public to submit questions to appropriate Members.

It was moved by the Mayor and seconded by the Deputy Mayor that, in accordance with Procedure Rule 4.2.12n), Procedure Rule 4.2.9.1 be suspended to allow Public Question Time to be extended to 45 minutes.

Upon being put to the vote the Motion was declared by the Mayor to be carried.

19.1 Trevor Sleet asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question which was asked by Keith Malvern in his absence:

I would like to ask a question regarding the loss of the lollipop lady in Murray Road.

Has a full risk assessment been carried out regarding the removal of this person at this specific location as the roads around these schools are used by commuters parking for the station and by drivers, often speeding and driving dangerously, using the Barkham and Finchampstead Roads to cut through to the Reading Road and visa versa?

Answer:

Thank you for your question.

The provision of controlled crossings will mean that crossing this road at all times of the day will be safer for pedestrians who currently only receive assistance twice a day for about an hour maximum.

The provision and design of controlled pedestrian crossings at all locations has been subject to an independent road safety audit undertaken by qualified auditors to reduce any risks associated with the installation of these crossings. We have at your request already provided you with a copy of the Safety Audit.

19.6 Sue Chapman asked the Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:

I work at Meadow Nursery School on Murray Road and one of the roles our school crossing patrollers fulfils is teaching the children at our nursery school about road safety. After the removal of our SCP will Wokingham Borough Council arrange for a road safety officer to visit our school to talk to the children about road safety?

Answer

The Council's Road Safety and My Journey teams undertake training at our schools throughout the Borough in both road safety and the promotion of sustainable travel.

We would be delighted to arrange a visit to your school.

19.7 Alexa Stott asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

At my school, parents dropping off their children frequently try to park on the "zig-zag" markings directly outside school. Our lollipop lady enforces traffic restrictions by telling drivers to park elsewhere. In her absence I am concerned that parents will park there and this will block the visibility of children trying to cross the road at the zebra crossing. Will the Council deploy traffic wardens on a regular basis to ensure traffic restrictions are enforced at all times?

Answer

School Crossing Patrollers are employed to provide assistance to those requiring it to cross the road. They are not there to enforce traffic infringements such as parking issues. We recognise that over the many years School Crossing Patrollers have operated and their passion for the job has meant they have extended their role beyond the tasks they have actually been employed to do.

Issues such as those you mention are not unique to locations near school crossing patrol sites and ultimately it is drivers' responsibility to drive safely and legally and any concerns relating to poor driving should be reported to the Police on the non-emergency number 101.

Parking issues can now be dealt with directly by Wokingham Borough Council following the transfer of enforcement powers from the Police last October (2017) through Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). Parking adjacent to schools is a known concern and since the introduction of CPE, the Council has prioritised visits by the Enforcement Officers at schools. The Team is relatively small in number and it is therefore not possible to be at every school every day therefore any specific problems relating to parking can be reported to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team. The Team will then work with the schools to address these issues and target areas of concern in their patrols. Contact details for the Parking Enforcement Team can be found on our website, but if you need to contact me I am happy to link you up with them.

19.8 Annette Medhurst asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Traffic and pedestrians counts at our school have shown that having a school crossing patroller is justified because this is a very busy time, with lots of conflict between drivers and pedestrians. Meanwhile, Government guidance indicates that a fixed crossing may not be an appropriate solution if the road is quiet at other times, not least since drivers may become accustomed to not having to stop for the crossing, and may begin to ignore its existence, with dangerous consequences. Have traffic and pedestrian counts also met standards for installing a zebra crossing?

Answer

At each of the School Crossing Patrol sites an assessment of the location was first undertaken in accordance with the processes described for establishing school crossing patrol sites in the Road Safety GB document entitled 'School Crossing Patrol Service Guidelines'. The assessment considers the number of pedestrians and vehicles during the morning peak period and indicates whether a patroller would or would not be justified (should the Council provide this discretionary service) or whether additional facilities such as pedestrian crossings may be justified. The assessment for the majority of sites indicated that a patroller would be justified; since the Council's proposal was not to provide a patroller the sites were identified for pedestrian crossings.

The provision of the proposed crossings have been thoroughly reviewed by an independent qualified road safety professional to ensure they are safe before implementation. However, as part of the review process additional Road Safety Audits and assessments will be carried out following the introduction of the crossings and any identified issues raised in these will be actioned accordingly.

Supplementary Question:

I do not know all the ins and outs and the numbers that are required for the installation of these permanent crossings but clearly the flow of traffic along Murray Road is very heavy and you deem it necessary to put this crossing in. Would the Council be prepared to investigate the possibility of Murray Road becoming one way because we have the situation where we have single file traffic basically at peak times and I wonder if that would be one possible solution for the amount of traffic that goes along there?

Supplementary Answer:

Higher traffic flow make it more likely that it is appropriate for us to put in a fixed crossing. I had thought of turning my road into a one way system. I am happy to meet with you and talk to you about it. I am happy to talk to Officers but given that there are a lot of issues with traffic and getting traffic around the town at the moment, I would not like to say that it is inevitable but I am happy to talk to you about it and see whether it is appropriate.

19.9 Helen Edwards asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Enabling children to walk, cycle or scoot safely to school is important for a fit and healthy community, and I've notice many year 6 children walk to school by themselves, which means they learn important road safety skills before having to make the longer (more dangerous) journeys to secondary school. I feel that parents are going to be less inclined to allow their children to walk if the journey is considered unsafe. How will the local authority ensure that the additional functions that our SCP performs are maintained (for example enforcing parking restrictions) to reassure me that my child it safe.

Answer

School Crossing Patrollers are employed to provide assistance to those requiring it to cross the road. They are not there to enforce traffic infringements such as parking issues or provide any additional functions. We recognise that over the many years School Crossing Patrollers have operated and their passion for the job has meant they have extended their role beyond the tasks they have been employed to do.

General road safety issues such as dangerous driving, speeding vehicles and poor parking such as those you mention are not unique to locations near school crossing patrol sites and ultimately it is drivers' responsibility to drive safely and legally and any concerns

relating to poor driving should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101.

Parking issues can now be dealt with directly by Wokingham Borough Council following the transfer of enforcement powers from the police last October (2017) through Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). Parking adjacent to schools is a known concern and since the introduction of CPE, the Council has prioritised visits by the Enforcement Officers at schools. The Ream is relatively small in number and it is therefore not possible to be at every school every day therefore any specific problems relating to parking can be reported to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team. The Team will then work with the schools to address these issues and target areas of concern in their patrols.

It is the responsibility of parents or carers to ensure their child is safe on the highway. Parents and carers play a vital part in teaching children general road safety and also how to cross the road safely.

However, the Council's Road Safety and My Journey Teams do undertake training at our schools throughout the Borough in both road safety and the promotion of sustainable travel. These will continue after the patrollers have been removed. Should your school wish to arrange bespoke training on the use of pedestrian crossings or any other related road safety area please ask them to contact the Council using the contact details available on our website.

19.10 Sally Cairns asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

The salary of a school crossing patroller is presumably considerably less than the cost of installing a crossing. How long will it take for this transition to be a cost effective decision for the Council – and what will the Council do if it is unsuccessful – i.e. suppose there is an increase in accidents, or local roads jam up, or you get lots of complaints from parents or residents – and many years of budget have been spent – what will you do?

