

Report

4

Report to:	Roads Safety Forum
Date of Meeting:	20 May 2015
Report by:	Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)

Subject:	Revised School Crossing Patroller Assessment Criteria
----------	--

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ advise of the revisions to the criteria used to assess requests for school crossing patrollers

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Forum is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that the amended criteria for assessing requests for School Crossing Patrollers be noted.

3. Background

- 3.1. The current criteria are based upon information recorded during surveys at school journey times. A measure of pedestrian demand (P) and vehicle flow (V) over the busiest ten minutes is identified from this information.
- 3.2. The pedestrian demand (P) is assessed by recording the number of children crossing the road, either with or without an adult, within 50 metres of the proposed crossing site. The vehicle flow (V) consists of all vehicles passing along the road within the predetermined area. These factors are then combined in the formula PV^2 and compared against predetermined threshold values.
- 3.3. Where the PV^2 is greater than 148,000, a patroller is clearly justified. Where the PV^2 assessment does not prove conclusive and falls between 74,000 (50%) and 148,000, other environmental factors will be considered and used to revise the original PV^2 value. This provides a weighted and more accurate assessment of potential risk at the site.
- 3.4. The criteria are based upon national best practice and were developed by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) and the Local Authority Road Safety Officers' Association (LARSOA), now Road Safety GB. The criteria were amended by the Road Safety Forum in 1998 to make it less onerous to justify a patroller and in 2011 so that patrollers would no longer be introduced at traffic signals with a pedestrian phase or at light controlled pedestrian crossings.

- 3.5. At its meeting on 29 January 2014, the Executive Committee approved the removal of 20 patrollers, subject to appropriate risk assessments, from locations serving predominantly secondary school pupils and the removal of lunchtime provision as part of Community and Enterprise Resources' savings proposals for 2015/2016. There is now a consequential need to amend the existing criteria to reflect these policy changes.
- 3.6. Research has shown that children under the approximate age of eight often still have difficulty dealing with traffic and judging vehicle speeds or distance, although this depends on the individual. Therefore, the Council's position is that pupils of secondary school age should, in general, be capable of crossing the road safely themselves.
- 3.7. Assessment criteria must be revised so that patrollers will only be approved at locations serving predominantly secondary pupils where a defined need is established based on particular road safety risks. Generally, however, patrollers will no longer be provided for secondary school pupils.

4. Revised Criteria

- 4.1. Primary school pupils and secondary school pupils will be counted separately during site surveys. Current criteria will be retained for locations serving mainly primary school pupils.
- 4.2. Sites pertaining to secondary school pupils will use alternative criteria. Where the recorded PV² is greater than the threshold value of 148,000, the location will be subject to a risk assessment to determine whether a patroller is justified or not. The risk assessment will make the recommendation of whether the request for a patroller is justified or refused.
- 4.3. The risk assessment will consider factors such as relevant injury/accident history, speed and volume of traffic, the number of acceptable gaps in the traffic for pedestrians to cross and the sufficiency of sightlines to enable pedestrians to cross the road safely.
- 4.4. This risk assessment has been previously utilised to determine whether existing patrollers are required at locations serving secondary school pupils and ensures a consistency of approach.
- 4.5. Should parents be of the view that particular children are not capable of crossing the road safely then it is the responsibility of parents to ensure that their children get to school safely. This position will be reflected within the risk assessment conducted.
- 4.6. Where the PV² assessment does not meet the threshold value of 148,000, the location will not be considered to merit further investigation and the request will be refused.
- 4.7. Lunchtime provision will not be introduced at any new sites serving either primary or secondary aged pupils.

5. Employee Implications

- 5.1. Changes to the assessment criteria will not have an impact on existing school crossing patrol staff as it only affects requests for new patrollers.
- 5.2. Assessments have been and will continue to be undertaken by existing staff.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. Other than the savings already undertaken, it is unlikely that these changes to the assessment criteria will have a significant financial implication. The removal of those patrollers from locations serving mainly secondary schools has already been agreed by the Executive Committee. A few patrollers will remain that have not already been considered for removal under the new criteria.
- 6.2. It is expected that requests for additional patrollers serving predominantly secondary pupils will be low as all secondary schools have been modernised and school travel patterns will be established by pupils.

