

## PART ONE - PUBLIC

**Decision Maker:** PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ROAD SAFETY

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment & Community Services PDS Committee on:

Date: 21<sup>th</sup> June 2022

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Key

## Title: REVIEW OF SCHOOL STREETS

**Contact Officer:** Elaine Beadle, Road Safety Manager  
020 313 4499 elaine.beadle@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Colin Brand, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

**Ward:** All Wards

**1. Reason for report**

- 1.1 To provide a summary of the issues and feedback raised during the Pilot School Street project at Hayes Primary School that was implemented in the Autumn Term of 2021.
  - 1.2 To recommend an approach to current and future School Streets in the Borough, following the evaluation of the Hayes Pilot School Street, and in light of further feedback from Temporary School Street venues.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the Portfolio Holder agrees:

- 2.1 That School Streets are not actively rolled out across the Borough, due primarily to resource implications but also the negative impact on some parents and on some nearby residents.
  - 2.2 That the Council supports schools that currently operate a School Street and that wish to continue running their School Street using their own marshals, where there is support from parents and local residents and the School Street is not causing significant negative knock-on effects in nearby streets.
  - 2.3 That Members note that if additional schools wish to install a School Street, consideration should be given to their Travel Plan status, catchment area, existing level of active travel and consultation to ascertain if there would be a significant parent buy in, in addition to consultation

with affected residents. Also, that the schools agree to commit to marshalling the School Street with their own resources going forward.

- 2.4 That funding for the ongoing support for existing School Streets continues to be found from the existing revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety; and for the possible introduction of any new School Streets would need to be considered on a case by case basis, subject to funding being available within that budget.
- 2.5 That the decision to introduce or discontinue any School Street is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.

## Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: Beneficial in respect to air quality and sustainable transport choices. Special arrangements are made to allow disabled drivers/passengers to access School Streets.
- 

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: This report is intended to help Bromley to develop a policy for School Streets
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Safe Bromley Healthy Bromley
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of introducing new scheme: Each new scheme would require a TMO (Traffic Management Order), surveys, signs and removable barriers. This would cost around £2,000 per school.
  2. Ongoing costs: Any future maintenance costs for signage and barriers will be funded from the existing highway maintenance budgets. Staffing costs to set up any new School Streets deemed helpful and support any existing School Streets would be found from within the existing budget for School Travel Plans.
  3. Budget head/performance centre: LIP capital programme
  4. Total current budget for this head: £196,000 LIP funding plus £353,000 revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety
  5. Source of funding: TfL LIP Grant and existing revenue budget
- 

## Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Existing staff resources
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 0.25 FTE
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

## Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: signs and barriers are procured through the Council's term contract with Riney.
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): local residents and visitors
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### Introduction

- 3.1 In the Borough Transport Plan (LIP 3, published in January 2019) Bromley has set out an objective to encourage and support walking and cycling. One tool that has been used in other London boroughs is School Streets. A School Street is a road outside a school with a temporary restriction on motorised traffic at school drop-off and pick-up times. Some boroughs use lockable barriers, some use manned barriers, some use ANPR enforcement cameras.
- 3.2 Following support from the Environment PDS at the meeting in March 2020 and approval by Executive, it was agreed that Bromley would undertake consultation with residents in the vicinity of the school and pilot a School Street at Hayes Primary School. Unfortunately due to Covid there was a delay.
- 3.3 In May 2020 TfL suspended the Council's expected LIP funding for 2020/21 and introduced an opportunity for boroughs to bid for emergency LSP (London Streetspace Plan) funding to assist with social distancing schemes ahead of the schools reopening. The timescale was only six weeks and funding had to be spent by October 2020. Officers approached all schools in the summer of 2020 to ask what the Council could do to help them to reopen safely in respect to changes on the highway. A small number of schools came forward with requests within the very tight deadline.
- 3.4 After reviewing the social distance requests from the schools Bromley bid for funding to implement 11 Temporary School Streets which would affect 13 schools. A number of other measures were introduced to assist safe walking and cycling to schools, including social distancing barriers and zebra crossings. Due to the timeframes, the bid had to be agreed in principle by an emergency PDS meeting in June 2020 then submitted to TfL before Officers were able to thoroughly investigate each site or receive a firm commitment from each school in terms of providing marshalling.
- 3.5 Despite Officer's best efforts in the Summer of 2020, only 5 of the 11 sites that they hoped to deliver were able to proceed in September 2020 either due to the unsuitability of the site or the lack of school resources to marshal the barriers. Clare House School also came on board in November 2020 to replace a school which had withdrawn.
- 3.6 After consultation with the local residents the agreed Pilot School Street at Hayes Primary launched in September 2021. The consultation showed a majority support for the trial, although a significant minority were against, with concerns about displacement of traffic to nearby streets. An additional temporary School Street was launched at St Mary's RC Beckenham in March 2022.
- 3.7 Of the six Temporary School Streets that started in the Autumn Term of 2020, only two are still running as four of the schools were unable to commit to a second year of marshalling. This left two schools (Clare House and Poverest) who have continued after the Temporary Traffic Orders were extended in March 2022, plus the recent addition of St Mary's RC Primary.

