**APPENDIX B**

**School Streets Schemes**

**Six Month review October 2020 – March 2021**

**Introduction**

We are making a real difference to our environment to encourage our residents to improve their health through active travel – all while reducing the chance of people catching Covid-19.

The Street spaces initiative will allow more space for people to safely walk or cycle in Harrow amid the coronavirus pandemic. Temporary cycle lanes and wider pavements and areas with reduced traffic flow are among the changes being made in many parts of the borough, thanks to Harrow Council working with TfL and Dft.

In May the Secretary of State for Transport issued statutory guidance under Section 18 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to all highway authorities in England and the Secretary of State, Grant Shapps, describes the moment as:

“*a once in a generation opportunity to deliver a lasting transformative change in how we make short journeys in our towns and cities. According to the* [*National Travel Survey*](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-travel-survey-statistics)*, in 2017-18 over 40% of urban journeys were under 2 miles – perfectly suited to walking and cycling*.”

The guidance says that local authorities in areas with high levels of public transport use should take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling to encourage active travel and enable social distancing due to the impact of social distancing on public transport capacity.

The Harrow Street Spaces programme took forward the government directive via Transport for London to deliver a range of active travel schemes including school streets schemes. These schemes are implemented on residential access roads to schools in order to create walking and cycling zones at the school opening and closing times in the week.

The schemes consist of restrictions on vehicular access at the morning and afternoon school drop off and pick up times. Exceptions are granted for vehicles belonging to residents and school staff in the zone. The school streets schemes have been implemented in 4 locations in the borough and the list of schemes is shown in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SS-01** | Grimsdyke School, Hatch End |
| **SS-02** | Newton Farm School, Rayners Lane |
| **SS-03** | Marlborough School, Wealdstone |
| **SS-04** | Park High School, Stanmore, Middx. |

**Methodology**

At the special meeting of TARSAP on 10th August it was recommended and subsequently agreed by the Deputy Leader on the 19th August that a review of the schemes would be conducted on a monthly basis to test the need for the measures to address the health crisis. The methodology to be used to assess the need for the schemes will take account of the following information:

* Pedestrian / cycling / vehicle activity (measured by counts)
* Emergency services comments
* Bus services comments (TfL)
* Officer observations regarding operational performance
* Residents feedback
* Schools feedback

All of these factors will be reviewed, and a course of action recommended in this report.

**Current situation with the pandemic**

The latest position with the rate of infection in Harrow is shown in the chart below.

| **Latest COVID-19 figures in Harrow****Data range: 15th March to 21st March 2021** |
| --- |
| Positive cases in the last week in Harrow | 113 |
| Percentage change in the past 7 days | -30% |
| PCR Testing rate per 100,000 | 517.3 |
| PCR Test positivity rate | 1.4 |
| Incidence rate (all ages) in the last 7 days per 100,000 | 45 |
| Incidence rate (aged 60 and over) in the last week per 100,000 | 22.4 |
| Test and Trace cases (cumulative) % complete | 87 |
| Test and Trace contacts (cumulative) % complete | 87 |

New cases of Covid 19 have decreased significantly from the peak in mid-January and are continuing to fall. The incidence rate shown in the table above is currently at 45 per 100,000. Deaths have increased since the new year but are also now decreasing. Vaccination rates are generally high in most groups.

The government restrictions have changed constantly since they were first introduced in late March 2020 in order to contain the spread of the virus and take account of the changing situation across the country. These changes have had variable impacts on the demand to travel by all modes of transport. The changes in London and the impacts are summarised below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Measures in London** | **Impact on travel** |
| 23/03/2020 | National lockdown (1) - stay home, non-essential shops and schools closed | Very high |
| 13/05/2020 | Relaxtion 1 - outdoor recreation permitted | High |
| 01/06/2020 | Relaxation 2 - be at home overnight / meet outside with 6 people | Medium |
| 04/07/2020 | Relaxtion 3 – stay alert, hospitality opens / meet up to 30 people / Covid secure guidance | Low  |
| 14/09/2020 | Rule of six indoors / outdoors introduced | Low  |
| 25/09/2000 | 10pm curfew on hospitality | Low  |
| 14/10/2020 | 3 tier system introduced, London tier 2 | Medium  |
| 05/11/2020 | National lockdown (2) - non-essential business closed / meet 1 person only outside, schools open | High  |
| 02/12/2020 | lockdown ends, 3 tier system reinstated - stricter restrictions on hospitality | Medium |
| 19/12/2020 | tier 4 added - similar to lockdown 2 rules, includes London, due to concerns about new variant of virus | High |
| 30/12/2020 | tier 4 extended to 75% of country | High  |
| 06/01/2021 | National lockdown (3) - stay home, non-essential shops and schools closed | Very high |
| 08/03/2021 | Schools and colleges reopen | Medium |
| 29/03/2021 | Stay at home rule ends, rule of six / 2 households can meet outdoors, outdoor sports facilities allowed | Medium |

When considering the traffic data presented in this report it is necessary to consider the government restrictions in force at the time. The higher the impact of the restrictions then the lower the traffic flows. The restrictions shaded in the table are those that relate to when schools were open during the operation of the school streets schemes.

**Pedestrian / cycling / vehicle activity (measured by counts)**

Pedestrian and cycle activity counts and vehicle volume counts were regularly undertaken at the sites. The pedestrian and cycle counts are taken at a mid-point in the scheme and repeat counts are undertaken at the same points for consistency. Both a weekday and weekend day are surveyed between 7am and 7pm to cover the busy periods. Surveys are undertaken by recording CCTV footage during the period of observation and later analysed by the survey company at their premises. Automatic traffic counters have also been used at each site to monitor traffic flows over the period of a week and calculate the average volume of daily vehicular traffic flow. The dates for data collection are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CCTV counts* August 19th
* September 16th
* October 14th
* November 11th
* December 9th
* January 20th
 | Automatic traffic counters* July 8th – 14th
* September 16th – 22nd
* October 12th – 18th
* November 7th – 13th
* December 6th – 12th
* January 18th – 24th
 |

The surveys were undertaken at the following locations as follows:

* Sylvia Avenue - east of Lyndon Avenue (SS-01)
* Sylvia avenue – north of Colburn Avenue (SS-01)
* Drake Road – east of Kings Road (SS-02)
* Drake Road – west of Alexandra Avenue (SS-02)
* Ravenswood Crescent – east of Kings Road (SS-02)
* Marlborough Hill – west of Badminton Close (SS-03)
* Marlborough Hill – east of Harrow View (SS-03)
* Burnell Gardens – south of Crowshott Avenue (SS-04)
* Thistlecroft Gardens – south of Crowshott Avenue (SS-04)

The table below gives details of the pedestrian, cycle and vehicle counts undertaken at the survey points.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Morning** | **SS-01** **Grimsdyke** **School** | **SS-02****Newton Farm** **School** | **SS-03****Marlborough School** | **SS-04** **Park High** **School** |
| Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles  | Pedestrians  | Cyclists | Vehicles | Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles | Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles |
| July / August | 12 | 5 | 125 | 35 | 1 | 161 | 175 | 11 | 306 | 11 | 0 | 74 |
| September | 874 | 3 | 159 | 398 | 15 | 254 | 1003 | 23 | 605 | 315 | 5 | 113 |
| October | 983 | 3 | 88 | 600 | 18 | 153 | 1087 | 13 | 365 | 48 | 2 | 77 |
| November | 1019 | 8 | 70 | 604 | 16 | 201 | 1113 | 12 | 258 | 297 | 7 | 68 |
| December | 961 | 8 | 71 | 584 | 10 | 195 | 994 | 10 | 337 | 192 | 3 | 78 |
| January | 143 | 3 | 76 | 88 | 2 | 95 | 205 | 3 | 256 | 33 | 0 | 56 |
| February | 11 | 2 | 31 | 21 | 1 | 66 | 98 | 3 | 230 | 10 | 0 | 37 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Afternoon** | **SS-01** **Grimsdyke** **School** | **SS-02****Newton Farm** **School** | **SS-03****Marlborough School** | **SS-04** **Park High** **School** |
| Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles  | Pedestrians  | Cyclists | Vehicles | Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles | Pedestrians | Cyclists | Vehicles |
| July / August | 3 | 1 | 80 | 5 | 3 | 153 | 69 | 4 | 269 | 5 | 0 | 80 |
| September | 713 | 2 | 104 | 343 | 14 | 226 | 896 | 10 | 569 | 284 | 5 | 58 |
| October | 938 | 1 | 47 | 511 | 20 | 116 | 1060 | 6 | 299 | 32 | 4 | 49 |
| November | 963 | 3 | 65 | 531 | 11 | 171 | 1070 | 11 | 268 | 232 | 4 | 47 |
| December | 896 | 6 | 52 | 533 | 9 | 151 | 1063 | 7 | 283 | 161 | 6 | 43 |
| January | 196 | 2 | 34 | 87 | 1 | 80 | 181 | 3 | 250 | 21 | 2 | 55 |
| February | 30 | 1 | 39 | 24 | 1 | 75 | 89 | 0 | 220 | 3 | 0 | 27 |

The counts in July / August reflect conditions prior to the schools opening, in September the conditions when the schools opened without a school streets scheme and thereafter the conditions with a school streets scheme operating up to December. The figures in the table that are shaded represent when the schools were open in the autumn term.

The impact of the government restrictions on traffic levels were initially low in September with fewer restrictions in force, and became moderate in October under the three tier system and high during the second lockdown in November and then reduced to moderate again in December when the lockdown was eased.

The vehicle flows at all sites clearly show an increase in September when the schools opened with schemes in place and then a reduction from October when the school streets scheme were introduced. Significantly the volume of pedestrians has increased at primary school sites in conjunction with a reduction in vehicles since September. This is likely to be as a consequence of more local walking to school.

The impact on pedestrians has been less significant for the High school and it is likely that this is because a higher proportion of older students may already walk to school and there is less modal shift. It should be noted that in October not many pedestrians were recorded for Park High School because the school was not open to students on that particular survey date.

The volume of cyclists has remained low at all sites despite the introduction of the school streets. This is probably due to the schemes only improving conditions in the immediate vicinity of the school rather than over the whole of the route being used by cyclists between home and school. It is important to improve the whole journey experience in order to achieve a significant uptake in cycling. The weather conditions during autumn were also not favourable for cycling with more wet weather.

During the third lockdown schools were closed and this is reflected in the January and February data. Survey data is not available for March when the schools opened again.

**Emergency services comments**

The Metropolitan Police, Fire & Rescue Service and Ambulance service have been contacted to seek their views about the impact of the school streets schemes on their respective services. No operational issues have been highlighted during the trials.

In general these schemes do not affect the ability of the emergency services to attend emergencies or incidents because they are exempt from the restrictions and there are no physical measures in the road that can affect them.

A meeting with the emergency was held on the 17th March and no issues were highlighted with these schemes.

**TfL bus services comments**

There are no regular bus services in close proximity to the school streets schemes directlt affected by the restrictions.

Transport for London (TfL) are responsible for the commissioning and operation of bus services in London and they have been contacted about their views on the impact of the school streets schemes on local bus services. No operational issues have been highlighted by TfL.

**Officer observations regarding operational performance**

Officers have undertaken on-site observations periodically to check on the operation of the schemes.

There is generally good compliance by vehicles within the restricted areas. Fixed CCTV enforcement is in place at Park High school and Grimsdyke school. The other sites are being enforced by the deployment of CCTV camera cars. Currently enforcement is soft with only warning letters being issued to vehicles not complying with the restrictions. The introduction of hard enforcement with the issue of penalty charge notices will be considered at a later date.

The systems used to issue permits to residents and school staff that are exempt from the restrictions was deployed smoothly and there have been very few operational issues. The web portals used for processing applications are functioning well.

A review has been undertaken of any potential parking and traffic issues caused by displaced drop off and pick up of pupils / students on neighbouring roads surrounding the restricted streets. This is a known potential consequence of school street schemes. Some localised problems have been observed during the autumn term but there are not considered significant. These issues could be addressed through further interventions or may reduce over time as travel patterns change.

**Public engagement**

An engagement portal was setup at the beginning of October to facilitate the receipt of public comments for all of the on-going school street scheme trials. The engagement portal closed on 31st March. Reminder leaflets were been sent to premises in the vicinity of the schemes to ensure that all feedback is received. A summary of the results of the engagement are shown below.

**What is your connection with this scheme?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Resident living in scheme** | **Business located in scheme** | **School located in scheme** | **Pedestrian** | **Cyclist** | **Motorist** | **Student at school** | **Parent / guardian of student at school** | **Other** |
| SS-01 Grimsdyke Primary School | 39 |  | 1 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 7 |
| SS-02 Newton Farm Primary School | 73 |  | 13 | 13 |  | 18 | 14 | 61 | 7 |
| SS-03 Marlborough Primary School | 89 | 1 | 5 | 25 | 15 | 43 | 3 | 35 | 29 |
| SS-04 Park High Secondary School | 43 |  | 4 | 9 | 1 | 18 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| **Grand Total** | **244** | **1** | **23** | **61** | **19** | **92** | **26** | **114** | **51** |

**How do you feel about this scheme?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **mostly negative** | **negative** | **neutral** | **positive** | **mostly positive** | **Grand Total** |
| SS-01 Grimsdyke Primary School | 34 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 20 | 71 |
| SS-02 Newton Farm Primary School | 70 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 33 | 140 |
| SS-03 Marlborough Primary School | 107 | 25 | 6 | 11 | 34 | 183 |
| SS-04 Park High Secondary School | 35 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 70 |
| **Grand Total** | **246** | **47** | **34** | **31** | **106** | **464** |

**What do you think should happen to this scheme in the future?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Don't know** | **Extend trial for up to 18 months** | **Make scheme permanent** | **Remove scheme** | **Review at end of 6 month trial** | **Grand Total** |
| SS-01 Grimsdyke Primary School | 0 | 10 | 22 | 35 | 3 | 70 |
| SS-02 Newton Farm Primary School | 5 | 13 | 37 | 78 | 7 | 140 |
| SS-03 Marlborough Primary School | 1 | 9 | 35 | 125 | 13 | 183 |
| SS-04 Park High Secondary School | 2 | 4 | 22 | 34 | 8 | 70 |
| **Grand Total** | **8** | **36** | **116** | **272** | **31** | **463** |

**Let us know any other comments you have?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SS-01 Grimsdyke Primary School** **General Comments Summarised** | **No.** |
| 1 | Traffic and parking issues moved to a different area/have knock on affect in other areas | 30 |
| 2 | Inconvenience to local residents  | 11 |
| 3 | This is safer for children/School | 9 |
| 4 | Environmental benefits | 5 |
| 5 | Update car park in the park to accommodate more cars/free permits for parents | 5 |
| 6 | One way system needed | 4 |
| 7 | Need better parking regulations/enforcement | 3 |
| 8 | Exemptions for traders and delivery drivers | 3 |
| 9 | Poor signage  | 3 |
| 10 | Poor communication | 3 |
| 11 | Road Safety issues on road and surrounding roads can be dangerous | 3 |
| 12 | Would not want to pay for permits in the future and always have exemption | 2 |
|  | Miscellaneous | 13 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SS-02 Newton Farm Primary School** **General Comments Summarised** | **No.** |
| 1 | My journey to school takes longer/difficulty to pick/up drop of when using the car | 18 |
| 2 | Scheme is now safer for all road users | 17 |
| 3 | Caused traffic issues on surrounding roads | 15 |
| 4 | Issues for contractors, visitors, delivery drivers gaining access | 13 |
| 5 | Need fixed ANPR as parents know they will not get a ticket/better enforcement | 11 |
| 6 | No issues before  | 7 |
| 7 | Inconsiderate parents block driveways  | 6 |
| 8 | Has had little impact on traffic or issues around the area | 5 |
| 9 | Environmental benefits | 5 |
| 10 | Scheme is great and has encouraged more walking and cycling | 4 |
| 11 | Put in one-way system | 3 |
| 12 | Scheme inconsiderate to residents | 3 |
| 13 | Too much signage/poor signage | 2 |
| 14 | Poor communication | 2 |
| 15 | Would not want to see parking charges or permit charges | 2 |
| 16 | Health benefits | 2 |
| 17 | Not fair on those that have to drive | 2 |
|  | Miscellaneous | 12 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SS-03 Marlborough Primary School** **General Comments Summarised** | **No.** |
| 1 | Increase in traffic on surrounding roads | 47 |
| 2 | Unfair/Inconvenience to residents/ parents | 20 |
| 3 | Access for deliveries/utilities/services/family | 19 |
| 4 | In favour | 16 |
| 5 | Environmental concerns on increased traffic regarding pollution/air quality/congestion | 13 |
| 6 | Road Safety Concerns | 11 |
| 7 | Waste of public funding | 9 |
| 8 | Placing of Signage/ location of signage/unclear | 9 |
| 9 | Traffic blocking drives | 5 |
| 10 | Inadequate consultation/ prior notification of scheme | 5 |
| 11 | Lack of enforcement from CCTV | 5 |
| 12 | Timing of Controlled hours too long | 4 |
| 13 | Extend trial period/zone | 4 |
| 14 | Parking on Boundary | 3 |
| 15 | No ANPR affecting quality of scheme | 3 |
| 16 | Access to through route | 3 |
| 17 | TMO – Publishing/wording | 3 |
| 18 | Do not support ANPR | 1 |
| 19 | Failure to adhere to Equalities legislation | 1 |
| 20 | Speeding | 1 |
| 21 | LTN related | 1 |
|  | Miscellaneous | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SS-04 Park High Secondary School** **General Comments Summarised** | **No.** |
| 1 | Congestion on surrounding roads | 20 |
| 2 | Has made a positive difference to the area/safer | 16 |
| 3 | Causing inconvenience to local residents or those with disabilities | 13 |
| 4 | Residents driveways have been blocked | 7 |
| 5 | Issues for contractors, visitors, delivery drivers gaining access | 7 |
| 6 | Better for Health | 6 |
| 7 | Do not want to see residents having to pay for permits in the future | 3 |
| 8 | Dis-benefit to environment | 3 |
| 9 | Better for the environment | 2 |
| 10 | Need better enforcement | 2 |
|  | Miscellaneous | 0 |