Answer

The cost of the new permanent crossing facilities and removal of School Crossing Patrollers will be cost neutral within about 8 years of implementation. The provision of the proposed crossing has been thoroughly reviewed by an independent qualified road safety professional to ensure it is safe before implementation. However as part of the review process additional Road Safety Audits and assessments will be carried out following the introduction of the crossings and any identified issues raised in these will be actioned accordingly. I would like to add that these new crossings will be available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, not just at the times when children go to school, and they will be available to all residents all of the time so I do think that it is a safer choice.

Supplementary Question:

So as a user of that road I do not think that it is a 24 hour problem. I think it is a beginning and end of the school day problem, and I wonder if you could say a bit more about what these people are meant to do if these crossings are inadequate?

Supplementary Answer:

I think that I would have to come back to you on that one. I will give you a written response.

19.11 Annabel Yoxall asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

In the afternoon, one of the functions the school crossing patroller performs is to stop people crossing to enable traffic to pass, given that there is a steady stream of people out of the schools. Without this, there could be substantial blocking back of traffic, leading to frustration and less safe driving – how will the authority ensure this does not happen?

Answer

The proposed crossings will be manually controlled, either by pedestrian flow at zebra crossings or by the push button unit at signal crossings. Whilst the flow of pedestrians will fluctuate and this may have some impact on traffic, it is the drivers' responsibility, by law, to stop at a zebra crossing if a pedestrian wishes to cross or at the changing of the signals if it is a toucan crossing. Pedestrians should also wait until the vehicle has stopped at either the stop or give way line before proceeding to cross.

Supplementary Question:

Overcrowding and a backlog of people by the crossing has meant that one of the schools has constructed a safe zone on their school site to allow children to go in. Has the Council reviewed the suitability and taken into account the cost of any potential structural changes needed to fence off safe zones once the SCP has gone, in order to keep the children safe?

Supplementary Answer:

I think the answer to that is no, but we will do that work anyway.

19.12 Diane Burch asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

We recently carried out our own survey at the Murray Road Crossing. This showed nearly twice the number of pedestrians.

If the data used is incorrect, using these figures to make any decision can only produce skewed results. Would the council consider redoing these surveys to make sure the figures truly represent the current usage of the crossings?

St Paul's, Junior, Walter Infant and Meadow Nursery Schools, Murray Road						Data collected on the morning of 5th July 2018						Passenger Car Units PCU
Time	(Using the Crossing)			(Using the Road)		Car	LGV 1	MGV 2	HGV 3			
	Pedestrians (All)	Pushchairs	Bikes/Scooters	Cycles 1/3	Motorcycles 1/2							
8.30 - 8.35	23					17		1				19
8.35 - 8.40	62	3	3			17		1				19
8.40 - 8.45	111	9	13			36		0				36
8.45 - 8.50	78	5	6		3	31	2	0				33
8.50 - 8.55	17	1	2			21	2	2				27
8.55 - 9.00	4	3	1		1	26		1				28
Sub-total	295	21	25		4	0	4	5	0			
Totals	295	21	25		1	0	4	10	0			162

268	Middle 20 minutes	Middle 20 minutes	115
-----	-------------------	-------------------	-----

School Name St Pauls Primary & Walter Infants School										Passenger car units PCU
Time	Peds	Cycles [1/3]	Motorcycles [1/2]	Car [1]	LGV [1]	Bus [2]	MGV [2]	HGV [3]		
08.15 - 08.20	4	0	1	38	3	0	2	2	51	
08.20 - 08.25	3	2	0	22	2	0	1	0	28	
08.25 - 08.30	22	0	0	32	1	0	0	0	33	
08.30 - 08.35	17	1	0	16	0	0	1	0	18	
08.35 - 08.40	42	0	0	20	2	0	0	0	22	
08.40 - 08.45	63	0	0	19	3	0	0	0	22	
08.45 - 08.50	20	1	0	25	1	0	1	0	28	
08.50 - 08.55	7	0	0	24	3	0	0	0	27	
08.55 - 09.00	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	10	
09.00 - 09.05	0	1	0	19	3	0	0	0	22	
09.05 - 09.10									0	
09.15 - 09.20									0	
09.25 - 09.30									0	

= Busiest consecutive 30 minute period			
PV ² =	151	30,276	= 4,571,676

This value exceeds the criteria threshold value (4,000,000) and therefore would justify the establishment of a School Crossing Patrol site. Hence further assessment is not required.

Answer

The data previously collected shows that a School Crossing Patroller would be justified at this site (should the Council choose to provide this service). As part of the process it was decided if the School Crossing Patroller was justified then a permanent pedestrian crossing would be provided. Therefore the doubling the amount of pedestrians would also mean that a School Crossing Patroller would be justified and would have the same outcome. i.e. a fixed crossing would be more sensible than otherwise. We will not carry out further surveys as the initial survey met the justification and the new data would also seem to confirm that this is still the case.

21. PETITION DEBATE

A petition containing in excess of 1,500 signatures, the threshold to trigger a debate at Council, had been submitted relating to the removal of the school crossing patrol service:

"We the undersigned petition Wokingham Borough Council to abandon its proposal to remove school crossing patrol services at seven locations across the Borough at the end of this academic year (July 2018)"

21.1 Petition submitted by Annette Medhurst

Annette Medhurst, the petition organiser and Diane Burch, addressed the meeting and set out the background to the petition. Annette Medhurst commented that she was the Chairman of the Management Committee at Meadow Nursery School on Murray Road. They had set up the petition after hearing of the proposal to remove seven school crossing patrollers across the Borough and to replace them with permanent pedestrian crossings. It was felt that this would have a significant negative impact on children's safety. She went on to state that the role of the School Crossing Patroller was to provide a safe place for children, parents and carers to cross and broadly this was also the function of permanent pedestrian crossings. However, data from the Department of Transport suggested that there were less accidents if a School Crossing Patroller was in place at school crossings as opposed to a permanent crossing feature. Whilst ultimately it was the responsibility of

parents and carers to ensure that their child travelled to and from school safely and drivers to drive responsibly, School Crossing Patrollers also helped to maintain traffic flow, helped to enforce parking restrictions and taught children about road safety. Permanent pedestrian crossings could not do this. Annette Medhurst stated that pedestrian crossings were an inferior solution to School Crossing Patrollers. She suggested that Members and Officers visit Murray Road over a week to see some of the challenges experienced, first hand.

Diane Burch stated that she had been a School Crossing Patroller on Murray Road for eight years. The crossing could be busy particularly if weather was poor or if there were delays in surrounding roads. She disputed the assertion that School Crossing Patrollers often put their lives at risk by stepping into the road to stop traffic. She felt that pedestrians using a zebra crossing would be stepping out into the road, with no guarantee that traffic would stop for them. In 2015 the Council had made the decision to remove School Crossing Patrollers where there was a safe, viable mechanism for crossing the road. The petitioners disputed that the permanent crossings provided this safe mechanism. Diane Burch went on to refer to a consultation held in March 2017 of which only 9 of 393 respondents had supported the proposal to remove the school crossing patrol service.

Members discussed the petition. Several Members commented that School Crossing Patrollers had no legal basis for enforcing traffic restrictions and that zebra crossings and other permanent crossings provided safe traffic management mechanisms all day, every day and not just term time. Some Members stated that there had not been an increase in accidents following the removal of School Crossing Patrollers in their wards. Others referred to crossing points in their ward and commented that they felt that permanent pedestrian crossings were the safer solution. It was drivers' responsibility to obey stop signs and other highway regulations.

A number of Members suggested that the financial saving that the removal of the School Crossing Patrollers represented did not outweigh the value to the community that they provided. School Crossing Patrollers helped to teach children road safety awareness and were well respected members of the school community. A Member referred to additional costs that permanent pedestrian crossings would bring such as ongoing maintenance costs. Several Members were of the view that the installation of permanent pedestrian crossings represented an investment in the safety of the Borough's children.

The consultation process was questioned and a Member questioned whether 20mph speed limits outside schools at school start and finish times could be considered in addition, where appropriate.

It was confirmed that copies of the safety audits undertaken had been circulated to the relevant ward members.

The following Motion was proposed by Andy Croy and seconded by Rachel Burgess.

'This Council will abandon its proposal to remove school crossing patrol services at seven locations across the Borough at the end of this academic year (July 2018).'

Prior to a vote being held, six Members, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2.15.5, requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposed Motion.

The voting was as follows:

For	Against	Abstained
Prue Bray	Keith Baker	John Kaiser
Rachel Burgess	Parry Batth	Bill Soane
Gary Cowan	Laura Blumenthal	
Andy Croy	Chris Bowring	
Carl Doran	Jenny Cheng	
Lindsay Ferris	Richard Dolinski	
David Hare	Guy Grandison	
Helen Power	Mike Haines	
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey	Charlotte Haitham Taylor	
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey	Emma Hobbs	
	Tim Holton	
	Graham Howe	
	John Jarvis	
	Norman Jorgensen	
	Pauline Jorgensen	
	Dianne King	
	Abdul Loyes	
	Julian McGhee-Sumner	
	Ken Miall	
	Philip Mirfin	
	Stuart Munro	
	Barrie Patman	
	Anthony Pollock	
	Malcolm Richards	
	Angus Ross	
	Daniel Sargeant	
	David Sleight	
	Chris Smith	
	Wayne Smith	
	Simon Weeks	
	Oliver Whittle	
	Shahid Younis	

Upon being put to the vote, the Motion was declared by the Mayor to have been lost.

The following Motion was proposed by Anthony Pollock and seconded by Ken Miall.

“The Council recognises the importance of safe routes to school. The Council implemented a policy between 2003-08 using grants provided by the previous Labour Government to remove school crossing patrollers and replace them, with various schemes including zebra, toucan and pelican crossings.

These types of crossings are inherently safe, since they provide pedestrian/car management systems which are recognised by both pedestrians and motorists 24 hours a day, and not just when children are being walked to and from school. Therefore this Council will continue with its capital programme to improve road safety in the vicinity of

schools by building new zebra, toucan or pelican crossings, as appropriate, in accordance with the safety audits undertaken by independent Road Safety Experts.

These new crossings will replace the School Crossing Patrollers when they are completed and provide a safer environment as demonstrated by independent safety audits for children walking to and from school.

We recognise the fantastic contribution made by our School Crossing Patrollers, who have given their time to this role over the years and extend our heartfelt thanks for their sterling service to our community. However, we cannot support the action that the petition requests, and we ask the Executive to take Council's view into account when making their decision.'

Prior to a vote being held, six Members, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 4.2.15.5, requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposed Motion.

The voting was as follows:

For	Against	Abstained
Keith Baker	Prue Bray	John Kaiser
Parry Batth	Rachel Burgess	Bill Soane
Laura Blumenthal	Gary Cowan	
Chris Bowring	Andy Croy	
Jenny Cheng	Carl Doran	
Richard Dolinski	Lindsay Ferris	
Guy Grandison	David Hare	
Mike Haines	Helen Power	
Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Imogen Shepherd-DuBey	
Emma Hobbs	Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey	
Tim Holton		
Graham Howe		
John Jarvis		
Norman Jorgensen		
Pauline Jorgensen		
Dianne King		
Abdul Loyes		
Julian McGhee-Sumner		
Ken Miall		
Philip Mirfin		
Stuart Munro		
Barrie Patman		
Anthony Pollock		
Malcolm Richards		
Angus Ross		
Daniel Sargeant		
David Sleight		
Chris Smith		
Wayne Smith		
Simon Weeks		

Oliver Whittle		
Shahid Younis		

Upon being put to the vote, the Motion was declared by the Mayor to have been carried.

RESOLVED: That the Council recognises the importance of safe routes to school. The Council implemented a policy between 2003-08 using grants provided by the previous Labour Government to remove school crossing patrollers and replace them, with various schemes including zebra, toucan and pelican crossings.

These types of crossings are inherently safe, since they provide pedestrian/car management systems which are recognised by both pedestrians and motorists 24 hours a day, and not just when children are being walked to and from school. Therefore this Council will continue with its capital programme to improve road safety in the vicinity of schools by building new zebra, toucan or pelican crossings, as appropriate, in accordance with the safety audits undertaken by independent Road Safety Experts.

These new crossings will replace the School Crossing Patrollers when they are completed and provide a safer environment as demonstrated by independent safety audits for children walking to and from school.

We recognise the fantastic contribution made by our School Crossing Patrollers, who have given their time to this role over the years and extend our heartfelt thanks for their sterling service to our community. However, we cannot support the action that the petition requests, and we ask the Executive to take Council's view into account when making their decision.

TITLE	School Crossing Patrol Service – Consultation Report 2018
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	The Executive on 26 July 2018
WARD	Coronation; Emmbrook; Loddon; Maiden Erleigh; Norreys; South Lake; Twyford; Wokingham Without;
DIRECTOR	Director of Locality and Customer Services - Josie Wragg
LEAD MEMBER	Executive Member for Highways and Transport -

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

The findings from the Safe School Crossing consultation are considered by Executive before a decision is taken on the future provision of the service.

The decision would cease the provision of a discretionary service currently consisting of school crossing patrollers currently operating at seven locations across the borough during the morning and afternoon start and finish of the school day only. New crossings will be provided at these locations that will be available to all users at all times.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Executive agree that:

- 1) WBC continue with its proposal to provide safe, permanent crossings at the seven locations that currently have a school crossing patroller, and, following their installation, remove the school crossing patrol service once the permanent crossings are complete as set out in Option 2, Appendix 1 of the report;
- 2) all affected schools are reminded that they have access to the Council's road safety and My Journey teams who can facilitate further road safety training for pupils if requested.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The Medium Term Financial Plan agreed at Full Council in 2015 to remove funding for the School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service. This has been partially implemented with the removal of eight patrollers last year. It is now proposed to remove the remaining seven patrollers and to replace these with safe crossing facilities.

Despite the previous MTPF decision, options for the future of the SCP service are set out in the report (see Appendix 1). Removing the remaining SCP service will result in a reduction on service, and the council has consulted on this in line with the constitution. The results are set out in the report and have not raised any specific issues or comments that were not anticipated or that should prevent WBC continuing with its proposal to remove the SCP service and provide safe permanent crossings at the seven locations. However, it is acknowledged that this could have some negative implications as SCP are valued by the community. This needs to be balanced against the wider

benefits of the new crossing facilities for a wider proportion of the Councils residents and also the financial benefits of the proposal.