#### Evaluation of the Temporary School Streets

- 3.8 Resourcing marshals for the barriers was an obstacle to other schools engaging in the Council's Temporary School Streets programme and has proved to be a stumbling block for some of the schemes that have dropped out as it is very labour intensive.
- 3.9 In some London boroughs physical barriers are not used to close the School Streets and instead ANPR (automatic number plate recognition) cameras are used such that PCNs (penalty

charges notices) can be issued to drivers who ignore the signs. If ANPR camera enforcement was available in Bromley it is possible that a number of School Streets would have remained active and other schools would want to join the scheme, but the use of ANPR for enforcing Moving Traffic Contraventions at School Streets is not currently a Bromley policy, nor is any funding allocated for the considerable cost of installing and maintaining cameras.

- 3.10 An estimate of the current cost of such cameras is £25,000 per camera, and each School Street would require at least two. The annual licence and maintenance cost for one camera is about £5,000.
- 3.11 So far there have been a number of methods used to evaluate the Temporary School Streets. These are; school surveys, pupil hands up surveys, parent surveys and a survey by Waterman Infrastructure and Environment to study traffic changes.
- 3.12 The Road Safety Team have continued to liaise with the schools operating a temporary or pilot School Street to find out how the schemes were working out. A summary of the schemes are below.
  - (i) Clare House Primary School
- 3.13 The Temporary Clare House Primary School Street has been running since November 2020 and overall has generally been well received by the residents, the school staff and the school community. There have been a few incidents which have been investigated and where necessary, have been reported to the Safer Neighbourhood team for their input. The Ward Councillors have been asked for their views and one Councillor said that his only concern raised was that the occasional incidents that occur are dealt with. He was assured that processes are in place to deal with incidents. An example of an incident at Clare House was when a driver insisted that they must be allowed to pass the barriers, when not permitted to do so, which led to an unpleasant argument with the barrier marshals and resulted in the Police becoming involved.
- 3.14 Hands Up surveys are carried out each year to establish how children travel to school. Before and after surveys were carried out as part of the School Street implementation and the results for Clare House Primary are below. The latest data was submitted in September 2022. There were 383 responses out of a possible 424 so there was around a 90% response rate for the latest data.

#### **Clare House Primary School: Before and After Hands-up Data**

| Date           | Walk | Scooter | Car | Car Share | Bus | Rail | Cycle | Park & Stride | Tram | School Bus/Taxi | Other |
|----------------|------|---------|-----|-----------|-----|------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------|-------|
| <b>Oct. 19</b> | 40%  | 8%      | 32% | 4%        | 2%  | 0%   | 3%    | 11%           | 0%   | 0%              | 0%    |
| <b>Dec 20</b>  | 44%  | 13%     | 29% | 1%        | 1%  | 0%   | 5%    | 8%            | 0%   | 0%              | 0%    |
| <b>Sep 21</b>  | 44%  | 17%     | 22% | 4%        | 1%  | 0%   | 7%    | 5%            | 0%   | 0%              | 0%    |

- 3.15 The latest hands up data submitted suggests that individual car journeys have decreased and car sharing and active travel including scooting and cycling has increased.
- (ii) Poverest Primary School
- 3.16 The Temporary Poverest Primary School Street has been running since September 2020 and is the only original scheme that is still operational. It has generally been well received by the residents and the school staff and the school community. There have been a few incidents

which have been investigated and where necessary, have been reported to the Safer Neighbourhood team for their input. The most serious was when a car tailgaited a permitted vehicle containing SEN children and therefore gained entry behind it. Parents were encouraged to notify their Ward Councillors if they had concerns about the School Street and they and the School have been in touch recently to discuss some concerns about parking and road markings. The Travel Planners and the Traffic Engineers are liaising with the school to resolve their concerns. We are awaiting more up to date feedback from the school and a new hands up survey but we expect this information to be submitted once the issues around parking and lining have been resolved.

- 3.17 Hands Up surveys are carried out each year to establish how children travel to school. Before and after surveys were carried out as part of the School Street implementation and the results for Poverest Primary are below.

**Poverest Primary School: Before and After Hands-up Data**

| Date           | Walk       | Scooter   | Car        | Car Share | Bus       | Rail      | Cycle     | Park & Stride | Tram      | School Bus/Taxi | Other     |
|----------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| <b>July 19</b> | <b>35%</b> | <b>2%</b> | <b>53%</b> | <b>1%</b> | <b>5%</b> | <b>0%</b> | <b>1%</b> | <b>2%</b>     | <b>0%</b> | <b>1%</b>       | <b>0%</b> |
| <b>July 21</b> | <b>36%</b> | <b>8%</b> | <b>44%</b> | <b>1%</b> | <b>3%</b> | <b>0%</b> | <b>1%</b> | <b>5%</b>     | <b>0%</b> | <b>0%</b>       | <b>0%</b> |

- 3.18 The latest hands up data submitted suggests that individual car journeys have decreased and active travel including scooting and park and stride has increased.

(iii) St Mary's RC Primary School

- 3.19 The Temporary St Mary's Primary School Street has only been running since March 2022 and is the last Bromley School Street to become operational. This scheme has been fairly challenging from the offset because the closure falls within an unadopted road and the residents consultation for the scheme was split 50/50. The school were concerned about how they would be able to absorb the marshalling costs and for most of the time the marshalling has been done at one end by the Head and Deputy Head Teachers although the Governors have agreed for the Site Manager to take on this role until the end of term. The other end of the road has been marshalled by a group of volunteer residents. The school is a Catholic Primary School and has a very large catchment area which has meant that many parents have continued to drive.
- 3.20 There have been four reported incidents at St Mary's since its start. One was an altercation with a driver who wanted to access the road (the resident was not displaying permit for entry) the Safer Neighbourhood Team were made aware and have visited the site. The second was confusion where a parent was already in the School Street zone before the start time due to mobility access needs and a resident volunteer stated that she needed a permit to exit – she didn't and this has since been resolved. The third was when a car which was in the zone before the start time was driven onto the pavement to exit the road around the barriers. The Safer Neighbourhood Team was again notified. Finally the School recently notified the Council that parents have been parking inconsiderately/illegally on surrounding roads. Parking enforcement was deployed and the Safer Neighbourhood Team was contacted for support in respect to verbal abuse.
- 3.21 During a site visit, the Road Safety Officer observed cars parking on corners and across a driveway, cars U-turning close to the junction, one car parked on double yellow lines, cars parking across or in the car park to flats and stopping in a bus stop.

3.22 All four schools were recently asked four questions to evaluate their thoughts. The only school to respond at this time was St Mary's RC Primary:

- Would you like the School Street to remain in its current format (marshals and barriers) for the new academic year 2022/23?

*"No. The Governors have agreed to our site manager being deployed as a marshal on a temporary basis, but will not permit him to continue to marshal in 22/23 due to the impact it has on his workload. We cannot afford to pay him additional hours."*

- What do you like about your School Street?

*"Local residents are in favour of it and give practical assistance. The School Travel Team are very supportive."*

- How could your School Street be improved, if at all?

*"School Street has pushed problems with traffic and parking onto other roads in the area and we receive regular complaints. Having ANPR in place of physical barriers would be more efficient."*

- Have you received any feedback from local residents that you have not already shared with us?

*"Some residents of Westgate Road have made it clear that they were, and are not, in favour of School Street. Complaints about parking and congestion on neighbouring roads."*

3.23 Hands Up surveys were carried out prior to the start of the scheme but we haven't had any comparative after data yet.

### **Evaluation of the Pilot School Street at Hayes Primary**

3.24 The original, agreed pilot for the evaluation of School Streets was Hayes Primary School.

3.25 The Hayes Primary Street has been running since September 2021 and overall has had mixed reactions depending on where people live and what their circumstances are. The scheme is challenging because the school has a very large catchment area and some parents were attracted to the school because it had a large car park which they thought could make their school run and commute to work more manageable. The school Management Team have recently changed as have the Ward Councillors. The feedback we have had from the new Ward Councillors has been generally supportive of the scheme but they have made a number of suggestions they feel would improve it. If the scheme is to be continued at Hayes Primary the Travel Planners will share these suggestions with the Traffic Engineers for their consideration.