The engagement feedback indicates a continuing level of unpopularity amongst the community towards these schemes.

There are comments about increased inconvenience and difficulties for access by visitors during the restricted hours. The restrictions only apply on school days for a short duration in the morning and afternoon and the roads remain open to all traffic outside of the restricted hours and so it is possible for visits to be arranged at different times during the day. In general these comments are a reaction to changes that affect lifestyles that rely heavily on using the private car and it is expected that making changes to travel patterns is something that people will initially be resistant to and will happen over a longer period of time. This is the experience of other London boroughs that have introduced similar schemes. The initial reaction to the schemes is understandably more negative as a consequence.

The issue of displaced traffic and parking issues on surrounding roads around schools is highlighted in the comments and from officer observations and this will require further discussions with the school and school community to consider the best way to mitigate these issues. These schools have travel plans in place which support modal shift and a review and update of these plans taking account of the experience of the school streets schemes will be necessary.

Concerns over costs being levied for permits are unfounded as the Road Traffic Regulation Act does not permit charges to be made for this purpose.

**Schools feedback**

The Schools have been contacted to seek their views about the impact of the school streets schemes. Their feedback is overwhelmingly positive indicating that the schemes have been successful at improving road safety outside the schools and that more students are walking which is better for their health as well as the reduced pollution from vehicle emissions.

The main criticism concerned enforcement. At Newton Farm Primary School and Marlborough Primary School where there is a reliance on mobile CCTV enforcement there is more instances of non-compliance with the restrictions evident than the other sites where fixed cameras have been provided. These schools would like to see enforcement improved to reinforce compliance.

The general sentiment from the schools is that the schemes should be made permanent because it has made life for the students much safer and less stressful.

**Summary and recommendations**

To summarise the outcome of the six-month review the findings are as follows:

* The general feedback to the schemes from the wider community is more negative than positive.
* There are no negative impacts on local bus services or the emergency services.
* The schools are very positive about the schemes and would like to see them retained because of the benefits for the students.
* The traffic surveys indicate that there have been increases in walking during the autumn term demonstrating that there is modal shift occurring in the way people travel to school.

The schools are key stakeholders and their comments are very important in determining the future of the schemes particularly as they are responsible for the health and wellbeing of young children and students in the local community who are vulnerable to the impacts of traffic congestion, road safety and air pollution. Whilst it is recognised that there is a more negative sentiment from the wider community to the schemes the main beneficiaries are the schools and their students and there are clearly positive impacts on them.

The main issues highlighted have been the displacement of drop off and pick up by parents in other areas close to the schools resulting in some localised traffic and parking problems. Further discussions with the school and school community to review their travel plans and consider further mitigations will be necessary. Additionally the comments about mobile CCTV enforcement not deterring some drivers from ignoring the restrictions are valid and consideration should be given to introducing fixed cameras at these sites.

It is therefore recommended that the scheme trials should be extended to 18 months to allow the schemes to continue to be evaluated and to address any issues that have been highlighted during the first 6 months of operation.