

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 9.00 am on 15 July 2022

Present:

Councillor Will Rowlands (Chairman)
Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Kim Botting FRSA,
Adam Jude Grant, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland,
Alison Stammers, Harry Stranger and Keith Onslow

Also Present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett MA J.P., Councillor Aisha
Cuthbert, Councillor Simon Jeal, Councillor Rebecca
Wiffen, Councillor Michael Tickner, Councillor Chloe-Jane
Ross, Councillor Will Connolly, Councillor Sam Webber
and Councillor David Cartwright QFSM

198 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mike Botting and
Councillor Keith Onslow attended as substitute.

Oral Questions from the Public

199 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

200 QUESTIONS

Questions had been received for oral and written response. These are
attached as appendices to the minutes.

201 CALL-IN: REVIEW OF SCHOOL STREETS

The Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety commenced by
making the following statement:

*'The premise of the 'Call ins' and the questions is incorrect, School Streets
are not ending and remain one option as the Council continues to support
active travel and road safety outside our schools. Whilst not being actively
promoted, each application will continue to be assessed on its merits.'*

*By their nature, most primary schools recruit from a relatively small catchment
area. In most cases children live within walking distance and this is the*

15 July 2022

primary form of active travel in School Travel Plans. Some faith schools and those in rural areas have wider catchment areas and therefore these children may have to travel by public transport or in some cases by car. Children in years five and six are encouraged, wherever possible, to walk to school without parental support to develop their independence and confidence and prepare for transition to secondary education.

Every school in Bromley is encouraged to produce a Travel Plan and the Council's School Travel Team assists each school to ensure that their plan is tailored to the school's circumstances. In 2019, when the last accreditation took place, Bromley had amongst the highest number of gold or silver accreditations, for increases in the number of children walking to school. TfL is currently conducting a fresh accreditation. Changes in the way children travel to school are measured and this allows the Council to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the various measures used to promote active travel in the Borough.

There are several measures available to the Council to promote active school travel, School Streets being one of them. The cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications. The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting, and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors Scheme; as well as supporting school crossing patrols at schools that want them.

The Council does not support the introduction of ANPR cameras. Each camera costs around £25,000 with annual running costs of £5000 a year. Enquiries with other councils has not produced any evidence that enough PCNs would be issued to pay for their cost. For a school with two cameras, 1000 PCNs would have to be issued to match the cost of the cameras and in any event it is not the purpose of such cameras to be used for income generation. Income from PCNs is not ring fenced and is subsumed in the general Council income. Even if the revenue generated were ring fenced to the School Travel budget, the expenditure of an average of two cameras per School Street at £60,000 for around 90 minutes a day for 190 school days a year would be poor value for money.

School Streets at some schools help in the promotion of active travel but they are not a panacea and are not suitable at all schools. Experience has shown that schools which were considering introducing them decided not to when they realised the commitment which would be required by the staff. Again, it is impractical to expect residents within a School Street to take on the commitment as, inevitably, the burden would rest on the retired or those working from home to operate barriers, in all weathers, twice a day for 190 school days. Should residents, under the auspices of a school wish to support a school within their travel plan in this way, then the Council would clearly have no objection--provided there were no reasons why such a School Street would be impracticable.

At the pilot School Street in Hayes, the consultation exercise showed that most residents of the streets just outside of the School Street itself were not in favour of the School Street continuing, with 79% being against the School Street, primarily due to the displacement of traffic and other nuisance.'

The meeting then moved on to the hearing of oral questions with responses from the Portfolio Holder. The questions and responses are detailed in the appendix to the minutes. It was noted during the course of the meeting that the written and oral questions received had been published on the Council website.

Councillor Michael Tickner attended the meeting to represent Beckenham Town Centre and Copers Cope Ward. He informed the Committee that in his Ward, two School Streets were currently operational which were well supported by local residents. He acknowledged the fact that the issue of School Streets was an emotive one and said it was important that debate was not stifled. He acknowledged the benefits of School Streets in terms of cleaner air, the benefits of walking, and less accidents because it was safer for children. In his view the proposed decision did support the continuation of School Streets. He mentioned that the School Street in Westgate Road had been well supported by local residents. The School in Westgate Road had said that it did not wish for the School Street to continue in its present form and that was because they did not want to have the burden of paying staff to man the barriers. The school was happy to support the School Street if the parents wanted to get involved and man the barriers. Councillor Tickner concluded by saying that he supported the decision in its present form and suggested that no further action should be taken.

The Chairman opened the floor to the Labour Group (as the main opposition party that had called in the Decision) and asked them to explain their concerns and the reason for calling in the decision. Councillor Alisa Igoe spoke first. She said that a quick look at the last 'Hands Up' survey conducted at Hayes Primary School last November, showed that walking levels had increased, scooting levels were up, bus use was up, park and stride use was up, cycling was up and car use was down from 32.7% to 14.6%, a drop of 18.1%. The report noted that 136 fewer children travelled to school by car and 68 more children parked and strode, and this was in the winter period. She expressed the view that Hayes School Street was a success and the decision should be reconsidered as it treated the report as a failure.

Councillor Igoe explained that the first reason that the Labour Group had called in the decision was that they believed the LIP provided strong evidence that School Streets were needed and as shown on page 130 of the Plan, they clearly met the first four Outcomes of the Mayor's Transport Strategy:

1. Outcome 1: London's streets will be healthy and more Londoners will travel actively:
2. Outcome 2: London's streets will be safe and secure:

3. Outcome 3: London's streets will be used more efficiently and have less traffic on them:
4. Outcome 4: London's streets will be clean and green:

Councillor Igoe explained that the LIP was the Local Implementation Plan, a statutory document, which set out how Bromley would implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy in the Borough. The document promoted behavioural change--how people should travel around the Borough by active modes in future, particularly on short journeys. It stated that the Council would work to reduce air pollution in areas where vulnerable people may spend significant amounts of time, then gave the example of schools. Councillor Igoe commented that in her estimation, there was not really a better way of reducing pollution around schools other than promoting the use of School Streets.

Councillor Igoe explained that the LIP estimated that Bromley's population was due to increase by 30,000 by 2032. To avoid further traffic congestion and worsening pollution the mode share target for Bromley was for 60% of trips to be made by public transport, walking and cycling by 2041. The document stated that a key Council objective was reducing the car mode share for travel to school by promoting a mode shift to both public transport and active modes.

Cllr Igoe stated that it was estimated that across London, 25% of peak hour traffic was associated with the school run. She said that in Bromley this figure was higher at 40%.

Councillor Igoe referenced page 7 of the LIP where it stated that walking investment would be directed to promoting walking to school to reduce the negative traffic and parking impacts associated with the school run and to promote healthy active lifestyles from a young age. Promoting and expanding public and active travel options for school journeys was essential to reduce school-run trips which caused these problems and safety concerns at the beginning and end of the school day. It was hoped that a good experience of public and active travel would maintain good health and make these modes of travel the default options for later in life.

Councillor Igoe said that in the LIP it stated that Bromley Council was committed to making roads safer by adopting the Zero KSI of no deaths or serious injuries by 2041. She said that she was mentioning this, as at the ECS PDS Committee on 21st June, it had been observed that there was a red alert on the ECS Performance Overview Report for the KSI numbers for 2020/21. The figure was 109, which was a 26% increase on the 'target' figure of 86.

Cllr Igoe quoted from the LIP where it said, *"it will be necessary to reduce the impact of the school run by shifting school trips from cars to other modes. The Council will, therefore, aim for 50% of travel to school to be by active modes and 20% by public transport by 2020/21."*

Councillor Igoe quoted as follows from page 51 of the LIP: - *'that the Council will consider implementing School Streets in areas where these can be shown to have a clear benefit to mode share and safety, that they play an important role in select cases as promoting active travel to school and reducing vehicle movements in the vicinity of schools where they are implemented. They will be focused on residential streets where school run traffic has the greatest negative impacts.'*

Councillor Igoe concluded by asking the Committee to refer the decision to the Executive to reconsider, in part, on the basis that the original decision did not consider evidence that School Streets achieved the objectives set out in the Local Implementation Plan; of vehicle pollution reduction, reduction in collisions and injuries to children and increasing the percentage of journeys to school made by active travel modes, and therefore the decision failed to consider that the Pilot demonstrated the contribution of school streets towards the delivery of the Council's policy objectives.

Councillor Jeal joined the meeting virtually and explained that this was because he had tested positive for Covid 19. He said that in his view there had been a lack of engagement with schools and residents. He stated that Hayes Primary School had submitted comments but that these comments were not part of the report that had been presented to the Committee. In his view this was not conducive to a proper assessment of the viability of the Hayes Primary Pilot Scheme.

Councillor Jeal stated that 279 local residents had been consulted, but only 85 had responded—this meant that it was not possible to conclude that local residents were not supportive. He said that many parents were supportive of the Hayes Pilot Scheme and that the Pilot had achieved its objectives. He also referred to the limited period of consultation that had been undertaken with schools and noted that this had been done in Summer 2020 when the main concern of schools was the pandemic and social distancing. During that time, schools would have been suffering from staff shortages and traffic had decreased. Councillor Jeal stated that many schools were interested in School Streets, but had not had the opportunity to express this interest to Council Officers.

Councillor Jeal stated that a TfL survey had shown that when parents were consulted with respect to School Streets, 81% were supportive. He expressed the view that the consultation process undertaken by Bromley was not wide enough and had not taken the views of most Bromley schools into consideration. He also referenced road safety and the recent increase in KSI levels and pointed out that a child had recently been struck by a car outside of Leeson's Hill Primary School.

In summing up, Councillor Jeal asked that the School Streets decision be referred to the Executive for re-consideration. He felt that the Pilot Scheme was not properly representative of the situation in Bromley and that the

decision had been made on the basis of a consultation process that was out of date and incomplete.

The next Councillor to speak on behalf of the Labour Group was Councillor Kathy Bance. She said that she had supported the Call In of the Decision as she was of the view that the decision should be reversed and that School Streets should be actively supported.

Councillor Bance expressed surprise that the Council had supported the amendments that had been proposed by Councillor Fawthrop at the previous meeting. She cited the following reasons and said that in her opinion:

- It strengthened the Council's Ability not to support School Streets
- The amendments made it difficult to get new School Streets approved even if a school had requested one
- The amendments made it easier to close School Streets

Councillor Bance said that in her view the response to public questions was one of contempt and that it was wrong that no-one had been provided with an advance copy of the Portfolio Holder's statement.

Councillor Bance felt that the consultation process was inadequate because it was limited to primarily the results from the Hayes Pilot School Street along with feedback from a small selection of other contemporary School Street venues. She expressed the view that as Bromley had so few School Streets, the consultation process should have included Boroughs that had far greater numbers of School Streets and more experience of their positive outcomes. She pointed out that 2017 saw the launch of the first School Street in Camden and that at the time of the meeting London had 511 School Streets. She said that Many of London's boroughs had successful School Streets so Bromley should have consulted with some of them before reaching such a negative decision on School Streets. She highlighted that Croydon Council were planning to introduce a further 11 or 12 School Streets which would then bring their total to 34 or 35.

Councillor Bance said that Lewisham Council had 36 School Streets and their new seven-point action plan on cutting pollution levels within 5 years, included the introduction of more School Streets, which they regarded as a pollutant reduction measure. She stated that Ealing Council had launched their first School Street in 2020 and an 18-month consultation showed 80% of those surveyed agreed that School Streets were a good idea. So, 11 more schemes were delivered that year bringing their number to 18. In 2022 many of those School Streets were made permanent.

Councillor Bance said that the reason these councils supported School Streets was because they focussed on tackling:

- Air pollution
- The vulnerability of children during the school run
- Children leading inactive lifestyles

- Traffic Congestion

Councillor Bance remarked that School Streets played a vital role in improving both the physical and mental health of both children on their way to and from school, as well as the residents who lived along the streets where schemes were in place. They provided clear evidence of a reduction of children's exposure to toxic air pollution. She felt that the Council should be promoting walking and cycling and encouraging both parents and children to lead active lifestyles. In her view this would mean that a child's journey to and from school would be safer, cleaner, healthier, was good for mental health and would make children calmer before the start of the school day.

Councillor Bance commented that the implementation of School Streets would mean an end to the emission of pollutants caused by vehicles idling. She said that a study conducted by Transport for London found that the School Street initiative helped to reduce nitrogen dioxide emissions by 23% during the morning drop off. This also helped to reduce the number of state schools located in areas with illegal levels of nitrogen dioxide pollution by 97%. She said that there were 455 London schools over and above the safe pollution level in 2016 and this had reduced to just 14 in 2019. She felt that the Council should be brave enough to take action to protect children and vulnerable adults from pollution. Cllr Bance stated that the Council's priorities should be to protect the planet, children and vulnerable people, so how therefore could the Council justify this very negative decision?

Councillor Bance urged the Committee to reconsider the supporting of School Streets in Bromley and to introduce a new consultation with other boroughs who firmly supported their School Streets. She asked that the Committee refer the decision to the Executive as in her view it failed to consider methods of implementation for School Streets which had been undertaken by other Councils. She said that the decision had not considered alternative implementation models at lower costs and that the decision had failed to consider the value of better health outcomes and the reduction of pollution levels. She stated that the positive impacts of active travel, particularly with respect to the reduction of childhood obesity, was not taken into account.

Councillor Ireland spoke as leader of the Liberal Democrats and she referred to the 'Making Bromley Even Better' document. She said that this was a very good document and one of the leading ambitions outlined in the document was that children should lead healthy, safe and independent lives.

The document stated that one of the priority ambitions for Bromley was that children and young people should thrive and that children and families would be at the heart of the Council's ambitions. She therefore expressed the view that the previous executive decision with respect to School Streets was contrary to the ambitions as laid out in the 'Making Bromley Even Better' document. She expressed the view that School Streets provided very obvious tangible benefits for children and also in terms of air quality. She said that TfL

15 July 2022

figures reported that where School Streets were in operation, nitrogen dioxide levels dropped by 23%.

She expressed the view that the adoption of the School Street decision made at the previous meeting, would in effect mean the end of School Streets in Bromley. She expressed the view that to expect schools to maintain the measures needed to run School Streets was not sustainable. Councillor Ireland stated that nearly all of the School Streets around London used camera enforcement to make them successful. She stated that she wanted to address the two main objections to School Streets as outlined in the previous report which was to do with money and resistance from neighbours. In her view the health of children was more significant than money. Councillor Ireland reported that she had communicated with various councils that operated School Streets and she said they all used cameras, and in terms of costs were able to break even. In her view, it was therefore the case that the Council was not able to make this decision solely based on cost.

Councillor Ireland stated that it normally took two to three years for new ideas to be accepted. She said that in terms of resistance from neighbours there was no data from the Council with respect to Poverest School apart from the fact that it was noted in the report that the School Street there had been well received. She referred to the Hayes Pilot Scheme and said that acceptance in the catchment area there was 60%. She summed up by saying that as there was no convincing argument that School Streets should be discontinued in terms of cost and also that there was no convincing data in terms of neighbour resistance, that the previous decision should be referred to the Executive for reconsideration because it was contrary to one of the primary ambitions of 'Building a Better Bromley' which was to promote the health and well-being of Bromley's children and young people.

Councillor Chloe Jane Ross spoke on behalf of the Liberal Democrats and pointed out that the Government was committed to Active Travel. The Government had recently appointed Chris Boardman as the first permanent National Active Travel Commissioner. She said that the Government had recently published its 'Decarbonizing Transport' one year review which recognised active travel as key to its success. The Government had also published a decarbonizing transport tool kit for local authorities which also emphasised the use of active travel. She expressed the view that if no funding was currently available for School Streets then it needed to be found. She said that a better policy was required than the one that had been outlined in the previous School Streets report. She felt that in line with central government commitments and ambitions, that the Schools Streets decision should be referred back to the Executive for review.

Councillor Will Connolly (on behalf of the Liberal Democrats) said that a third of the pupils in the Hayes Pilot Scheme either walked or cycled to school despite its large car park. He highlighted the better air quality that School Streets provided especially since 1/11 pupils suffered with asthma.

Councillor Connolly reported that the Deputy Head of Poverest Primary School had stated that the school needed the support of the Council so that its School Street could continue and that local action groups were also in support of the School Street. He referred to page 4 of the Council's Corporate Strategy which said that the Council would encourage more sustainable forms of travel like cycling and walking. He also referred to the Council website which noted the major benefits to the community and individuals that was associated with active travel. He requested that the School Streets Decision be re-considered by the Executive.

Councillor Alison Stammers wanted to make a statement but the Chairman explained that as she had not called in the decision she could ask a question but was not allowed to make a statement.

Councillor Webber asked the Committee to note figures from the WHO which showed that Bromley's Air Quality needed to be improved.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that there were two courses of action available to them, they could either support the original decision and vote that no further action be taken, or they could vote to refer the decision to the Executive for review.

RESOLVED that:

No further action on the call-in be taken. This meant that the decision stood and could be implemented.

**WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS
ORAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS
ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

The meeting ended at 10.05 am

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS Special Meeting—Oral Questions from the Public.

15th July 2022

1) Question from James Hamilton:

You consulted local residents on whether they would favour a permanent School Street on George Lane. 58% of residents responded that they are in favour. Is it Council policy to ignore the express wishes of the majority of local residents in all areas of decision-making?

Response to Question 1:

I refer you to the statement that I have just made.

Supplementary Question from James Hamilton:

Can you confirm that the figure that you quoted in your opening statement of 73% is correct? That is not the figure I have.

Response:

I can confirm that that is the figure I have been given as a result of the survey.

(Note: The figure quoted in the statement from Cllr Bennett was 79% and not 73%)

2) Question from Will Conway:

At the June 21st Environment PDS meeting officers said that they had consulted other councils regarding their school streets.

Could the Portfolio Holder please list all other Councils consulted, how many of them are continuing to run School Streets and how many of those are using ANPR cameras?

Response to Question 2:

If Mr Conway attends this meeting, information will be provided to him in writing.

The information is as follows:

The boroughs that were contacted in August 2021 were Sutton, Camden, Lambeth, Haringay, Harrow, Havering, Brent, Hillingdon, Southwark, Hounslow, Kingston, Lewisham, Merton, Richmond and Wandsworth, Croydon, Ealing, Bexley, Hammersmith and Fulham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Westminster, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea. London Councils also sent Bromley's request for

information to all London boroughs on our behalf of. Responses received gave officers the following information:

- Redbridge used ANPR
- Enfield use manned barriers
- Harrow have both ANPR and barriers
- Waltham Forest use ANPR
- Havering use ANPR
- Brent use barriers
- Croydon use ANPR
- Bexley don't have any School Streets
- Lambeth have 2 ANPR and 20 barrier schemes
- Merton use ANPR
- Sutton were reviewing the use of ANPR schemes

Supplementary Question:

What is the Council's income from ANPR cameras over the last five years?

Response:

We don't have any ANPR cameras outside of schools.

3) Question from Brendan Donegan:

The School Streets review document states ANPR camera enforcement for School Streets is not Bromley Council policy. Why is this?

Response to Question 3:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

4) Question from Brendan Donegan:

ANPR cameras used in School Streets elsewhere in London generate revenue, yet the Council's review document is silent on this point. Surely this information is vital for making this decision.

Response to Question 4:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

Supplementary Question:

I don't think that you have answered my question.

Response to the Supplementary Question

ANPR cameras would need to cover the cost.

5) Question from Jane Dutton:

6.6% of Bromley deaths are attributable to human made air pollution so far this year. (CleanAir in Cities App). School Streets are proven to reduce air pollution, improve learning outcomes and enable active travel for children. Without them, how do you plan to protect little lungs from air pollution?

Response to Question 5:

Public Health do not recognise this statistic for Bromley.

6) Question from Parisa Wright:

Please will the council reconsider its focus on the negative minority and ensure "School Streets" remain an active part of Bromley's efforts to improve quality of life for all, e.g. school road safety, air pollution, active travel, and our asthma, obesity & diabetes crisis', and in turn safeguard our future by cutting carbon emissions.

Response to Question 6:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

7) Question from Mandy James:

On what grounds does Bromley Council think its results in the TfL STARS programme mean modal shift is taking place on the school run?

Response to Question 7:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

8) Question from Many James

What evidence can Bromley Council provide to show that its 'anti idling' campaign around schools has had an impact on air pollution at the school gates?

Response to Question 8:

Warnings issued by civil enforcement officers to idling motorists at participating schools always lead to drivers either switching off their engines or leaving the location.

Bromley does not take air samples at the school gates.

Supplementary Question:

Does Bromley have any intention of checking air quality outside of schools?

Response:

It is not Bromley's intention to air monitoring outside of schools. We did look at having them with the Civil Enforcement Officers, but all they would pick up

would be the fumes from the cars that they were dealing with on the anti-idling campaign. We do have 32 air monitoring positions. They are there in the locations where the information can be collected and they are quite expensive. There is no money for new ones and they are sited in accordance with advice from Public Health and Public Protection.

9) Question from Thomas Morton:

Given the overwhelming support for School Streets from local residents and the support of several Conservative Councillors, could the Council list the negative impacts that School Streets would have on children.

Response to Question 9:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made. .](#)

10) Question from Thomas Morton:

How is the Council going to help schools that want to have a School Street without the installation of ANPR cameras, and can the Council provide evidence of School Streets being successful without ANPR cameras.

Response to Question 10:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

I would like to ask for some clarification on one of the questions. Can you list some of the negative impacts on children of School Streets?

Response:

[That question does not arise from your original question which was regarding ANPR cameras.](#)

11) Question from Ben Harvey:

Why is Bromley Council deciding not to support School Streets without having tried ANPR camera enforcement, and without detailed information about how ANPR camera enforcement worked in other boroughs?

Response to Question 11:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

12) Question from Ben Harvey

If Bromley Council is not going to actively support School Streets, what measures will Bromley Council commit to introducing to tackle air pollution and road safety on the school run, congestion caused by the school run, and childhood obesity?

Response to Question 12:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

13) Question from Richard Garvey

With the suspension of support for school streets, which measures is the Portfolio Holder proposing to reduce car trips and can they provide evidence that such measures are at least as effective as School Streets.

Response to Question 13:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

14) Question from Richard Gibbons:

LB Bromley Transport Strategy 2019 (LIP3), page 8

“The Council will focus initiatives to reduce the impact of air pollution in the areas of highest exceedance, primarily within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or where vulnerable people may spend significant amounts of time, for example, schools.”

Q1. The Portfolio Holder has praised the Council’s Transport Strategy which states that it will focus on initiatives to reduce the impact of air pollution outside schools. Evidence shows that Schools Streets are such an initiative. What alternatives to School Streets can the Portfolio Holder offer that reduce road danger and toxic emissions from vehicles outside schools?

Response to Question 14:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

There are about 40 TfL Gold Star accredited schools in the Borough, the air pollution in all cases exceeds WHO guidelines. Some of those schools have the worst air pollution in the borough. What has the Council done to reduce air pollution outside of those schools?

Response:

[I will send you a list of the schools.](#)

15) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Please list all schools in LB Bromley, their current TfL STARS status, i.e., Gold, Silver, Bronze, Engaged, Not Engaged; and indicate (a) if schools are on through or non-through roads; and (b) if road conditioned outside school entrance would allow a School Street intervention, i.e., not on bus route?

Response to Question 15:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

Can I be provided with a written response in answer to this question.

Response:

Yes, a written answer will be provided

16) Question from Sarah Gill-Schmitz:

Please will the council reconsider its focus on the negative minority and ensure School Streets remain an active part of Bromley's efforts to improve school road safety, reduce air pollution, increase active travel and in turn safeguard our future by cutting carbon emissions--as has been stated as a key climate goal by Bromley Council in the LBB Net Zero Carbon Action Plan, September 2021.

Response to Question 16:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

Supplementary Question

Bromley Council actively supports active travel for secondary school children, however being a parent of a child that attends a school by a very busy junction near Chislehurst War Memorial, most secondary school parents say that they cannot allow their children to walk to school because the junction is so busy that the children that are walking are rushing across the road to cross the junction without a safe crossing. So active travel is not the number one thing on their minds. Could you please say how the Council could support these parents to encourage their children to walk safely to school?

Response:

I have two answers to that. First of all on that specific crossing, I have had meetings with Councillor Alison Stammers and the other Chislehurst Matters Councillors to discuss how we can improve it. Secondly, we have an active road safety programme for young people to encourage them to walk safely.

Question 17 from Jamie Devine:

The World Health Organisation informs us the children and babies are more vulnerable to air pollutants from combustion vehicles than adults because 'They inhale more air per unit of body weight and their brains are still developing and neuro toxic compounds in air pollution can affect children's cognitive development'. Why wont the Council introduce this reasonable measure (School Streets) to protect its most vulnerable residents?

Response:

We have School Streets and we are not getting rid of them.

Supplementary Question:

In your statement there is no recognition or acknowledgement of the damage that air pollution can cause to children or babies. What is Bromley Council going to do to mitigate against air pollutants?

Response:

We have a very comprehensive Air Quality Programme on the website and I encourage you to read it.

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS Special Meeting—Written Questions from the Public.

15th July 2022

1) Question from Anne-Marie Connelly:

Can the committee explain its decision not to support School Streets given that the main issues seemed to be a small group of complaints and some associated costs which could potentially be met elsewhere?

Bromley currently has 6 school streets identified (<https://www.bromley.gov.uk/cycling-walking-school/school-streets>) for 82 primary schools. Our neighbours in Croydon have 14 permanent and 21 under consideration across 72 primary schools.

1. Why is Bromley unable to support this if other boroughs can?
2. What other measure for our children does the council intend to take that focus on hub areas like schools rather than borough wide initiatives

Response to Question 1:

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

2) Question from Louise Clark

In the Review of School Streets presented to the Environment Committee on 21 June the Council stated that one of the reasons they have not remained active is that no funding has been "allocated for the considerable cost of installing and maintaining cameras." What calculations have the Council made on the extent to which ANPR revenues could offset the cost of installation and maintenance?

Response to Question 2:

It is hard to know the level of income likely to be generated from fines issued via ANPR cameras if they were used in School Streets in this Borough. Bromley would wish to avoid penalising drivers where possible and also to make sure there was compliance to help make the School Street work effectively; large signs would deter and warn drivers of the presence of cameras. Also, by their nature School Streets would not be used on main roads, so any initial income generated from their use is likely to dry up well before the cost of installation was covered, as local drivers became aware of the cameras, and there is also the ongoing maintenance costs of each camera to be considered. It is not possible to predict income from fines, as compliance is what we are seeking, but Officers would not expect fines to cover costs in the case of School Streets.

3) Question from Helen Brookfield

School Streets are proven to reduce car journeys to school. Bromley Council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP3) agreed it would "focus initiatives to reduce the impact of air pollution... where vulnerable people may spend significant amounts of time- e.g. schools " and that a "key focus " would be to "shift switchable short local trips away from the car" stating, "it will be necessary to reduce the impact of the school run by shifting school trips from cars to other modes". If Bromley Council is not going to support School Streets then what are they going to do to reduce the number of car journeys to school?

Response to Question 3:

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

4) Question from Laura Vogel:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop has asked the Portfolio Holder to list the costs of holding this additional meeting of the PDS committee. Could the Council also list the costs of not providing proper scrutiny, good governance and supporting a robust democracy on the Council?

Response to Question 4:

Cllr Bennett to provide the answer.

5) Question from Laura Vogel:

Will the Council state the increase in the number of cars on Bromley roads that we all endure during school run hours? What does the Council propose to reduce school run traffic if it does not support school streets?

Response to Question 5

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

The Council does not hold data to show traffic volume by hour of the day.

6) Question from Euan Pyle:

Does the council recognise that one of the best way to reduce motor traffic is to make other forms of (more road space efficient) transport (i.e. cycling and walking) safer and that School Streets actively make these modes of transport safer?

Response to Question 6:

School Streets are just one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications. A School Street may make the road immediately outside a school safer, but if traffic is inadvertently redirected to nearby streets, this can be to the detriment of road safety overall.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

7) Question from John Blakely:

Please explain how the decision not to proceed with the School Streets programme will enable Bromley Council to reduce car use (currently the highest of all London

Boroughs), reduce air pollution and increase road safety especially for children and vulnerable residents?

Response to Question 7:

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

8) Question from Oje Egwaoje

With the increasing number of families with young children moving into Bromley, what does the Council propose to support children travelling independently to school if they stop the roll-out of school streets?

Response to Question 8:

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

9) Question from Steve Baynes:

Given the cessation of School Streets, what measure is the Council proposing to combat increases in pollution around schools? Given that childhood obesity is around 30%, ending School Streets appears to double down on harm to children, for the sake of removing minor inconveniences to drivers.