3.26 In March 2022 we asked parents and residents at Hayes Primary School to tell us what they thought about their School Street.

### **Parents Surveys**

3.27 We received 496 parent responses out of a possible 636 and many of those who responded made several points each which were mainly negative. The full responses are reported in Appendix 1 and are also summarised below.

- 3.28 For some parents, the School Street at Hayes has severely disrupted their routine and the introduction of the scheme has left them stressed and frustrated.
- 3.29 Parents said the problem had simply been moved, there is more congestion, inconsiderate parking and poor manoeuvering with parents doing three-point turns and sometimes mounting the pavement and more idling. They said there should be permanent parking enforcement in the area. They said it's hard for parents with children at more than one school, with babies and very young children and working parents or elderly relatives who were helping with the school run. They said the School Street had made it hard to park and had added additional time to their journey, they found it stressful. Due to the large catchment area (some children are travelling from as far as West Wickham and Keston) some parents said they were unable to walk.
- 3.30 One parent describes how she has had to put her child in breakfast and after-school clubs and another says she will be moving her child to a more local school.
- 3.31 Concern was raised about extra aggression; some had seen the Caretaker being abused in front of the children. Some said they didn't like to see a Police presence on the school run. They said that some parents were arriving before the road closure and parking up. There were suggestions for the scheme to start earlier and there were also suggestions to make the closure bigger to extend to Hayes Wood Avenue and Burwood Avenue or even to incorporate a one-way system. Others said that children had to walk in the road and the children get wet when it rains. Some parents felt that there should be more permits issued for one off occasions, to parents with babies or with hidden disabilities while others felt too many people already had permits. Several parents felt that the scheme had been introduced at the request of residents in George Lane when in fact, it was implemented to encourage active travel. They felt that the residents of George Lane knew there was a school before they moved in, so they should accept some disruption at school drop off and pick up times. Several parents were unhappy that they could no longer use the school car park and some thought the car park permit system should be revised and reinstated. One parent said they were discriminated against as only a handful of schools in Bromley had School Streets. Parents said that things were now more dangerous and speeds in George Lane should be reduced.
- 3.32 On the plus side the scheme was described as excellent and parents described how there is less pollution and how it has improved their journey to school and would improve access for the Emergency Services. They said it feels more relaxed with fewer cars and while some parents said that children were more likely to be run over, others said children would be less likely to be run over. One parent said she was proud of being part of a scheme that encourages active travel and another said she would be desperately sad if it were to end.
- 3.33 Despite the negative comments when asked "has the School Street improved your journey to school", 50.8% of those who responded said yes it has, 49.8% said no it hadn't. Asked if they would like to see the Pilot School Street made permanent in 2022-23, 61.6% of those who responded said yes they would and 39.7% said no they wouldn't.

#### Hayes Primary Resident Surveys

- 3.34 A total of 279 residents living in the roads within the consultation area were consulted. 85 responses were received. Further details can be seen in Appendix 2.
- 3.35 When asked were you in favour of a School Street at Hayes Primary School prior to the scheme being introduced 52 residents (61.2%) said yes and 33 (39.8%) said no.
- 3.36 Asked if the Hayes School Street were to secure political support and funding would they be in favour of the scheme becoming permanent on George Lane, 49 residents (57.7%) said yes and 36 (42.3%) said no.

3.37 It was clear from the comments that residents in George Lane had a better experience of the School Street than some residents in other roads. Many complained about displacement, additional congestion and aggression. They describe more idling and pollution and parents parking and manoeuvring badly and even parking on their driveways. Many of the residents comments mirror those previously described by the parents.

Breakdown of responses by road:

3.38 Of the 85 responses, 79 were from inside the catchment area (George Lane, Hayes Wood Ave, Burwood Ave, Glebe House Drive, Georgian Drive), and 6 were from outside.

3.39 The 79 inside the catchment area were 46 were in favour of the School Street staying if funding is available and 33 were against it staying.

3.40 The break down by road:

- George Lane – 37 responses – All in favour of the School Street staying if funding is available
- Hayes Wood Ave – 37 responses – 8 in favour of it staying, 29 against
- Glebe House Drive – 1 response – Against it staying
- Georgian Close – 4 responses – 1 in favour, 3 against

3.41 Hands Up surveys are carried out each year to establish how children travel to school. Before and after surveys were carried out as part of the School Street implementation and the results for Hayes Primary are below.