The report provides a summary of comments received from the 393 individual responses received to the public consultation including one objection from Twyford Parish Council in relation to the crossing patrol serving Polehampton Schools. In addition there was an E-Petition set up during the consultation entitled 'Save our School Crossing Patrollers' which ended in June 2018 which had 222 names attached. All comments have been considered and a summary of the key issues raised along with WBC's response is contained at Appendix 2.

A further petition has been received with 1640 names and this will have been debated at the July Full Council Meeting

Background

School Crossing Patrollers (SCP) are currently employed by the Council to help children cross the road safely, primarily to and from school. Some parents may believe the Authority assumes responsibility for the safety of their children on their whole journey to and from school when it provides a SCP. This is a misconception and even where a SCP is provided, parents remain responsible for ensuring their children's safety, just as they do when a zebra crossing or signal controlled crossing is provided. The provision of the School Crossing Patrol service is discretionary and currently provides assisted crossings for pupils of 10 schools within the borough of which there is a total of 55 primary, infant and junior schools and 10 secondary schools.

The council removed funding for the SCP service from the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) agreed at Full Council in 2015. Implementation of this decision was delayed and a 'special item' within the MTFP was agreed for 2017/18 to cover the cost of the service for one final year subject to rolling the unspent balance forward into 2018/19 to fund the reduced service to July 2018. As part of last year's budget setting, a capital bid was approved for a sum of £600,000 to deliver the new or improved permanent crossing facilities at the schools currently served by SCP.

Following a consultation last year, the decision to withdraw the service was partially implemented with the removal of eight patrollers who had been operating at locations that already had a safe formal crossing facility (zebra or signal controlled crossing). This change has been successfully implemented with no recorded increase in safety issues or personal injury accidents. (In the three years previous to the implementation of the changes there were two recorded slight injury accidents during school start and finish times at the controlled crossings. Since the removal of the patrollers at these locations there has been one recorded slight injury).

The SCP service continues to operate at seven sites across the borough. Two further sites are currently vacant. The SCP Service currently employs seven patrollers (1.16 FTE) and a part time designated SCP organiser (0.59 FTE) who recruits, plans and supervises the remaining patrollers.

The affected sites are:

- All Saints Primary School, Norreys Avenue, Wokingham;
- St Paul's Junior & Walter Infant Schools, Murray Road, Wokingham;
- Keep Hatch Primary School, Keep Hatch Road, Wokingham;
- Willow Bank Infant & Junior School, Duffield Road Woodley;
- South Lake Primary School, Nightingale Road, Woodley;
- Woodley CE Primary School, Hurricane Way, Woodley; &
- Polehampton Infant & Junior School, London Road Twyford.

In addition two sites which are currently unmanned have been assessed for the provision of a formal crossing, namely;

- Oakland's Infant & Junior School, New Wokingham Road, Crowthorne &
- Loddon Primary, Silverdale Road, Earley

At each of these sites, the Council has carried out an assessment with accordance to the processes described in the Road Safety GB document entitled 'School Crossing Patrol Service Guidelines'. Where the assessment has indicated that assistance to cross the road is justified, the Council has proposed suitable formal pedestrian crossing facilities to

be provided. It is proposed that the remaining SCP service will cease once the permanent crossings are complete.

To support the above proposal, a number of options were considered (see Appendix 1)

Analysis of Issues

To support the above proposal, a number of options were considered (see Appendix 1). There are advantages and disadvantages to each of the options proposed but primarily, these are to retain the SCP service, to provide alternative crossing facilities or to provide both. The main issues are the loss of the valued SCP service and any public dissatisfaction with this (see consultation responses section) must be balanced against the benefits of the new permanent crossing that will serve a wider proportion of the boroughs residents. Further, the financial implications must be considered and both are set out below.

Consultation

The MTFP decision to remove funding for the SCP service, represents a reduction in service requiring public consultation. Between 22 January and 2 March 2018 public consultation was undertaken about the following proposal:

- End the remaining SCP Services in July 2018 (to coincide with the end of the academic year);
- To allow, design and deliver permanent pedestrian crossings (zebra or signal controlled) before September 2018 (to coincide with the start of the academic year), These works would be funded through the council's capital programme (either within the existing Integrated Transport Capital Programme, through appropriate CIL/S106 funding).

The table below provides details of the number of responses received by the Council in response to this consultation.

School	Number of responses relating to a pupil at school (please note parents could tick more than one school)
All Saints Primary School	5
St Pauls Junior School	157
Walter Infant School	132
Keep Hatch Primary School	103
Willow Bank Junior School	13
Willow Bank Infant	13
South Lake Primary School	Zero
Woodley CofE Primary School	6
Polehampton CofE Infant School	12
Polehampton CofE Junior School	5
No school	7

How children of the respondents get to school				
	4 or more	3	2	1
Walk, ride, scoot with an adult	14	30	119	117
Walk, ride, scoot on their own	11	4	10	51
Are driven to school	2	5	19	17

What school year respondents' children are in	
Foundation	98
Year one	80
Year two	63
Year three	76
Year four	73
Year five	66
Year six	70

In addition, a response from Twyford Parish Council has been received stating that "Twyford Parish Council object to the withdrawal of the school crossing patroller role". No further comments were provided by the parish.

Appendix 2 below provides the key issues raised by consultees along with responses from WBC.

Consultation Summary

It is very clear that School Crossing Patrollers at each of the locations are well-respected and valued by those responding, with many commenting that the SCP provides not only assistance for those requiring to cross the road but also additional safeguarding of young road users in general.

Of the 393 individual responses received, 9 were in support of the proposals. Comments included "sounds fine as I can cross the road with my child"; "I am fine with removing SCPs if permanent crossings are in place. Parents can easily handle this"; "[I would] rather the money was spent elsewhere, parents can cross the road" & "a 24 hour road crossing would be safer".

A large proportion of the other comments related to general road safety issues such as dangerous driving, speeding vehicles and poor parking. Issues such as these are not unique to locations near school crossing patrol sites and ultimately it is drivers' responsibility to drive safely and legally and any concerns relating to poor driving should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101. Parking issues can now be dealt with directly by Wokingham Borough Council following the transfer of enforcement powers from the police last October (2017) through Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). Parking adjacent to schools is a known concern and since the introduction of CPE, the council has prioritised visits by the enforcement officers at schools. The team is relatively small in number and it is therefore not possible to be at every school every day therefore any specific problems relating to parking can be reported to the councils parking enforcement team. The team will then work with the schools to address these issues and target areas of concern in their patrols.

The general safety for children on their journey to school was also raised as a significant concern. However, it is ultimately the responsibility of the parent or carer to ensure their child is safe on the highway. Parents and carers play a vital part in teaching children general road safety and also how to cross the road safely. The council through its Road Safety Education Team also work with schools to provide road safety training and activities and this service will continue.