7. Other implications

- 7.1. Relevant risk and sustainable development issues pertaining to the change to the assessment criteria have been considered and assessed.
- 7.2. There are no significant risks associated with this change in policy as the revised assessment method has already been employed during an exercise relating to Savings Proposals for 2015/2016. Any new requests will be investigated by an experienced road safety practitioner.
- 7.3. It is unlikely that there will be any implications for sustainability as few patrollers will be operating at a site serving mainly secondary school pupils that has not already been subject to assessment using the revised criteria.

8. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements

- 8.1. An equality impact assessment has been carried out on the recommendations contained within this report. The proposals will have a differential impact as the recommendations are intended to target specific sector(s) of the community. However, this impact is justifiable and the results of the assessment have been published on the Council website.
- 8.2. There is no requirement to undertake consultation in terms of the information contained within this report.

Colin McDowall

Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)

14 April 2015

Link(s) to Council Objectives

- Achieve efficient and effective use of resources
- Improve community safety
- People focused

Previous References

- Report to the Roads Safety Forum 29 June 2011
- Report to the Executive Committee of 29 January 2014

List of Background Papers

None

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact: -

Colin Smith, Roads and Transportation Services

Ext 3757 (Tel: 01698 453757)

E-mail: colin.smith@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

School Crossing Patrol Assessment Sheet

Primary Pupils

Proposed location:

School(s) served:

Survey undertaken on:

Survey Results

Number of primary school children (P) crossing during busiest ten minute period.	
Number of vehicles (V) during busiest ten minute period.	
PV^2	
PV^2 as a proportion of the value required for recommending a patroller (value required is 148,000).	

If proportion is 100% or greater then Patrol recommended.

Is Patrol recommended

Yes/No

If percentage is between 50% and 100% then consider other factors detailed below.

Environmental Factor	Relevant- Yes/No
Vehicle Speeds	
Visibility	
Excessive Street Furniture	
Closeness to Junction	
Parking Problem	
Concentration of Accidents	

Recalculated PV^2 as a proportion of the value required for recommending a patroller.	
---	--

If proportion remains under 100% then Patrol is not recommended.

Is Patrol recommended

Yes/ No

Ward:

Requested By:

School Crossing Patrol Assessment Sheet

Secondary Pupils

Proposed location:

School(s) served:

Survey undertaken on:

Survey Results

Number of secondary school children (P) crossing during busiest ten minute period.	
Number of vehicles (V) during busiest ten minute period.	
PV ²	
PV ² as a proportion of the value required for recommending patroller investigations (value required is 148,000).	

If proportion is 100% or greater then further site investigation is required.

If proportion is under 100% then Patrol is not recommended.

Does the PV² survey meet the threshold value?

Yes/ No

Is further investigation required?

Yes/ No

Is Patrol recommended after further investigation?

Yes/ No/ NA

Ward:

Requested By:



School Crossing Patrol Request – Risk Assessment

Work Activity Details:	To assess the need for a school crossing patroller
Workplace:	Location:
	Area:
Task Details:	Secondary school pupils crossing the road without the benefit of a school crossing patroller
Result:	Is a patroller recommended at this location? Yes/ No

Risk without additional controls in place			likelihood x severity (* x *) = *		
To whom:	Employee	The Public X	High (6-9)	Medium (3-4)	Low (1-2)

Risk with additional control in place			likelihood x severity (* x *) = *		
To whom	Employee	The Public X	High (6-9)	Medium (3-4)	Low (1-2)

Type of Feature	Yes	No	Comment and/or Action
Speed Limit			
Lamp Columns (location)			
School signs (dia 545 or other)			
Plates (School or Patrol)			
Other Warning Signs and Plates			
Hazard Warning Lights (Remote or key)			
School Keep Clear marking and length			
Parking Restrictions			
Guard rails			
Trees close to the point			
Bus Stops and/or shelters			
Any other feature not mentioned above			

Please complete the Hazard Identification Section also.

Remedial Actions Required:



Hazard Identification	Yes	No	Comments	Control Measures/ Action
1. Does the site have relevant injury accident history in the previous three years?				
2. Does the speed or volume of traffic seem to be exceeding the appropriate limit?				
3. Are there sufficient sightlines, in both directions and from both footways, to enable pedestrians to cross the road safely?				
4. Are there sufficient gaps in traffic to allow pedestrians to cross the road safely?				
5. Are the existing signs and/or road markings missing/ causing difficulties?				
6. Are "school children crossing" signs required / in place.				
7. Are there any parking problems?				
8. Are the presence and/or duration of any road/other works causing difficulties?				

Assessment by:

Designation:

Responsible Manager:

Designation: