

<b>Decision- Maker:</b> Director of Regeneration Enterprise and Skills	<b>DATE</b> 11/11/19	<b>ITEM NO</b> GSP741
<b>TITLE:</b> School Streets	<b>WARD (S)</b> Abbey Wood, Eltham North, Eltham West, Peninsula	
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> Assistant Director of Transportation & BSR	<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b> Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport	
<b>DECISION CLASSIFICATION:</b> Non Key	<b>IS THE FINAL DECISION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS REPORT TO BE MADE AT THIS TIME?</b> Yes	

1. Decision required

The Director for Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills is recommended to:

- 1.1 Note the results of the pilot launch of School Streets, which has involved an Experimental Traffic Management Order made by the Council in October 2018 which closes roads to traffic outside four primary schools in the mornings and afternoons in the Royal Borough of Greenwich;
- 1.2 Agree to the advertising of the Traffic Orders and statutory highway notices required in order to continue the existing School Streets pilot on a permanent basis;
- 1.3 Authorise the Assistant Director of Transportation to consider and determine whether any of the representations received in response to the statutory consultation to be undertaken pursuant to 1.2 above are significant, substantial or material and are therefore required under the Council's Constitution to be reported to the Lead Member before a

decision is made on whether or not to make the requisite traffic orders to implement the School Streets pilot on a permanent basis;

- 1.4 Authorise the Assistant Director of Transportation, in the event that he determines that none of the representations received in response to the statutory consultation undertaken pursuant to 1.2 above, are significant, substantial or material, to make the requisite traffic orders, in order to implement the School Streets pilot on a permanent basis; and
- 1.5 Authorise the Assistant Director of Transportation, in the event that no representations are received in response to the statutory consultation undertaken pursuant to 1.2 above, to make the requisite traffic orders, in order to implement the School Streets pilot on a permanent basis.

Agreed/Not Agreed: Pippa Mack

Date:

11/11/19.

2. Links to the Royal Greenwich high level objectives

2.1 This report relates to the Council's agreed high level objectives as follows:

- *a healthier Greenwich*
- *a safer Greenwich*
- *a cleaner, greener Greenwich*

2.2 The Corporate Plan also includes a specific sub-objective under 'a cleaner, greener Greenwich' to:

"Work with schools and communities to encourage a reduction in school runs making sure school entrances and surrounding streets are safer."

2.3 The Royal Borough's adopted Third Local Implementation Plan for transport (LIP3) also includes the following priorities:

- "LPI: Promoting a sustainable transport network in Royal Greenwich that provides opportunities for active travel, and thereby good physical and mental health, for everyone."

- “LP3: Improving safety, particularly for vulnerable road users, reducing collisions and ensuring people feel secure on streets and in public areas.”
- “LP4: Improving air quality by reducing the levels of key pollutants that are associated with traffic and transport in the Royal Borough.”

### 3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 To reduce conflicts between cars and young pedestrians in the immediate vicinity of the school, and encourage families and staff to be more active on their journey to school by walking, scooting, cycling and park & stride more.

### 4. Introduction and Background

- 4.1 Many primary schools across the Royal Borough have serious concerns about safety and health risks that children are exposed to during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up times. A proportion of pupils still travel to school by car; schools and local residents regularly report issues with irresponsible driving and parking behaviours fearing a child might be harmed. Travelling by car to school reduces the opportunities to be physically active, a contributing factor to obesity in children.
- 4.2 Another concern is children being directly exposed to a high level of air pollution from cars during the same period, contributing to the overall exposure to poor air quality which can cause lifelong health problems. Children are more vulnerable to these airborne pollutants.
- 4.3 In conjunction with Car Free Day in September 2017 ten schools participated in having the road closed outside their school. The proposal was to provide a child friendlier environment when children arrive at school and offer a vision of how much more pleasant, safer and healthier it would be if there were less vehicular traffic on the road outside school during morning and afternoon peak times. The event generated an interest in exploring the possibility of closing roads outside of the borough’s schools on a more permanent basis, which has been done in two other London Boroughs: Camden and Hackney.
- 4.4 Eight primary schools in the Royal Borough were invited to take part in a School Street pilot. They were selected based on their engagement with travel planning, as indicated by their TfL STARS status, and an initial assessment of the technical feasibility. Factors taken in to account included the following: level of car-use in conjunction with the journey to school, impact of the closure to local residents and businesses, bus routes and

minimising disruption to general traffic flow. Four schools opted out and four schools opted to take part in the School Street pilot.