**Hayes Primary School: Before and After Hands-up Data**

| Date    | Walk | Scooter | Car   | Car Share | Bus   | Rail  | Cycle | Park & Stride | Tram | School Bus/Taxi | Other |
|---------|------|---------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------|-------|
| June 21 | 36%  | 6.5%    | 32.7% | 2.1%      | 1.2%  | 0.45% | 4.0%  | 8.9%          | 0%   | 0.45%           | 0%    |
| Nov 21  | 44%  | 10.4%   | 14.6% | 2.0%      | 1.65% | 0%    | 4.2%  | 23.2%         | 0%   | 0.36%           | 0%    |

3.42 Hands up surveys were completed before and after the scheme started; 661 responses were recorded in June 2021 and only 547 in November 2021 which is 64 fewer responses. Despite this and the survey being conducted in the winter months 136 fewer children travelled to school by car and 68 more children parked and strided.

**Going Forward**

3.43 Although the Authority has been given powers to enforce moving traffic contraventions (MTCs), policy has limited that to yellow box junctions, banned turns and a few other contraventions. Given the comments received from the schools, if the trial is to be extended and to include new schools, the options and costs for the operation of permanent School Streets will need to be determined.

3.44 Each time a School Street is implemented, there are considerable costs to the Council in terms of staff time for consultation, the cost of statutory signs and barriers, and the cost of traffic management orders. Experience has shown us that very often a School Street will fail after a time as the resource implications for a school are so great. The only way to avoid this resource implication is for ANPR cameras to be purchased so that barriers would not need to be placed

and marshalled. Such cameras cost about £25,000 each and each School Street would require at least two. The annual licence and maintenance cost for a camera is about £5,000.

- 3.45 There would be some income generated from PCNs issued to motorists who drove through the ANPR cameras, but the nature of the local roads where these School Streets operate means that it is likely that compliance would soon be achieved, and the income to the Council from PCN payments would reduce to an insignificant amount – insufficient to cover the ongoing maintenance costs of cameras yet alone the capital investment in the cameras.
- 3.46 Therefore the cost of using ANPR cameras to facilitate School Streets is very high, considering the number of schools that could potentially request a School Street if there were no marshalling/resourcing implications for schools. The cost benefit would suggest that although the data above suggests modal shift away from car use and towards active travel, the cost to the local authority would be high. At present there is no budget for School Streets – current School Streets, both the Pilot School Street at Hayes, and the three Temporary School Streets, were paid for from TfL grants that are no longer available.
- 3.47 Any funding for the capital investment in ANPR cameras for School Streets, along with ongoing running costs, would need to be found from Council funding unless future funding is granted by TfL.
- 3.48 Overall the feedback from parents and residents living within a School Streets is, on balance, positive. However, residents living just outside the School Street are almost universally against the School Street, as they experience displacement issues, with requests coming to the Council for new parking controls in these locations.
- 3.49 The Council may wish to consider whether any investment in infrastructure improvements around schools might not be better spent on improving facilities for pedestrians to encourage walking to schools without enforcing no-drive areas (i.e. School Streets).

#### **4 IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN**

- 4.1 Beneficial in respect to air quality and sustainable transport choices. Special arrangements are made to allow disabled drivers/passengers to access School Streets.

#### **5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Consistent with the Council's objective from the 2021-2022 Environment and Community Services Portfolio Plan (section 5) of reducing traffic congestion: reduce traffic congestion, improve road safety (including public perception of improving road safety), and encourage walking and cycling.

#### **6. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Any signs and posts are procured within the existing Riney contract Any ANPR cameras are procured by ACPOA.

#### **7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The cost of introducing a new School Street is £2,000 for signs, barriers and traffic orders, plus any additional cost depending on the method of enforcement used.
- 7.2 Funding for this work has previously come from TfL LIP grant, but uncertainty remains about future funding levels.

- 7.3 Funding for the ongoing support for existing School Streets is currently met from the existing revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety. The possible introduction of any new School Streets would need to be considered on a case by case basis, subject to funding being available within that budget.

## 8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 A suitable traffic order will be put in place for any new School Street scheme.

| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | <p><b>08/06/2020</b> - Environment and Community Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee <a href="#"><u>FUNDING SUBMISSION FOR HIGHWAY MEASURES TO SUPPORT SOCIAL DISTANCING DURING RECOVERY FROM LOCKDOWN</u></a></p> <p><b>29/01/2020</b> - Environment and Community Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee <a href="#"><u>HAYES VILLAGE LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENTS</u></a></p> <p><b>17/11/2021</b> - Environment and Community Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee <a href="#"><u>REVIEW OF TEMPORARY SCHOOL STREETS</u></a></p> |