

North Yorkshire County Council
Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

Bikeability Scheme 2020/21

Report to Executive Members – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval for a recommendation that the Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services (BES), in consultation with BES Executive Members agree the Bikeability delivery model for the year 2020/21, including acceptance of the Department for Transport (DfT) grant.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Bikeability training forms part of the North Yorkshire Road Safety Curriculum developed by the Road Safety and Travel Awareness (RS&TA) Team together with Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) to promote appropriate road user education and training at key stages in every child's education.
- 2.2 We currently use a targeted delivery model to offer grant funded training to priority schools. Other schools are offered training on a paid-for basis.
- 2.3 The Scheme employs seven fixed term, part time staff and approx. 50 zero hours relief cycle trainers.

3.0 2020/21 Grant

- 3.1 The DfT have invited NYCC to accept a one year contract for the year 2020/21, which would provide 3000 places and a grant of £120,000. The £40 DfT Grant contribution per pupil trained has remained unchanged throughout the nine years of the Bikeability programme in North Yorkshire. The grant does not cover the true cost of delivery.
- 3.2 To-date the additional cost to the County Council has been met from the Road Safety and Travel Awareness revenue budget with additional support from the 95 Alive Partnership and Public Health. Funding pressures in all of these areas means, that for the programme to continue, a new source of funding will be required to meet the shortfall, either through a charging scheme or another source. Additionally in 2020/21 the shortfall will increase due to staff pay rises and other cost of living increases, resulting in a total funding shortfall of approximately £78,000
- 3.3 An alternative delivery model will be required if we continue to provide Bikeability. Unless the full shortfall can be funded from another source, we will need to introduce a fee for all students or cease delivery.

3.4 The scale of the fee will depend on the level of contributions from other sources. See figure 1 for examples of contribution levels and the fees required.

Figure 1. Examples of contribution levels and the impact on the fees required. This fee would be charged to all priority 1 students currently receiving free training. All other students would continue to be charged the full cost per head.

Grant £	Shortfall £	Other £	Cost per Student £
120000	78000	0	£26.00
120000	78000	30000	£16.00
120000	78000	40000	£12.67
120000	78000	50000	£9.33
120000	78000	60000	£6.00
120000	78000	78000	£0.00

4.0 Future service delivery options to consider:-

4.1 See table below for summary of options to consider.

Option	Service Level	Service Cost 2020/21	BES Saving	Positives	Negatives	Recommendation
1	Maintain current service level and delivery model (free of charge to priority schools)	£78,000	£0	-Continued delivery	-Not financially sustainable. -Management of scheme would use 60% of remaining officer time.	Not Recommended
2	Maintain current service level and charge a fee per pupil at each priority school to cover shortfall. SEE FIGURE 1	£ Varies	Up to £78,000	-Continued delivery	-Management of scheme and 60 staff would use 60% of remaining officer time. -Potential reduction in demand.	Recommended
3	Cease delivery	£0	£78,000	-Nil cost to NYCC. -Schools would seek alternative providers. -Little impact on casualty numbers	Potential initial criticism.	Not recommended

4	Outsource Delivery	£0	£78,000	-Nil cost to NYCC. Minimal Officer admin and monitoring required.	TUPE will apply. Others LA's have worked around this issue. Remains work in progress.	Not recommended
---	--------------------	----	---------	---	---	-----------------

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1 Consideration has been given to the financial impact of this proposal, as outlined in figure 1 and Table 4.1. The £40 DfT Grant contribution per pupil trained has remained unchanged throughout the eight years of the Bikeability programme in North Yorkshire. To-date the additional cost to the county council has been met from the Road Safety and Travel Awareness revenue budget with additional support from the 95 Alive Partnership and Public Health. For the programme to continue, funding will be required to meet the shortfall, either through a charging scheme or another source.