The zebra crossings and a signal (light-controlled) crossings proposed to serve the schools to replace the SCP are safer places for pedestrians to cross the road. Fundamentally, these facilities will benefit all users 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and not just at school times. The table below gives details of the proposals at each site at the time of writing. Some sites are currently being reviewed to confirm the level of provision is acceptable. As a result of this review some of the proposed crossing treatments may change.

Proposed Crossing Treatment	Location
Zebra Crossing	St Paul's Junior & Walter Infant Schools, Murray Road, Wokingham Keep Hatch Primary School, Keephatch Road, Wokingham Willow Bank Infant & Junior School, Duffield Road Woodley South Lake Primary School, Nightingale Road, Woodley Woodley CE Primary School, Hurricane Way, Woodley
Traffic Signal Crossing (PUFFIN)	Oakland's Infant & Junior School, New Wokingham Road, Crowthorne Loddon Primary, Silverdale Road, Earley Polehampton Infant & Junior School, London Road Twyford.
Enhancement to existing Crossing location	All Saints Primary School, Norreys Avenue, Wokingham

Financial Information

Annual cost of current SCP service

Year		
Annual cost of SCP service 2018/19	Staff of 7 patrollers (1.16 FTE's) and a part time designated School Crossing Patrol Organiser (0.59 FTE)	£40,000 Revenue
	SCP specific risk assessments	£4,200
Total annual cost		£44,200
Cost year to date		£9,600

Removal of service cost

Redundancy costs	£18,300	Revenue
Crossing facilities	£361,000	Capital

The cost of the School Crossing Patrol service for this current financial year is approximately £44,200 revenue which covers staff and annual risk assessments. Any further works required to mitigate risks identified would be undertaken from the existing traffic management reactive maintenance budgets.

As part of last year's budget setting, a capital bid was approved to enable appropriate new pedestrian crossing facilities at each appropriate school crossing patrol. Appropriate crossing have been designed as per table 2 with an estimated capital cost of £361,000. These new facilities will have a life span of approximately 15-20 years (industry average) before they will require upgrading or replacing.

From an invest-to-save perspective, the cost of the new permanent crossing facilities and removal of SCPs will be cost neutral within eight years of implementation. After eight years, the saving to the Council will be £44,200 per annum.

Conclusion

The SCP service is valued by the community it serves but this is limited in its scope to children attending the local schools and during the beginning and end of the school day. Permanent crossings will serve a wider proportion of the borough's residents through the full day. If the SCP service is removed, the financial cost of providing permanent crossing facilities will be recovered after eight years.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Council faces severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of the austerity measures implemented by the Government and subsequent reductions to public sector funding. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions in excess of £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context.

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	(£6,000), £361,000	Yes	(Revenue) & Capital
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	(£44,600)	Yes	(Revenue)
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	(£44,600)	Yes	(Revenue)

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

Cross-Council Implications

None

List of Background Papers
None

Contact Matthew Gould	Service Place
Telephone Tel: 0118 974 6460	Email matthew.gould@wokingham.gov.uk

Options – School Crossing Services

Option	Pros	Cons	Financial implication
1. Retain all seven SCP's and provide no new controlled crossings (status quo)	<p>Continuation of a well-respected and valued community service.</p> <p>Personal assistance to users crossing the road at school times</p>	<p>Ongoing annual revenue cost to provide a discretionary service</p> <p>Only benefits the school community during short periods of the day</p> <p>Annual Safety assessment required at SCP each site</p>	<p>Annual revenue costs of the service £40,000</p> <p>Additional £4,200 for annual H&S risk assessments + associated remedial measures to mitigate any identified risks</p>
2. Remove all SCP's and provide new controlled crossings where appropriate	<p>No Annual H&S risk assessments required at SCP each site</p> <p>New crossings will provide assistance to all users wishing to cross the road at all times of the day</p> <p>No annual revenue costs</p>	<p>One off capital expenditure</p> <p>No School Crossing Patrol Service</p>	<p>Ongoing annual revenue saving of £44,200</p> <p>One off Capital cost of £361,000</p>
3. Assess all SCP locations and retain only those where a SCP is justified, & provide no new crossings	<p>Continuation of a reduced well-respected and valued community service at those sites where the patrollers are retained</p> <p>Personal assistance to users crossing the road at school times</p>	<p>Ongoing annual revenue cost to provide a discretionary service</p> <p>Only benefits the school community during short periods of the day</p> <p>Disestablishment of one site resulting in no crossing</p>	<p>Reduction of one patroller reducing the cost of the service by circa £4,000</p> <p>Reduces cost of annual H&S risk assessments by £600</p> <p>Total annual revenue cost of service circa £39,600</p>

		provision or SCP assistance	
4. Provide appropriate new crossings at all sites and retain all seven SCPs	<p>Continuation of a well-respected and valued community service.</p> <p>Personal assistance to users crossing the road at school times</p> <p>New crossings will provide assistance to all users wishing to cross the road at all times of the day</p>	<p>Ongoing annual revenue cost to provide a discretionary service</p> <p>Patrollers operating on controlled crossings and in the case of signal control will be duplicating resources and may be confusing to drivers</p> <p>Annual Safety assessment required at SCP each site</p> <p>Implications in relation to the decision made last year, may need to re-instate previously disestablished sites</p>	<p>Annual revenue costs of the service £40,000</p> <p>Additional £4,200 for annual H&S risk assessments + associated remedial measures to mitigate any identified risks</p> <p>Capital cost to provide new crossings of £361,000</p> <p>Potential increase in revenue costs to reinstate previous SCP locations circa £50,000</p>
5. Provide appropriate new crossings at all sites and retain 2/3 SCPs	<p>Partial continuation of a well-respected and valued community service.</p> <p>Some personal assistance to users crossing the road at school times</p> <p>New crossings will provide assistance to all users wishing to cross the road at all times of the day</p>	<p>Ongoing annual revenue cost to provide a reduced discretionary service</p> <p>Annual Safety assessment required at retained SCP sites</p> <p>One off capital expenditure</p> <p>Patrollers operating on controlled crossings and in the case of signal control will be</p>	<p>Annual revenue costs of the service £15,000</p> <p>Additional £1500 for annual H&S risk assessments + associated remedial measures to mitigate any identified risks</p> <p>One off Capital cost of £361,000</p>

		<p>duplicating resources and may be confusing to drivers</p> <p>Implications in relation to the decision made last year, may need to re-instate previously disestablished sites</p>	
--	--	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of consultation responses and WBC response

Responses relating to All Saints Primary School	
Key Themes	WBC response
Poor driving – speeding in the area	Speed limit enforcement is a matter for Thames Valley Police and any concerns should be reported to them on the non-emergency number 101.

