

RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISION



Decision taken by individual Cabinet member

(All sections must be completed (mark "N/A" as applicable))

DECISION MAKER *(Name and designation)*

Councillor Jules Crossley - Policy, Performance & Sustainability Portfolio Holder

DECISION AND THE REASON(S) FOR IT

The decision is to respond (as attached) to Hampshire County Council's [consultation on service change proposals](#) that the County Council has identified as having a significant public impact.

The Council is responding to these proposals:

- Proposed changes to Older Adults' Day Services
- Proposed changes to Planned Highway Maintenance funding
- Proposed changes to the Post-16 Transport service
- Proposed changes to the School Transport and Post-16 Transport services

DATE DECISION TAKEN

7 May 2025

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

(Those examined by officers and generated by consultation, etc)

The response has been prepared in consultation with Cabinet. All members were invited to share their views and provide feedback on the draft.

The only alternative option would be to not respond to the consultation. However, due to the significance of expected impacts on the council and residents, this is not considered an appropriate option.

ANY CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS DECLARED

(conflict of interests of any executive member who is consulted by the officer which relates to the decision. A note of dispensation should be attached).

N/A

Signed _____ Cllr Jules Crossley _____
(Decision maker)

Designation: Policy, Performance & Sustainability Portfolio Holder

HCC Future Services Consultation

Draft RBC Response

Proposed changes to Older Adults' Day Services

To what extent do you agree, or disagree, with proposed changes to Older Adults' Day Services at:
Chesil Lodge (Winchester)

- Strongly disagree
- **Disagree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Newman Court (Basingstoke)

- Strongly disagree
- **Disagree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

If we stop providing day care services at these locations, what do you feel is the best approach for us to meet people's care needs?

- **For another provider to start running the day services at these locations (or nearby)**
- To use other council-run services in other parts of Hampshire
- To use existing day services run by other providers where available
- To use other services run by other providers (such as domiciliary care, meals on wheels, or carer respite services)
- Not sure

Are you aware of any organisations or businesses who may be interested in running these day care services for us?

- Yes, in Basingstoke
- Yes, in Winchester
- No

If you are aware of any organisations who may be interested in running these day care services for us in Basingstoke, please tell us who they are here:

[No Response]

If you are aware of any organisations who may be interested in running these day care services for us in Winchester, please tell us who they are here:

[No Response]

Do you believe that the proposed changes to Older Adults' Day Services would impact anyone based on any of the following characteristics?

- **Age**
- **Disability**
- Gender reassignment
- **Marriage and/or civil partnership**
- Pregnancy and/or maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- **Poverty**
- Rurality
- Environmental impact
- Don't know

- None of these / not applicable

Tell us here if you have any:

- comments on this proposal,
- views on how this proposal could impact people or groups in Hampshire (such as those you may have highlighted above), and/or
- suggestions for other ways we could deliver Older Adults' Day Services more efficiently.

The Council is concerned about the outsourcing or closure of this service. There is some evidence that outsourced services can reduce democratic accountability and [result in lower service quality](#). Any change to alternative provision will need to be [carefully managed](#) to maintain the confidence of service users and staff. This service has significant mental and physical health benefits for its users. The service provides respite for carers, provides a space for accessing other health and care services, and contributes to safeguarding vulnerable adults. Private services cannot be expected to provide such a holistic service, to the same quality, for a similar cost to the service user.

The County Council's own [Equality Impact Assessment](#) (EIA) for this proposal notes the significant negative impact on people with disability, given that most service users will have multiple chronic conditions. The proposal does not provide sufficient justification or mitigations to support the County Council to fulfil its duty to have due regard to the Equality Act.

This decision does not appear to consider the long-term financial implications. A budget reduction of £250,000 per year is an insignificant contribution to the County Council's overall deficit of £97.6 million and will make little difference to whether the County Council is forced to issue a Section 114 notice in 2026/27. However, this proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the service users and will likely result in even greater health and care costs in the long term. The unknown implications of local government reorganisation suggest that the County Council should not be making long term decisions that should rightly be made by a successor organisation who may well come to a different conclusion.

The solution to the County Council's fiscal situation cannot be to cut preventive services in favour of reactive services. This can only lead to greater costs in the long term.

Do you, or does anyone you care for, access day care services at either of these locations?

Chesil Lodge (Winchester)

- [None of these](#)

Newman Court (Basingstoke)

- [None of these](#)

Proposed changes to Planned Highway Maintenance funding

To what extent do you agree, or disagree, with the proposal to remove the £4.323 million funding supplement from the Planned Highway Maintenance budget?

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Do you believe that the proposed changes to planned highway maintenance funding would impact anyone based on any of the following characteristics?

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and/or civil partnership
- Pregnancy and/or maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Poverty
- Rurality
- Environmental impact
- Don't know
- None of these / not applicable

Tell us here if you have any:

- comments on this proposal,
- views on how this proposal could impact people or groups in Hampshire (such as those you may have highlighted above), and/or
- suggestions for other ways we could deliver highway services more efficiently

The County Council is proposing to make a short-term budget reduction at the risk of a long-term increase in reactive maintenance costs. The Asphalt Industry Alliance states that preventive maintenance [reduces the financial risk of unforeseen major reactive maintenance works and reduces road user compensation claims](#). While this may help balance the budget now, it does not put the County Council on the right path for long-term financial sustainability.

The County Council should ensure that this proposal does not put at risk the 25% of the County Council's additional Government funding that is [contingent on local highway authorities demonstrating continual improvement in highways maintenance practice](#).

The County Council's [Vision for Hampshire 2050](#), [Climate Change Strategy](#), and [Local Transport Plan](#) all rightly prioritise active travel to create a carbon neutral, inclusive transport network that promotes healthy lives. This proposal acts against the County Council's strategic aims. Last year, the [Council's residents survey](#) found that road and pavement repairs were the issue that most needed improving by a significant margin. The County Council should invest more in planned highways maintenance to reduce the cost of reactive maintenance and encourage active travel.

The County Council's own [Equality Impact Assessment](#) (EIA) for this proposal notes the negative impact on older and younger people and people with disability, given that they could experience a disproportionate increase in difficulty/inconvenience when travelling by foot or cycle. The Council would argue that this also applies to people experiencing poverty. [People on the lowest income are already far less mobile than the wealthiest in England](#). The County Council risk making this situation worse by disincentivising walking and cycling, and increasing the risk of damage, and wear and tear to cars from poorly maintained roads. Increased vehicle maintenance also has an environmental impact with increased demand for consumables and spare parts requiring replacement, recycling, and/or disposal.

Proposed changes to the Post-16 Transport service

To what extent do you agree, or disagree, with the following proposed changes to Post-16 Transport?

To only assist with travel for Post-16 students who have special educational needs or a disability, and who are from a low-income family

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Requiring families to contribute to the costs of Post-16 transport for their child

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Introducing mandatory Independent Travel Training (ITT) for some students

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Requiring parents to be their student's Passenger Assistant where it is reasonable for them to do so

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Do you believe that the proposed changes to Post-16 Transport would impact anyone based on any of the following characteristics?

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and/or civil partnership
- Pregnancy and/or maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Poverty
- Rurality
- Environmental impact
- Don't know
- None of these / not applicable

Tell us here if you have any:

- comments on this proposal,
- views on how this proposal could impact people or groups in Hampshire (such as those you may have highlighted above), and/or
- suggestions for other ways we could deliver Post-16 Transport services more efficiently.

The County Council's [Vision for Hampshire 2050](#), [Climate Change Strategy](#), and [Local Transport Plan](#) rightly prioritise a carbon neutral, resilient and inclusive transport network that is accessible and affordable for

all. This proposal, by removing affordable, inclusive, and sustainable public transport options, may act against the County Council's strategic aims.

The County Council's own [Equality Impact Assessment](#) (EIA) for this proposal notes the very significant negative impact on young people, people with a disability, and people experiencing poverty.

Young people over the age of 16 living in Rushmoor are more likely to have an Educational Health and Care Plan compared to other districts in Hampshire. Students in the borough already have [poorer educational attainment and lower further education participation](#) compared to the rest of England. This proposal, by acting as a disincentive for people to continue with education, risks reducing educational outcomes further.

Introducing parental contributions for remaining users can only act as a disincentive for people experiencing poverty to continue with education. [Given that education is a significant contributor to social mobility](#), this can only result in exacerbating inequality and deprivation in the County. Since the County Council believes this will only a minimal amount each year, it's difficult to see how such a disproportionate impact can be justified given such a limited contribution to its financial position.

The Council believes that the proposals and proposed mitigations do not provide sufficient justification or mitigations, especially given the very significant negative impacts identified, to support the County Council's duty to have due regard to the Equality Act.

Proposed changes to the School Transport and Post-16 Transport services

To what extent do you agree, or disagree, with the following proposed changes to School Transport and Post-16 Transport?

To use bus pass usage data to reduce the number of regularly unused seats

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

To use the full licensed capacity of buses to help meet variable demand for spaces

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

To ask parents to increase their financial contribution to the cost of discretionary transport

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

To prioritise granting a Public Transport Season Ticket or a Personal Transport Budget over contracted transport, where this is appropriate and more cost effective

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know

Which of the following types of transport support do you think we should prioritise, if they can meet the needs of the student and are cheaper than arranging transport?

- A season ticket for public transport
- A personal transport budget (giving money to parents or carers so they can take their child to school or pay for someone else to do it)
- Giving training to a student to travel by themselves to school
- Something else

For 'something else', please describe:

Do you believe that the proposed changes to School Transport and Post-16 Transport would impact anyone based on any of the following characteristics?

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and/or civil partnership
- Pregnancy and/or maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

- Poverty
- Rurality
- Environmental impact
- Don't know
- None of these / not applicable

Tell us here if you have any:

- comments on this proposal,
- views on how this proposal could impact people or groups in Hampshire (such as those you may have highlighted above), and/or
- suggestions for other ways we could deliver School Transport and Post-16 Transport services more efficiently.

The County Council's own [Equality Impact Assessment](#) (EIA) for this proposal notes the significant negative impact on people with disabilities and experiencing poverty. The County Council should consider mitigations to address these issues, including:

- Engaging with school transport users about non-usage of a bus pass before removing the pass. It should not rely solely on usage data from digital bus passes to make automatic decisions on whether to remove bus passes.
- Guarantee a seat or wheelchair accessible space for all disabled school transport users.
- Carefully consider the use of public transport passes and public transport budgets in consultation with individual service users and their families to find the most appropriate cost-effective solution to meet individual needs. The priority should be to meet individual needs, not to make the most economical decision.
- Not increasing contribution rates for students from a low-income background. This can only increase inequality, deprivation, and restrict access to education that make a significant contribution to achieve social mobility.

These extensive mitigations may mean the County Council find the efficiencies achieved by these proposals is outweighed by the cost of creating and maintaining the mitigating actions.

Finally, to help us improve access to future consultations, please tell us where you first heard about this consultation:

- Via an email or letter sent to you