- 4.5 School Streets were piloted during October 2018 under an experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO) for a minimum period of 6 months- they have now been operational for approximately 12 months. The experimental scheme implemented time-limited street closures to allow children to arrive and leave school in a safe and pleasant environment. Foldable bollards were installed to prevent vehicular access during the closure times; participating schools were responsible for raising and lowering the bollards before and after the closure. During the period of the experimental scheme, [non-statutory consultation was carried out] parents, residents, local businesses and other stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback on the scheme.

## 5. Road Closures

- 5.1 The road closures were in place for up to 1.5 hours in the morning (8:00-09:30) and 1 hour in the afternoon (15:00-16:00) to fit around school starting and finishing times. The closures do not accommodate breakfast clubs or after school activities outside of those hours.
- 5.2 Participating schools are responsible for closing the road during the closure times by raising and lowering the bollards. Parents, carers and school staff will not have vehicular accesses during the closure times. Residents would be encouraged to avoid vehicular movement during the closure times but would be able to enter/exit in an emergency situation via liaison with the school.
- 5.3 Please see Appendix A for details of schools and closure sites.

## 6. Available Options

- 6.1 There are three options available.
- 6.2 Option one is to make permanent the experimental TMOs for time limited road closures within the participating schools and retain the foldable bollards and associated school signage. This would make school travel for pupils and parents more pleasant, safer and provide better air quality.

6.3 Option two is to make permanent the experimental TMOs as described in 5.2, with a reduction to the morning operating hours in response to consultation comments.

6.4 The third option is to “do nothing”. This would perpetuate the health and safety risk to pupils in school areas. This would also be contrary to the objectives of the Royal Borough’s Corporate Plan and transport policy, as set out in Section 2.

## 7. Preferred Option

7.1 Option one - To make permanent the experimental TMO timed road closure at participating locations listed shown in Appendix A with the option to reduce closure times to suit school needs and residents requests (provided the hours are within the two stipulated time periods).

7.2 The School Streets zones include the following roads for each school:

- De Lucy Primary School; Cookhill Road,
- Gordon Primary School; the section of Grangehill Road between junctions with Earlsall Road and Craigton Rd/Elibank Road,
- Haimo Primary School; the section of Haimo Road from its junction with Froissart Road to the junction with the slip road of South Circular Rd (access to Co-op and other shops),
- St Joseph’s Primary School; Commerell Street.

## 8. Reasons for Recommendations

8.1 The proposal is recommended because it will continue to encourage children, carers and staff to be more active on their journey to school by walking, scooting, cycling and park & stride more, in line with the Council’s Local Implementation Plan and the Mayors Transport Strategy.

## 9. Consultation Results

9.1 The consultation document and questionnaire shown in Appendices B was completed by a total of 359 residents, schools and businesses in the areas listed in Appendices A. Consultation documents were also sent to the local Ward Councillors, and schools. Statutory authorities including the emergency services were notified of the proposal.

9.2 54 (15%) responses were received for De Lucy Primary School, 144 (40%) for Gordon Primary School, 89 (25%) for Haimo Primary School and 73 (20%) for

St Joseph's Primary School. Results received from participating school areas reveal the following:

Do you support the School Street?

De Lucy School-	Yes: 57.4%	No: 27.8%	No opinion 14.8%
Gordon School-	Yes: 62.5%	No: 27.8%	No opinion 9.7%
Haimo School-	Yes: 78.7%	No: 16.9%	No opinion 4.5%
St Joseph's School-	Yes: 79.5%	No: 13.7%	No opinion 6.9%

How much do you think the School Street has helped achieve the following objectives: Made our roads safer, particularly for walking and cycling.

De Lucy School-	Yes: 51.9%,	No: 18.5%	No opinion: 29.6%
Gordon School-	Yes: 54.2%,	No: 7.6%	No opinion: 38.2%
Haimo School-	Yes: 83.2%,	No: 10.1%	No opinion: 6.7%
St Joseph's School-	Yes: 75.3%,	No: 11.0%	No opinion: 13.7%

How much do you think the School Street has helped achieve the following objectives: Reduced pollution from transport.