Responses relating to St Paul's Junior School	
Key Themes	WBC response
The SCP is a reassuring and popular figure for parents and children and is part of school community (including comments by two teachers)	It is acknowledged that SCP are popular however, the service they have been employed to provide is to ensure children can cross safely and this would duplicate the function of the Pedestrian Crossing once installed.
The area is heavily used by traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times	Pedestrian Crossings provide safe crossing points and are appropriate for busy roads
Frequent incidence of poor driving– including cars mounting the kerbs	It is drivers' responsibility to drive safely. The Council will ensure all lining, signing and other site aspects are present and in good condition before the start of the new school year (Sept 2018). Matters of poor driving should be directed to the police via the non-emergency number 101.
Pavements too narrow for the volume of pupils	It is parents' and carers' responsibility to ensure the safety of their children on journeys to and from school. SCP's role is to ensure people can cross roads safely not to ensure safety in other areas.
There are significant incidents of poor parking in the area which increases the risk to children	Poor parking is a problem at many schools however it is the responsibility of car driver to ensure they do not park inconsiderately and it is not the responsibility of the SCP to prevent poor/illegal parking. WBC will pass on comments to its Civil Parking Enforcement contractor to investigate and see if additional patrol are required

Responses relating to Walter Infant School	
Key Themes	WBC Response
Frequent incidence of poor driving	<p>It is drivers' responsibility to use the highway in a safe manner and follow the laws of the road. The Council will ensure all lining, signage and other site aspects are present and in good condition before the start of the new school year (Sept 2018)</p> <p>When WBC takes over Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) from the police later this year it will be able to target problem areas more effectively</p>

There are significant incidents of poor parking in the area which increases the risk to children	Poor parking is a problem at many schools however it is the responsibility of car driver to ensure they do not park inconsiderately and it is not the responsibility of the SCP to prevent poor/illegal parking. WBC will pass on comments to its Civil Parking Enforcement contractor to investigate and see if additional patrol are required
Incidence of children running from parents and need for SCP to help 'crowd control'	It is parents' and carers responsibility to ensure the safety of their children on journeys to and from school. SCP's role is to ensure people can cross roads safely not to ensure safety in other areas.
The area is heavily used by traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times	Pedestrian Crossings provide safe crossing points and are appropriate for busy roads

Responses relating to Keephatch School	
Key themes	WBC response
The SCP is a reassuring and popular figure for parents and children and is part of the school community	It is acknowledged that SCP are popular however, the service they have been employed to provide is to ensure children can cross safely and this duplicates the function of the Pedestrian Crossing
Housing development in the area is leading to increase in traffic on local roads	Pedestrian Crossing provide safer crossing points and are appropriate for busy roads
Poor driving. Speeding is a problem in the area and police have taken action in the past	It is drivers' responsibility to drive safely and legally and any concerns should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101. There is a series of traffic calming in place around the school and an enforceable speed limit. Issues regarding noncompliance should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101.
SCP are important in encouraging children to walk to school and this may decrease if SCP are remove	There is no reason that the replacement of SCP with a permanent crossing should deter children from walking and WBC provides support to school to encourage their children to walk through Road Safety Education.

Responses relating to Willow Bank Infant and Junior School	
Poor driving – speeding	It is drivers' responsibility to drive safely and legally and any concerns should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101. The school is in a 20mph zone and can be enforced by the police
SCP is popular part of the school community	It is acknowledged that SCP are popular however, the service they have been employed to provide is to ensure children can cross safely and this duplicates the function of the Pedestrian Crossing

SCP are important in encouraging children to walk to school and this may decrease if SCP are remove	There is no reason that the replacement of SCP with a permanent crossing should deter children from crossing and WBC provides support to school to encourage their children to walk through Road Safety Education.
Poor parking is common and obscures views	Poor parking is a problem at many schools however it is the responsibility of car drivers to ensure they do not park inconsiderately and it is not the responsibility of the SCP to prevent poor/illegal parking. WBC will pass on comments to its Civil Parking Enforcement contractor to investigate and see if additional patrol are required

Responses relating to Woodley CofE Primary	
Key themes	WBC response
The SCP is a reassuring and popular figure for parents and children	It is acknowledged that SCP are popular however, the service they have been employed to provide is to ensure children can cross safely and would duplicate the function of the Pedestrian Crossing once installed
The area is heavily used by traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times	Pedestrian Crossings provide safe crossing points and are appropriate for busy roads
The junction where the SCP operates in complicated and it is hard to tell where traffic is going to come from	It is parents' and carers responsibility to ensure the safety of their children on journeys to and from school. The provision of a formal crossing facility will assist all users in crossing the road in the same way a SCP would. As with a school crossing patroller, there is a legal requirement for vehicles to stop ether at a red traffic signal or when a person is using a Zebra Crossing.
SCP are important in encouraging children to walk to school and this may decrease if SCP are remove	There is no reason that the replacement of SCP with a permanent crossing should deter children from walking and WBC provides support to school to encourage their children to walk

Responses relating to Polehampton CofE Infant and Junior Schools	
Key themes	WBC response
The area is heavily used by traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times	Pedestrian Crossings provide safe crossing points and are appropriate for busy roads
Some comments supported the prosed change as a safety improvement	Both SCP and permanent crossing provide safe crossing points, however permanent crossing have the advantage of being available 43/7
SCP are important in encouraging children to walk to school and this may decrease if SCP are remove	There is no reason that the replacement of SCP with a permanent crossing should deter children from walking and WBC provides support to school to encourage their children to walk

General responses (and those not relating to a school)	
Poor driving – in particular drivers failing to stop and speeding	It is drivers' responsibility to drive safely. Additional speed reducing measures could be considered at individual sites if problems persist however enforcement is the responsibility of Thames Valley Police and any measure could only be introduced in collaboration with them. Any concerns should be reported to them on the non-emergency number 101.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 26 JULY 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.40 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor (Chairman), Julian McGhee-Sumner, Richard Dolinski, Pauline Helliard-Symons, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Stuart Munro, Anthony Pollock and Simon Weeks

Other Councillors Present

Laura Blumenthal
Prue Bray
Rachel Burgess
Gary Cowan
Andy Croy
Lindsay Ferris
Dianne King
Helen Power
Angus Ross
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey

23. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited members of the public to submit questions to the appropriate Members.

23.1 Trevor Sleet asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

I would like to ask a question regarding the loss of the lollipop lady in Murray Road.

Has a published cost benefit analysis been carried out regarding the cost of the lollipop lady v's that of installing a pedestrian crossing at this location?

Answer

Broadly speaking yes however this site is subject to a redesign following my intervention in the last few weeks and therefore the cost benefit will be recalculated following the redesign. This information will be made public.

Supplementary Question

I have a copy of the road safety audit report that was based on the decision to remove the lollipop lady in Murray Road and in that safety audit report the site visit was done on the 13th February when the schools were on half term. So it is no wonder that there was no traffic at that time.

My question will be therefore will Wokingham Borough Council accept the failings of this report and reinstate the lollipop lady?

Supplementary Answer

I attended the site on Monday, along with our Road Safety Auditor, and I observed the activity outside the school and he was with me during that time so I think the Council has viewed that site during school times with school pupils going in and out of the school.

23.3 Sally Cairns asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Can the decision about the school crossing patrollers be considered on a site by site basis? The number of consultation responses from the different sites indicates very different levels of concern, and the full Council meeting debate highlighted that the situation is very different outside the different schools – in terms of how helpful a crossing will be given the road layout, and whether there are likely to be other groups of people wanting to cross the road at different times of the day. Does this have to be an all or nothing decision, or can the best solution be chosen for each location?

Answer

I have visited each of the sites concerned along with Officers and the crossings have been designed with specific reference to each site. That is what we have already done. We have taken into account the different characteristics of each site. We have done surveys of numbers of cars and numbers of children accessing school so I think we have done that and certainly I have tried to look for solutions that will work at each site taking into account each sites' characteristics.