Response to Question 9:

School Streets continue to be supported and remain one option as the Council continues to encourage active travel and road safety outside our schools. Bromley is a leading Borough in London in respect to working with schools to generate workable and effective School Travel Plans. Each plan is tailored to the school's individual requirements and the Council supports each individual plan. There are a number of tools in the toolbox, School Streets being just one of them, and the cost benefit of each measure must be considered, along with the resource implications.

The Council supports an anti-idling campaign for schools; cycle and scooter training; active travel campaigns to support walking, scooting and cycling; road safety education and the introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities on routes to school; the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme; as well as supporting School Crossing Patrols at schools that want them.

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS Special Meeting—Oral Questions from the Public.

15th July 2022

1) Question from James Hamilton:

You consulted local residents on whether they would favour a permanent School Street on George Lane. 58% of residents responded that they are in favour. Is it Council policy to ignore the express wishes of the majority of local residents in all areas of decision-making?

Response to Question 1:

I refer you to the statement that I have just made.

Supplementary Question from James Hamilton:

Can you confirm that the figure that you quoted in your opening statement of 73% is correct? That is not the figure I have.

Response:

I can confirm that that is the figure I have been given as a result of the survey.

(Note: The figure quoted in the statement from Cllr Bennett was 79% and not 73%)

2) Question from Will Conway:

At the June 21st Environment PDS meeting officers said that they had consulted other councils regarding their school streets.

Could the Portfolio Holder please list all other Councils consulted, how many of them are continuing to run School Streets and how many of those are using ANPR cameras?

Response to Question 2:

If Mr Conway attends this meeting, information will be provided to him in writing.

The information is as follows:

The boroughs that were contacted in August 2021 were Sutton, Camden, Lambeth, Haringay, Harrow, Havering, Brent, Hillingdon, Southwark, Hounslow, Kingston, Lewisham, Merton, Richmond and Wandsworth, Croydon, Ealing, Bexley, Hammersmith and Fulham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Westminster, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea. London Councils also sent Bromley's request for

information to all London boroughs on our behalf of. Responses received gave officers the following information:

- Redbridge used ANPR
- Enfield use manned barriers
- Harrow have both ANPR and barriers
- Waltham Forest use ANPR
- Havering use ANPR
- Brent use barriers
- Croydon use ANPR
- Bexley don't have any School Streets
- Lambeth have 2 ANPR and 20 barrier schemes
- Merton use ANPR
- Sutton were reviewing the use of ANPR schemes

Supplementary Question:

What is the Council's income from ANPR cameras over the last five years?

Response:

We don't have any ANPR cameras outside of schools.

3) Question from Brendan Donegan:

The School Streets review document states ANPR camera enforcement for School Streets is not Bromley Council policy. Why is this?

Response to Question 3:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

4) Question from Brendan Donegan:

ANPR cameras used in School Streets elsewhere in London generate revenue, yet the Council's review document is silent on this point. Surely this information is vital for making this decision.

Response to Question 4:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

Supplementary Question:

I don't think that you have answered my question.

Response to the Supplementary Question

ANPR cameras would need to cover the cost.

5) Question from Jane Dutton:

6.6% of Bromley deaths are attributable to human made air pollution so far this year. (CleanAir in Cities App). School Streets are proven to reduce air pollution, improve learning outcomes and enable active travel for children. Without them, how do you plan to protect little lungs from air pollution?

Response to Question 5:

Public Health do not recognise this statistic for Bromley.

6) Question from Parisa Wright:

Please will the council reconsider its focus on the negative minority and ensure "School Streets" remain an active part of Bromley's efforts to improve quality of life for all, e.g. school road safety, air pollution, active travel, and our asthma, obesity & diabetes crisis', and in turn safeguard our future by cutting carbon emissions.

Response to Question 6:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

7) Question from Mandy James:

On what grounds does Bromley Council think its results in the TfL STARS programme mean modal shift is taking place on the school run?

Response to Question 7:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

8) Question from Many James

What evidence can Bromley Council provide to show that its 'anti idling' campaign around schools has had an impact on air pollution at the school gates?

Response to Question 8:

Warnings issued by civil enforcement officers to idling motorists at participating schools always lead to drivers either switching off their engines or leaving the location.

Bromley does not take air samples at the school gates.

Supplementary Question:

Does Bromley have any intention of checking air quality outside of schools?

Response:

It is not Bromley's intention to air monitoring outside of schools. We did look at having them with the Civil Enforcement Officers, but all they would pick up

would be the fumes from the cars that they were dealing with on the anti-idling campaign. We do have 32 air monitoring positions. They are there in the locations where the information can be collected and they are quite expensive. There is no money for new ones and they are sited in accordance with advice from Public Health and Public Protection.

9) Question from Thomas Morton:

Given the overwhelming support for School Streets from local residents and the support of several Conservative Councillors, could the Council list the negative impacts that School Streets would have on children.

Response to Question 9:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made. .](#)

10) Question from Thomas Morton:

How is the Council going to help schools that want to have a School Street without the installation of ANPR cameras, and can the Council provide evidence of School Streets being successful without ANPR cameras.

Response to Question 10:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

I would like to ask for some clarification on one of the questions. Can you list some of the negative impacts on children of School Streets?

Response:

[That question does not arise from your original question which was regarding ANPR cameras.](#)

11) Question from Ben Harvey:

Why is Bromley Council deciding not to support School Streets without having tried ANPR camera enforcement, and without detailed information about how ANPR camera enforcement worked in other boroughs?

Response to Question 11:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

12) Question from Ben Harvey

If Bromley Council is not going to actively support School Streets, what measures will Bromley Council commit to introducing to tackle air pollution and road safety on the school run, congestion caused by the school run, and childhood obesity?

Response to Question 12:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

13) Question from Richard Garvey

With the suspension of support for school streets, which measures is the Portfolio Holder proposing to reduce car trips and can they provide evidence that such measures are at least as effective as School Streets.

Response to Question 13:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

14) Question from Richard Gibbons:

LB Bromley Transport Strategy 2019 (LIP3), page 8

“The Council will focus initiatives to reduce the impact of air pollution in the areas of highest exceedance, primarily within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or where vulnerable people may spend significant amounts of time, for example, schools.”

Q1. The Portfolio Holder has praised the Council’s Transport Strategy which states that it will focus on initiatives to reduce the impact of air pollution outside schools. Evidence shows that Schools Streets are such an initiative. What alternatives to School Streets can the Portfolio Holder offer that reduce road danger and toxic emissions from vehicles outside schools?

Response to Question 14:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

There are about 40 TfL Gold Star accredited schools in the Borough, the air pollution in all cases exceeds WHO guidelines. Some of those schools have the worst air pollution in the borough. What has the Council done to reduce air pollution outside of those schools?

Response:

[I will send you a list of the schools.](#)

15) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Please list all schools in LB Bromley, their current TfL STARS status, i.e., Gold, Silver, Bronze, Engaged, Not Engaged; and indicate (a) if schools are on through or non-through roads; and (b) if road conditioned outside school entrance would allow a School Street intervention, i.e., not on bus route?

Response to Question 15:

[I refer you to the statement I have just made.](#)

Supplementary Question:

Can I be provided with a written response in answer to this question.

Response:

Yes, a written answer will be provided

16) Question from Sarah Gill-Schmitz:

Please will the council reconsider its focus on the negative minority and ensure School Streets remain an active part of Bromley's efforts to improve school road safety, reduce air pollution, increase active travel and in turn safeguard our future by cutting carbon emissions--as has been stated as a key climate goal by Bromley Council in the LBB Net Zero Carbon Action Plan, September 2021.

Response to Question 16:

I refer you to the statement I have just made.

Supplementary Question

Bromley Council actively supports active travel for secondary school children, however being a parent of a child that attends a school by a very busy junction near Chislehurst War Memorial, most secondary school parents say that they cannot allow their children to walk to school because the junction is so busy that the children that are walking are rushing across the road to cross the junction without a safe crossing. So active travel is not the number one thing on their minds. Could you please say how the Council could support these parents to encourage their children to walk safely to school?

Response:

I have two answers to that. First of all on that specific crossing, I have had meetings with Councillor Alison Stammers and the other Chislehurst Matters Councillors to discuss how we can improve it. Secondly, we have an active road safety programme for young people to encourage them to walk safely.

Question 17 from Jamie Devine:

The World Health Organisation informs us the children and babies are more vulnerable to air pollutants from combustion vehicles than adults because 'They inhale more air per unit of body weight and their brains are still developing and neuro toxic compounds in air pollution can affect children's cognitive development'. Why wont the Council introduce this reasonable measure (School Streets) to protect its most vulnerable residents?

Response:

We have School Streets and we are not getting rid of them.

Supplementary Question:

In your statement there is no recognition or acknowledgement of the damage that air pollution can cause to children or babies. What is Bromley Council going to do to mitigate against air pollutants?

Response:

We have a very comprehensive Air Quality Programme on the website and I encourage you to read it.

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS Special Meeting—Oral Questions from Councillors

15th July 2022

1) Question from Cllr Rebecca Wiffen:

As more young families move into Bromley, what measures are the Council going to take to encourage healthy, active lifestyles and active travel if they are ending School Streets

Response to Question 1:

[I refer you to my statement.](#)

Supplementary Question

What are the negative impact on young families and children of having school streets around their schools?

Response to the Supplementary Question:

[It would be the traffic that is displaced.](#)

2) Question from Cllr Rebecca Wiffen:

If School Streets is permanently decommissioned, how will the Council work with Schools to improve active travel and healthy lifestyles?

Response to Question 2

[I refer you to my statement](#)

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Wiffen said that her supplementary question had been covered by Cllr Bennett's statement.

This page is left intentionally blank