De Lucy School-	Yes: 48.2%	No: 16.7%	No opinion: 35.2%
Gordon School-	Yes: 50.7%	No: 10.4%	No opinion: 38.9%
Haimo School-	Yes: 75.3%	No: 14.6%	No opinion: 10.1%
St Joseph's School-	Yes: 71.2%	No: 15.1%	No opinion: 13.7%

How much do you think the School Street has helped achieve the following objectives: Making walking and cycling the best way to travel.

De Lucy School-	Yes: 40.7%	No: 25.9%	No opinion: 35.2%
Gordon School-	Yes: 50.0%	No: 17.4%	No opinion: 32.6%
Haimo School-	Yes: 70.8%	No: 16.9%	No opinion: 12.4%
St Joseph's School-	Yes: 71.2%	No: 12.3%	No opinion: 16.4%

9.3 The main recurring comments that were received as part of the consultation are discussed in Section 10 and set out in Appendix D along with officer's comments.

9.4 Emergency services were notified of the experimental traffic order and scheme. No objections have been made relating to the scheme. It should be

noted that emergency services carry the standard key that will unlock the bollards for access in emergency situations.

9.5 No other comments were received from any other statutory organisations.

## 10. Frequent Consultation Comments

10.1 Comments were submitted as part of the consultation. Officer comments have been provided in response to each statement.

10.2 *"People still driving the cars on the closed road but driving up on the grass area to get around the bollards there are plenty of people illegally parking on the grass area and pavements in surrounding road"* - 10 comments. Council officers have worked with schools to understand these issues and are implementing any further minor traffic management measures necessary to prevent this inappropriate behaviour.

10.3 *"The timing could be reduced in the morning to 8.15. This would allow staff and residents to be able to go to work without having to leave earlier"* - 5 comments. Timed closures for the morning restrictions can be reduced from 8:00-9:30am to 8:15-9:15. The afternoon times will remain unchanged as the closure is during peak school egress hours.

10.4 *"Extend the area, block all 3 entrances - Earls Hall Rd & Craighton Rd"* - 26 comments and *"Extend it to include adjacent roads - other end of Commercial St and Christ Church"* - 13 comments.

The Council will consider further School Streets following the completion of the first phase of trial School Streets (as considered in this report). This will include an assessment of the most appropriate sites to prioritise for inclusion. Additions to the current experimental School Streets may emerge as priorities but it would not be appropriate to prejudge that assessment at this stage. Whilst there could well be benefits to adding to the current experimental sites, this needs to be considered alongside the benefits of other potential School Streets sites

10.5 *"Unproductive scheme / waste of money and increase in pollution"* - 21 comments. The primary objective of the scheme is to encourage families and staff to be more active on their journey to school by walking, cycling, etc. Consultation results indicate the initial objective is being met.

10.6 *"Pushed the issues elsewhere"* - 13 comments. As noted in Paragraph 8.4, the Council will consider further School Streets following the completion of the

first phase of trial School Streets. In the meantime the Council has followed up on reports of inappropriate parking and related behaviour around the closures. It has worked with the schools involved and deployed its Parking Enforcement officers. Anybody experiencing these issues is encouraged to report them to [schoolstreets@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:schoolstreets@royalgreenwich.gov.uk).

- 10.7 *“Exception or access to residents and businesses”* - 6 comments; *“Remove the bollards and put in a camera operated ticketing system or electronic barriers for better access for residents of the road”* – 13 comments; and *“Close it totally / only access to residents with a permit”* – 13 comments.

The Royal Borough does not currently have the powers required to effectively enforce a closure of the type suggested, with exceptions for certain groups. The adoption of powers to enforce Moving Traffic Contraventions has been approved by London Councils and in July the Council passed a formal resolution to take on the powers. Once the back-office systems required to begin enforcement are in place, it will be possible to consider the role of this kind of system in School Streets. A full-time permanent closure of the trial School Streets is not recommended as the impact on residents (and others within the area of the closures) would be disproportionate.

## 11. Cost of Delivery

- 11.1 The physical works required have already been installed as part of the experimental scheme. Costs arising from making the scheme permanent would be limited to those of making the necessary Traffic Management Order and informing residents of the effected area of the outcome of the decision.
- 11.2 Bollards, road signs, TMOs and additional promotional materials were funded through the Local Implementation Plan’s Borough Allocated Funding.
- 11.3 Costs incurred in designing lamppost sleeves, pre-engagement / post consultation letters and leaflets, and information distribution amounted to £6,875.50.
- 11.4 Costs incurred in installing required sign posts, bollards, maintenance and repairs, drafting and making of the experimental TMO amounted to £34,883.51.
- 11.5 Costs of engineering measures are laid out below but exclude officer time. As each school location is unique in its location, implementation costs vary, therefore costs provided are average per site



Item	Cost
Purchase street furniture @ £611 per unit and installation, install additional bollards to prevent circumvention of bollards using pavement, signage, and lighting.	£7,500
TMO costs	£2,300
Designing lamppost sleeves, consultation leaflets and letters for a school area	£2000
Approx. total cost per school:	£11,800

11.6 Behaviour change activities delivered to support any continuation of the scheme will be supported through Royal Greenwich's School Travel Plan programme as part of the Local Implementation Plan delivery programme.

12. Next Steps: Communication and Implementation of the Decision

12.1 Implementation of the proposal requires statutory consultation on Traffic Management Orders and Highway Notices, consistent with the Road Traffic Regulations. The next steps, prior to permanent implementation of the scheme, are to advertise those Orders and Notices and to consider any representations made to those Orders/Notices.

13. Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Legal including Human Rights Act	<p>This report seeks to continue on a permanent basis, an existing Experimental Traffic Management Order (ETMO) which is currently in operation and made by the Council as traffic authority under the Road Traffic and Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA").</p> <p>The RTRA empowers the Council to make Traffic Management Orders ("TMOs") and in making such TMOs, the Council must follow the procedures set</p>	<p><i>Eleanor Penn,</i>  <i>Assistant Head of</i>  <i>Legal Services,</i>  <i>29/10/2019</i></p>

out at Schedule 9, Part III of the RTRA and as detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (“the 1996 Regulations”). The 1996 Regulations, prescribe (among others) specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that the Council must strictly observe.

The procedure for implementing an ETMO does not require statutory consultation in advance. However, if the scheme is successful and a decision is made for it to become permanent, statutory consultation will be required.

The making of the requisite permanent TMOs will need to be the subject of a separate report to either the Lead Member or Director, as a result of the following:

1. The 1996 Regulations require the Council to take account of any representations made during the statutory consultation stage, before the TMOs are made.
2. A recent High Court judgment confirms that the Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at sections 122(1) and (2) of the RTRA and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.
3. Under the Responsibility for Functions section in Part 3 of the Council’s Constitution, determination of TMOs, following publication and consultation, and for which significant and substantial or

	<p>material objections have been received, are required to be taken by the Lead Member.</p> <p>4. The same Part 3 of the Council's Constitution requires that where no such significant and substantial or material objections have been received, determination of the TMOs is required to be taken by the Director. This therefore covers not only the situation where representations are received which need to be reported to the Lead Member (as above) but also where no representations are received. This report recommends that the Director authorise the Assistant Director of Transportation to determine these matters in her place.</p>	
<p><b>Finance</b> and other resources including procurement implications</p>	<p>The Director of Regeneration Enterprise &amp; Skills is requested to note the results from the School Streets pilot and agree to the advertising and making of the Traffic Orders and Highway Notices required to permanently implement the scheme. The estimated £10,000 cost of this scheme will be met from this year's Borough Allocated Funding from TFL.</p>	<p><i>Sue Rock Accountancy Business Change Manager, 25/10/19</i></p>
<p><b>Equalities</b></p>	<p>The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no apparent equality impact on end users.</p>	<p><i>Rich Udemezue Senior Traffic Engineer 19 July 2019</i></p>

#### 14. Report Appendices

14.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- Appendix A      List of Schools
- Appendix B      Consultation Questionnaire
- Appendix C      Questionnaire Response Breakdown
- Appendix D      Main Comments Received

#### 15. Background Papers

N/A

Report Author:      Rich Udemezue, Senior Traffic Engineer  
Tel:                    020 8921 3804  
Email:                Rich.Udemezue@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to:        Ryan Nibbs, Group Manager (Traffic)  
Tel:                    020 8921 2397  
Email:                Ryan.Nibbs@royalgreenwich.gov.uk