Supplementary Question

That seems to be a decision about what type of crossing in each location and I suppose my question is it might be that a crossing is the best for some and keeping the school crossing patroller is the best for others and it is whether there can be that flexibility in the decision?

Supplementary Answer

As we have decided to withdraw the funding for the crossing patrollers a number of years ago I am looking at what we put in to those sites to make them as safe as we can. So I think the answer to that is probably no.

23.4 Annette Medhurst had asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question which in her absence was asked by Sally Cairns:

Councillor Pollock - having observed the situation at the Murray Road crossing on Monday morning – and the constant fluctuation in the numbers of people waiting to cross, the queues of cars needing to get through, and the somewhat random parking behaviour – would you agree that a school crossing patroller – who can constantly adjust to what is happening, is a better solution than any kind of formal crossing – and that although a fixed crossing may seem like a reliable long-term solution, in many ways it is a very risky solution, since you don't know how well it is going to work, particularly when the weather changes, or there are roadworks on surrounding streets – and if additional measures are needed, it could all become much more expensive than the current efficient and adaptable school crossing patroller.

Answer

As you say I attended the school on Monday morning along with our Road Safety Auditor. I attended from 8.15am to approximately 9.15am. The first 20 minutes or so was without the school crossing patroller being present and I was particularly impressed by the curtesy of drivers towards the children crossing or seeking to cross the road. I didn't see any driver speed through the crossing when a child was there. I particularly saw one car very

carefully stop and let the child and parent cross so my impression was generally speaking that the motorists were behaving particularly well. I do accept that there was a problem further down the road where a couple of cars met each other as one came down and one went up but I think that is nothing to do with school crossing patrollers and something to do with parking generally and maybe that needs to be addressed or looked at. So that is separate from the school crossing patroller and I don't think the school crossing patroller sited where she was could have intervened with those two cars that were arguing with each other over a piece of road space.

So as far as the crossings themselves we have replaced school crossing patrollers with crossings throughout the Borough over the last 10 years or so and I don't think any of them are more dangerous now than they were before and in some instances where the traffic was of a higher speed than they are here it was actually beneficial.

As I have said I am going to look at this site particularly. Since I visited it when I was Chair of the Education Committee there are more children going to the site so there may be some issues on that front but the principal is that I don't see that the crossing itself is inherently less safe than a school crossing patroller.

23.6 Diane Burch asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Tony Johnson reported in the local Wokingham Paper (dated July 19th), that the Council Leader said; "The residents sent us a clear message on 3rd May - If our residents feel that they are not being listened to, then we need to redouble our efforts to show that we have taken on board what they have to say".

Bearing this in mind; why does it appear that they not listening to the parents and children at least at the Keephatch and Murray Road crossings – who realise not only how dangerous these alternative crossings will be at their particular locations but, according to the survey undertaken by the independent Road Safety Experts in April of last year, the conclusion was (on the Murray Road crossing) that: "Under the justification criteria outlined in Section 6, this location does not require a pedestrian facility."

Might I also point out that according to these figures, between the hour of 5pm and 6pm only 10 pedestrians crossed the road at the crossing. Announcing that "other road users can safely cross the road using the automated crossings" doesn't apply to this site so to the untrained eye – it does look like needless and unwanted expense.

Bearing all this in mind, would the Council please consider delaying the installation of automated crossings (at least at these two sites) until a further (and perhaps more detailed) survey can be completed, instead of (what appears to be) trying to rush through these unwanted and expensive alternatives?

Answer

Formal crossings such as zebra and puffin controls are safe forms of crossing facilities and the designs for the proposed crossings have been through an independent road safety audit to confirm this.

The assessment process you refer to uses the Department for Transport's guidance to establish if a pedestrian crossing is required. This guidance assumes no existing crossing is provided and considers pedestrian demand and traffic over the entire day. As you have

highlighted because the maximum demand is during two relatively short periods of the day and the assessment considers the demand throughout the day, the survey results when analysed showed that no crossing was necessary.

However recognising that the demand is focused over two short periods of the day, we used the Road Safety GB guidance for establishing if a crossing patroller would be justified. This assessment would also identify whether a formal crossing could be considered rather than providing a patroller.

The assessment for both Murray Road and Keephatch identified a patroller would be justified. Where the assessment identified one would be justified we have proposed to install a formal crossing as an alternative.

Delaying the delivery of the crossings and undertaking further surveys is not considered necessary as it will not change the outcome of the assessment.

However, as a result of the concerns you and the public have raised the designs of both crossings are being reconsidered with a view to providing traffic signal controlled crossings instead.

Supplementary Question

We heard of the death a few years ago of a school crossing patroller up north. The details were discussed at one of our meetings and we learnt that the accident was probably caused by the driver being unable to see the school crossing patroller in the road due to low sun and probably the glare of a wet road. Are there any additional safety measures that they would be willing to take at the Murray Road crossing because during the winter months the low winter sun and glare off wet roads are a real hazard in the months of December and January?

I have had a few drivers confess that they genuinely cannot see me on the crossing and, of course, I am always in high-viz clothing. There is a real concern on my part that if they cannot see me in high-viz wear what chance does any pedestrian, child or adult, have in normal clothing?

Supplementary Answer

When I was with you the other day, as I said to a question earlier, I was very impressed with how motorists came up to the crossing and were relatively slow. They were not driving at 60mph or even 30 or 40mph and the parked cars to some extent also do provide for drivers slowing down because of the parked cars beside. However I do think perhaps there needs to be examination of some of the parking aspects. I think you and I saw two cars arguing as to who had the right of way and I noticed that perhaps a couple of the cars in front of that car had been parked there for quite a while so I don't know what the parking restrictions are.

So I will look into things a bit more at that site because I do take your point. I think the issue of low sun perhaps we need to put covers over some of the lights when they are installed so that they can be seen and they are not blinded by the sun. So I take your point and thank you for that and we will take that into account.

24. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited Members to submit questions to the appropriate Members

24.3 Lindsay Ferris asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

I have considerable concerns that the financial information presented for the closure of the School Crossing Patrol Service (see pages 21/21 of this Agenda) are inaccurate and omit a number of ongoing Revenue costs associated with the provision and future running of the crossing facilities proposed to be provided.

Why have these ongoing revenue costs been excluded, as it gives a false impression of any supposed savings?

Answer

I believe the costs you are referring to relate to any interest payments associated with capital borrowing and the ongoing maintenance and operation costs once the sites have been installed.

I can confirm that the majority of the capital funding has been allocated from grants with a very small proportion from developer contributions. Therefore there are no additional costs associated with borrowing in this part.

As for maintenance and operation these costs are relatively small and will be absorbed within the existing maintenance budgets. The new lights will all be LED so power consumption and therefore cost will be very low and in terms of faults the most common fault is bulbs requiring replacement. With LED this is no longer a regular issue. As these installations will be new any maintenance or faults during the first few years will be covered under warranty. For new traffic signal installations the approximate annual cost is less than £600 per site.

Supplementary Question

I beg on the debate to differ if necessary on the interest payments because not all your money will be coming from that because it is a question of how the money is funded. So I will query that later.