6.0 Equalities Implications

6.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any adverse equality impacts arising from the recommendation. It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010. See Appendix A

7.0 Legal Implications

7.1 If followed the recommendations contained in this Report would help go toward the County Council fulfilling its statutory duty under Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to *"prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety"* and having elsewhere complied with its duty to *"carry out studies into accidents on roads"* within its area, to *"take such measures as appear to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including the dissemination of information and advice relating to the use of roads and the giving of practical training to road users"*.

8.0 Recommendations

8.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director – BES, in consultation with the BES Executive Member for Access authorise the Corporate Director, Strategic Resources, to accept the DfT grant offer for 2020/21

8.2 It is recommended that the Corporate Director – BES, in consultation with the BES Executive Member for Access authorise the Corporate Director, Strategic Resources, to approve the delivery model outlined in option 2, Table 4.1

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director - Highways and Transportation

Author of report: Fiona Ancell

Background documents: None

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated May 2015)

2020/21 Bikeability Funding

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	Business and Environment Services, Highways & Transportation, Road Safety
Lead Officer and contact details	Fiona Ancell. Team Leader, Road Safety Team
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Tony Law Senior Strategy and Performance Officer.
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	Individual Officers using service data.
When did the due regard process start?	October 2019

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

Bikeability training forms part of the North Yorkshire Road Safety Curriculum developed by the Road Safety and Travel Awareness (RS&TA) Team together with Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) to promote appropriate road user education and training at key stages in every child's education.

The provision of Bikeability cyclist Level 1/2 training to all Year 6 primary school pupils is one of the Tour de France Legacy commitments made by the County Council.

1. DfT have offered £120,000 to fund 3000 Level 1/2/3 places in 2020/21.
2. The council wish to implement a charging scheme for priority schools to cover the funding shortfall. Schools would fund the cost by using their Sports and PE premium grant.

This EIA seeks to assess the impact.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

1. The grant does not cover full cost of delivery and the previous shortfall funding source will no longer be available in 2020/21
2. The aim is to continue to deliver the service by charging all students a fee to offset the funding shortfall.

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

Bikeability training and delivery will continue to be provided by NYCC staff. Charging will change the administrative procedure (purchase orders and invoicing will require additional officer time to process)

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

No consultation has been undertaken and none is planned.

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

The recommendation to accept funding will require Council funds of up to £78,000

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
Age	X			
Disability	X			The training is offered to all Year 6 pupils, regardless of any of these characteristics.
Sex (Gender)	X			
Race	X			
Gender reassignment	X			
Sexual orientation	X			
Religion or belief	X			
Pregnancy or maternity	X			

Marriage or civil partnership	X			
Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
...live in a urban area?	x			
...live in a rural area?	x			
...have a low income?			x	May impact of low income families if schools pass the cost onto parents.
Section 8. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.				
No				
Section 9. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)				Tick option chosen
1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.				x
2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.				
3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts.				
4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.				
Explanation of why this option has been chosen.				
The recommendation will mean maintaining current level of provision.				
The recommended option will help go toward the County Council fulfilling its statutory duty under Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and to carry out studies into accidents on roads within their area, taking such measures as appear to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including the dissemination of information and advice relating to the use of roads and the giving of practical training to road users.				
Section 10. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)				
NYCC will continue to measure take up and accident rates in accordance with their statutory duty to give road safety information and training (See Section 9 above).				
Section 11. Action plan. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA, including post implementation review to find out how the outcomes have been achieved in practice and what impacts there have actually been on people with protected characteristics.				

Action	Lead	By when	Progress	Monitoring arrangements
Continue to measure take up rates	Road Safety Team Leader	March 2021		
Continue to measure accident rates.	Road Safety Team Leader, in association with the 95 Alive partnership	Quarterly		

Section 12. Summary Summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The proposal to provide Bikeability training provision will have a positive impact on the overall cohort of young people.

Section 13. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Fiona Ancell

Job title: Team Leader, Road Safety & Travel Awareness

Directorate: BES

Signature:

Completion date:

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Barrie Mason

Date: 06/11/19