I will also just make a comment before I get to my question. You mentioned that the decision was made a little while ago about this. My understanding is that it was on the first phase that the decision was made and that the paper presented said it would review the second phase so I have an issue with that. Also you were asked about not being able to do something about keeping any school patrollers. You know you can do that via a supplementary estimate so that is not an issue.

The issue I now have is there is an ongoing replacement cost for these control systems. They last somewhere between 10-15 years. So somewhere in the costs will need to be a replacement cost and I also do believe that the maintenance of seven new crossings, which is what you are putting here, would actually be quite a significant increase on the number so I will be asking you to come up with a specific issue regarding how you are going to increase the contract associated with the maintenance of the crossings that we

have in the Borough and how that will come as I think the figures you mentioned of £600 a year is actually low but I would like you to provide that and if you could provide it by a written answer I am happy for you to do that?

Supplementary Answer

I said that the maintenance costs are relatively small and I don't think that is likely to change the number of crossings here and there are other crossings that we have in the Borough. The answer says that it is not going to significantly increase the maintenance budget but I will seek to get the more detailed answer you have asked for but I believe that the answer I have given is accurate.

24.5 David Hare had asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question. Due to his inability to attend the meeting a written reply was provided:

The Council designed a zebra crossing for Murray Road which was due to be installed on 25th July – before any decision was finally made about the effectiveness of these controls. It has now been delayed, but would it have been pulled if the anger of local residents had not been expressed at the last Council meeting, with questions about the validity of this idea abounding. An uncontrolled crossing on Murray Road would cause traffic chaos and might well lead to injury of the crossing users.

Answer

Following a site meeting with the local ward Member on the 10 July 2018, Officers have been considering a request to change the original proposed zebra crossing to a Puffin Crossing. The scheme will now be redesigned. I visited the school on 23rd July and observed the children arriving at school with their parents, and spoke to parents, a teacher and Mrs Birch which provided additional information on other issues beyond the issue of a school crossing patroller. I will take these into account during the redesign process.

24.6 Rachel Burgess asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

The School Crossing Patrol consultation raises a significant number of safety concerns. With regard to the Keephatch Road crossing these concerns are backed up by the independent road safety audit. The audit states that the proposed site of this zebra crossing is not safe for two reasons: poor visibility and, more crucially, proximity to the roundabout. The audit states that “the close proximity of the proposed zebra pedestrian crossing to the...roundabout...could result in an increased risk of...collisions”. Are the findings of the road safety audit going to be ignored at the Keephatch Road site?

Answer

No not all. All findings from a Road Safety Audit are an integral part of the design process and where applicable recommendations that have been identified have been adopted and included in the final scheme design.

The Road Safety Audit did not identify that the design would provide an unsafe crossing facility but highlighted recommendations that if implemented would improve safety further.

With regard to the hedgerow, clearance has started on site. The final design for the crossing has been proposed as far north as possible without taking pedestrians away from the desire line.

Supplementary Question

I would just like to focus on the location of the crossing. I don't believe that the crossing should be placed where it was originally proposed because of what it says in the Road Safety Audit. It cannot be placed much further north, as the Road Safety Audit suggested, because that is not practical and I don't think anyone thinks it would be. It cannot be placed at the south side of the roundabout because of the dropped kerbs and houses there. So do you not agree with me that the only safe solution, in this particular setting, is a school crossing patroller on the south side of the roundabout?

Supplementary Answer

I am advised that it is safe on the north side of the roundabout at a suitable distance from the roundabout to ensure that there is safety.

24.7 Andy Croy asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Clearly, the main driver to cut the School Crossing Patrollers (SCPs) is financial – the cut first appears in the 2015 Medium Term Financial Plan and if safety were an issue I am sure the Borough would have replaced these SCPs years ago.

The financial information provided in the report excludes:

- Any attempt to quantify the value of non-core services (e.g. road safety training to children, a pillar of community cohesion, an extra set of official eyes and ears) provided by the SCPs;
- Maintenance costs of the proposed crossing sites, including, for example, maintenance of any high friction road surfaces which will need to be added.

Why are the Executive making a financial decision based on incomplete financial information?

Answer

The decision being made today is not based on financial considerations. That decision was made in 2015 and we are today deciding on whether we continue to implement that decision.

Supplementary Question

The decision was made in 2015 and indeed you said earlier that it was decided to withdraw the funding in 2015 and that is why we are where we are today. So what you are saying is that there are no revenue implications for the maintenance of the high friction road surface and no revenue implications for the continued clearance of the vegetation on, for example, the Keephatch site and there are no revenue implications, for example, in the changes in the parking markings that you have eluded to all over these sites? There are revenue implications that are not included in the financial assessment.

So the question is why are you making a decision based on incorrect financial information?

Supplementary Answer

I do not agree with you that there are missing revenue implications because I think that what we are doing is actually spending capital money to make these places safe.

25. SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL SERVICE - CONSULTATION REPORT 2018

The Executive considered a report setting out the findings from the Safe School Crossing consultation.

The Executive Member for Highways and Transport advised the meeting that following consultation with local Ward Members it was intended to redesign the crossings proposed at four of the sites: Murray Road, Norreys Avenue, Keephatch Road and Hurricane Way. Officers would then come back with redesigns and as the new crossings would take 3-5 weeks to build it would therefore be necessary to reprogramme the delivery of these sites.

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen commented that she had received a lot of positive feedback in relation to the Silverdale Road site as residents were looking forward to the crossing.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) WBC continue with its proposal to provide safe, permanent crossings at the seven locations that currently have a school crossing patroller, and, following their installation, remove the school crossing patrol service once the permanent crossings are complete as set out in Option 2, Appendix 1 of the report;
- 2) all affected schools be reminded that they have access to the Council's road safety and My Journey teams who can facilitate further road safety training for pupils if requested.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

CALL IN MEETING – 3 SEPTEMBER 2018

SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL SERVICE

Indicative List of Witnesses and Timetable for the meeting

Item	Name/Role	Time
1	Councillor Parry Batth (Chairman) opens the meeting and explains the procedure for considering Call-Ins	7.00 PM
2	<p>Councillor Imogen Shepherd-Dubey explains the reasons for the Call-In</p> <p>Supporting witnesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane Burch • Keith Malvern • Annette Medhurst <p>Committee Members question Councillor Shepherd-Dubey and the supporting witnesses</p>	7.10 PM
3	<p>Councillor Anthony Pollock (Executive Member) addresses the Committee</p> <p>Supporting witnesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Malcolm Richards • Councillor Keith Baker (written statement) • Councillor David Chopping • Clare Lawrence (Assistant Director, Place) • Matt Gould (Lead Specialist, Highways and Transport) <p>Committee Members question Councillor Pollock and the supporting witnesses</p>	7.50 PM
4	Summary Session – witnesses provide clarification in relation to points raised by other speakers/witnesses. Members of the Committee ask any concluding questions	8.30 PM
5	Conclusions – the Committee discusses the written and verbal evidence and considers any appropriate recommendations to the Executive.	9.00 PM
6	Councillor Parry Batth closes the meeting	9.30 PM

Note:

- 1 The Chairman may decide to invite further witnesses and amend the indicative timings.
- 2 Written submissions from witnesses will be considered during the relevant part of the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank