

CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Director – Caroline Holland



**Democracy Services
London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden SM4 5DX**

**Direct Line: 0208 545 3357
Email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk**

Date: 27 January 2022

Dear Councillor

**Notification of a Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Housing,
Regeneration and the Climate Emergency**

The attached non-key decision has been taken by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and the Climate Emergency with regards to:

- **School Streets – ETMO Results – Ursuline High School**

and will be implemented at **noon on Tuesday 1 February 2022** unless a call-in request is received.

The [call-in](#) form is attached for your use if needed and refers to the relevant sections of the constitution.

Yours sincerely

Democracy Services

NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

See over for instructions on how to use this form – all parts of this form must be completed. Type all information in the boxes. The boxes will expand to accommodate extra lines where needed.

Title of report: School Streets – EMT0 results- Ursuline High School

Reason for exemption (if any) – N/A

Decision maker

Councillor Martin Whelton, **Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration & the Climate Emergency**

Date of Decision

27 January 2022

Date report made available to decision maker

26th January 2022

Decision

Having considered the officer's recommendations and all the representations, I agree to the recommendations as set out in the report in making the school street permanent and for a statutory consultation to be undertaken to change the hours of operation to 8.00– 9.00am and 2.45 – 3.30pm Monday -Thursday term times only

Reason for decision

To maintain and further improve on reducing congestion, risk, pollution outside school gate and continue to encourage active travel and bring about a change in behaviour.

The reduced hours of operation follows liaison with the school

Alternative options considered and why rejected

To remove the restrictions. This would be against the Council's objectives in improving the environment in terms of safety, access, air quality and increase in active travel and use of sustainable transport. It will do nothing to address localised congestion.

Documents relied on in addition to officer report

N/A

Declarations of Interest

N/A

Cllr Martin Whelton

Cabinet member for housing, regeneration, and the climate emergency

27 January, 2022

Publication of this decision and call in provision

Send this form and the officer report* to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk for publication. Publication will take place within two days. The call-in deadline will be at Noon on the third working day following publication.

IMPORTANT – this decision should not be implemented until the call-in period has elapsed.

Committee: Cabinet Member Report

Date: 26th January 2022

Agenda item: N/A

Wards: Raynes Park

Subject: School Streets – EMTO results- Ursuline high School

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration.

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and the Climate Emergency

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Mitra Dubet, email: mitra.dubet@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and:

- A) Notes the results of the Experimental Traffic Management Order used to implement the School Street and its associated restrictions as shown below and on plan in Appendix 1.

School	Restricted Roads	Restricted periods Monday-Thursday Term times only
Ursuline High	Crescent Road & Southdown Drive	8.00 – 9.00am 2.45 - 4.00pm

- B) To consider all the representations received as set out in Appendix 2 and agrees to proceed with making the existing Experimental Traffic Management permanent.
- C) Agrees to the undertaking of a statutory consultation to change the hours of operation to 8.00 – 9.00am and 2.45 – 3.30pm Monday-Thursday term times only (to reflect the schools' new hours).
- D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report details the result of the Experimental Traffic Management Order used to introduce the School Street restrictions in September 2020.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with making the Experimental Traffic Management Order (ETMO) permanent and retain the School Street. This will ensure that the objectives associated with school streets are met and retained.
- 1.4 This report also seeks approval to undertake a statutory consultation to change the hours of operation to 8.00 – 9.00am and 2.45– 3.30pm Monday-Thursday term times only.

2.0 DETAILS

2.1 As part of the Council's objective to reduce congestion, pollution, collisions, risk and provide a safe environment within the vicinity of schools, the Council has a rolling road safety and accessibility programme. Measures that are often implemented include 'school keep clear' zig-zag road markings to prevent drivers parking close to the school gates and to improve sightlines; 20mph speed limits with accompanying traffic calming measures and road safety education. These measures have been very successful in most areas, as there has been an improvement in perception of safety with a reduction in risk of injury. Although these measures have been successful in ensuring access and safety, the level of congestion, risk and air quality outside the schools remain a concern. The contributing factor is the high- localised volume of vehicular traffic and obstructive parking within the vicinity of schools often generated by parents / carers of pupils attending the school.

Air Quality

2.2 To assess the level of air quality around schools, in January 2017 the Mayor of London commissioned an assessment of air quality outside 50 London schools. A report was published in May 2018 (the Mayor of London on School Air Quality Programme) detailing its findings of unacceptable levels of air quality during the school opening and closing periods of the day. One of the contributing factor to this poor air quality within London is road transport, of which the Mayor of London has introduced a series of measures to improve the air quality especially around schools, however, this still remains a concern. It is considered that without significant intervention, as the Capital grows rapidly with increasing congestion, adverse health and safety implications are set to continue.

2.3 The Mayor's Air Quality report also identified that school travel in some areas often does not contribute substantially to local emissions, as many walk, scoot, cycle or travel by public transport, with much of the road transport emissions emanating from the nearby busy main roads. However, seeking to manage and reduce school related car travel still has an important role to play. Cars picking up and dropping off children near the school gates result in a concentration of emissions amongst larger numbers of children, worsening exposure including the increase in risk of collisions. The recommendations also often focus on delivering broader improvements to the environment around the schools for walking and cycling, and the promotion of sustainable transport including footway widening, kerb build-outs, improved crossing facilities on desire lines and traffic calming.

2.4 The Mayor's Air Quality report highlights that without significant intervention, as the capital grows rapidly with increasing congestion, the air quality levels are forecast to rise considerably, which will impact on adverse health and safety implications. Health implications include triggering or exacerbating chronic diseases such as asthma, hearth attack, bronchitis and other respiratory problems.

2.5 Recommendations in the Mayor's report is for local authorities to try and minimise the level of pollution outside schools by introducing measures to minimise vehicular traffic outside school gates. Due to the pandemic, since May 2020, all local authorities have been encouraged to expedite such improvements.

2.6 In addition to the above, in response to a green recovery, DfT / TfL provided funding (subject to a bid process) for boroughs to consider, consult and implement School Streets so as to reduce congestion, remove the obstructive parking that is often associated with schools; promote active and sustainable modes of travel; improve safety and air quality particularly outside schools. Further information is available on the Council's website www.merton.gov.uk/schoolstreets

2.7 During tranche 1 of the funding process, the Council was successful in its bid to DfT/TfL in securing

funding to design and implement a number of school streets throughout the borough. However, due to extremely tight deadlines set by TfL/DfT, the programme was introduced under an Experimental Order. As per legislation, the Council does need to make a decision no later than 18th month of the ETMO coming in to effect.

2.8 As part of Merton’s commitment, a report dated 3rd August 2020 titled School Streets–Restricted Vehicular Access -Experimental Traffic Management was submitted to the Cabinet Member for approval to implement a number of school streets. Cabinet Member decision was made to implement the school street programme under an Experimental Order.

2.9 Although it is normal practice to undertake before and after surveys that can be used for an impact assessment, particularly on the neighbouring roads, due to the pandemic / lock down and a general change in traffic pattern and behaviour, any survey at the time would not have yielded a true reflection of normal traffic pattern.

3.0 SCHEME

3.1 To achieve a number of objectives such as improving safety and air quality and encourage active travel, the Council introduced a school street within the following roads. The school street restricts entry of motorised traffic into restricted roads during specific times based on schools’ starting and finishing times. The restrictions only apply during school term periods.

School	Restricted Roads	Restricted periods Monday-Thursday Term times only
Ursuline High	Crescent Road & Southdown Drive	8.00 – 9.00am 2.45 - 4.00pm

3.2 Initially the Council intended to use a default period of 08.15 - 09.15am and 15.00-16.00hrs. However, the restricted hours were based on the schools’ then adopted opening / closing hours. Being mindful of the fact that parents often arrive earlier than the starting and finishing times, it was considered necessary to extend the initial proposed hours by at least 15 minutes. However, since then, feedback and observations have revealed that across the board many parents are arriving just prior to the restricted times and are willing to wait longer.

3.3 During these periods, the roads as set out within the above table is predominately ‘pedestrian and cycle only’ zone. Residents who live in the affected roads are allowed vehicular access as are teachers and those with special needs children who need to be driven to school. This is via an on-line exemption process. Others who may also qualify for an exemption can also register with the Council; exemptions are subject to meeting the appropriate criteria. Location plan and exemption catchment area are attached in appendix 1.

4. CONSULTATION

Statutory Consultation

4.1 Due to extremely tight deadlines set by TfL/DfT, the programme was introduced under an Experimental Order. This type of Order enables the implementation of a scheme during the statutory consultation stage. An Experimental Order allows the restrictions and the Order to be in place for a maximum of 18 months before a final decision is made. Anyone can make a representation within the first six months (the statutory/formal consultation period) of the Experimental Order coming into force. The EMTO allowed the Council to meet its extremely tight deadlines but more importantly, it enabled the school, residents and other road users to experience the restrictions, thereby allowing them to make an informed decision prior to

responding to the consultation. It also allows the Council to make minor adjustments. Consultees had in excess of 6 months to respond to the consultation and residents were encouraged to allow sufficient time to experience the scheme before making a representation.

- 4.2 The consultation began on 29th September 2020 and concluded on 31st July 2021. Newsletters were delivered to all those properties directly affected (see plan in appendix 1). The newsletter detailed the consultation process; the proposed measures and a location plan. A copy of the newsletter with the plan is attached in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 Residents were encouraged to submit their feedback on the Council's website using specific on-line feedback link. All available information was also posted on the website. [Introducing new school streets 2020 \(merton.gov.uk\)](#). Street notices were erected on lamp columns and published in the local papers and the London Gazette.
- 4.3.1 In terms of publicising the school streets programme there was an article on School Streets in My Merton magazine [the Winter 2020 edition](#). This copy was distributed to all households in Merton from 19 November 2020. There was also a news article about it in [the Spring 2021 edition](#) which was published on 25 March 2021.
- 4.3.2 The school was provided with a banner to be attached to the school gate. The banner set out the details of the restrictions and affected roads. The school was also requested to inform and remind parents of the restrictions.
- 4.4 After removing blanks and those without an address and combining multiple entries from the same person, the statutory consultation resulted in 49 representations from within the newsletter postal area, of which 26 are in support of the scheme and 23 against. In percentage terms, 31.9% of those within the restricted area object to the scheme with 68.1% who chose not to object.
- 4.4.1 In addition, there are 26 representations from outside the newsletter postal area, 7 of which are in support and 19 against. Many of the responses from outside the newsletter postal area are from neighbouring roads. All responses are detailed in Appendix 2.
- 4.5 There are some respondents who support the proposals unconditionally, but some of those who support the scheme have similar reservations as those who object. The specific positive benefits cited include reduced traffic, reduced vehicle idling and easier for residents to park, and a feeling that the road is now safer for children. It has also been cited that The Downs is heavily used for school access and should be included in the scheme.
- 4.6 As with many other school streets, the concerns and objections are the same with regards to the impact of the restrictions on their daily lives such as receiving visitors, deliveries, tradespeople etc. Some believe that the negative effects of the proposals outweigh the benefits. Some believe that the scheme to be out of proportion to any perceived problem. The hours of operation are also considered too long and not in line with the actual school hours. It is felt that there should be far more flexibility for residents regarding permits to overcome these issues.
- 4.7 In response to some of the points raised by the objectors:-
- The restrictions were based on the hours provided by the school, which at the time were operating staggered hours. Additional time were added to the school's core hours to capture those parents who arrive early attempting to avoid the restrictions. If the restrictions are made permanent the Council will undertake a statutory consultation to change / reduce the hours

based on the school's current core hours. The hours will allow additional periods to capture the many parents who arrive early particularly during afternoon pick up periods.

- With regards to exempting all visitors, trade, deliveries etc would somewhat defeat the objectives of the scheme. The idea is to change behaviour in terms of reliance on use of private vehicles as well as reduce volume of traffic not just outside the school gates but in general particularly during the peak period which will also affect congestion periods in the area. Merton's exemption compared to other boroughs is generous and the Council has been extremely flexible regarding carers, taxis and household emergencies but it simply is not possible to allow every vehicular activity. It is appreciated that there may be some inconvenience and although some residents disagree, the benefits which is hoped to lead to further change in behaviour and maintain the change is considered worthwhile.
- Although the school street objectives include discouraging school related traffic, it also aims at changing attitude toward private car use by all including residents and their visitors with the hope that a change in attitude would result in a general reduction in volume of traffic and the use of alternative modes of travel.

4.8 One of the objectives is to deter car trips for 'the school run', which is a major source of congestion and poor air quality outside schools as well as on route to and from schools. In the past the Council has attempted to address school related traffic and parking issues through School's travel plan, Road safety Education and parking management. However, it has become very clear that a more stringent action is required to change the behaviour of parents and motorists in general. A school street can be an effective method of bringing about this change.

4.9 It is appreciated that some parents continue to resist the change and have found their way into neighbouring roads or else / and stop on the boundary of the restrictions causing a nuisance. Since this area is subject to a CPZ and parking without a permit is not permitted and illegal; this behavior can be addressed through parking enforcement. Although due to the number of schools and limited staff it is not possible to provide daily enforcement for every school, routine enforcement is carried out on a rota basis with targeted enforcement in some more difficult and congested areas. With continued enforcement, it is considered that there will be a change in behaviour albeit at a slower pace than expected.

4.10 Wimbledon and Raynes Park have excellent public transport links and therefore parents and visitors should be discouraged to use private motorised vehicles. A combination of School Street enforcement and parking enforcement should encourage a change in behavior and attitude.

4.11 The legal signs plus advance signs have been in place since Sept / Oct 2020. The signs at the entrance to the restricted roads fully comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TRSGD) (2016). School streets signs and restrictions are no different to any other moving contravention signs and are used across London and as such motorists are obligated to abide by them.

4.12 A full assessment of all school street signage across the borough has been carried out and arrangements have been made to further improve the signage in terms of numbers, position and visibility across the borough. This would be over and above of is actually required and considered as necessary. If the scheme is made permanent, '*Term Time only*' supplementary plates will be added to the main entry signs. All advance signs which already include this text are being redesigned as more of a pictorial sign, thereby making it easier for drivers to observe.

4.13 All those who are directly affected by the restrictions were informed of the restrictions and they are exempt by following the registration process. All vehicles registered to the address can be registered for exemption. In terms of *affected* residents, only those who have no alternative

vehicular access to their homes are classed as directly affected; all others who have an alternative vehicular route are classed as indirectly affected and cannot be exempt. To meet the objectives of the school street, it is necessary to minimise volume of traffic. By facilitating non-essential traffic, it will do nothing to encourage a change in behaviour. Notwithstanding, in light of issues that have been raised by some residents across the school street programme, the Council has been reviewing its exemptions; for example, there are already provisions within the system for residents to enter the vehicle registrations of taxis that are being used to transport them for medical reasons. There are also provisions for carers and household emergencies. In terms of neighbouring roads, Parking Services will pay additional attention in this area to address displacement.

- 4.14 One of many purposes of the school street is to improve safety, reduce risk and improve air quality in the restricted road as well as reduce traffic in general; after all, if parents or other visitors are discouraged to drive during the peak periods, there will be reduced traffic on route to and from the restricted roads. Another objective is to improve road safety and perception of road safety not only for pupils attending the school, but also for the residents and their visitors. This can be achieved by minimising volume of traffic past the school and remove the associated parking whilst pupils are arriving or leaving. For a school street to remain effective and to meet its objectives, it is necessary to reduce volume of traffic by reducing number of exemptions. Many delivery services can be made aware of the restricted periods when placing an order and deliveries can be made outside these hours. Trade personnel and other visitors can also enter the road either before or after the restricted periods. Emergencies can be exempt after the event as long as evidence of emergency is provided. Every effort is made to minimise inconvenience but it simply is not possible to accommodate every scenario or eventuality.
- 4.15 The school street restrictions do not prevent residents from accessing their homes, and the system makes provisions for exemptions under certain circumstances. Anyone within the restricted road can leave at any time. The contravention is for entering the road. In terms of visitors, there is nothing preventing visitors arriving within the restricted periods as long as it is not in a motorised vehicle. The Council has a number of initiatives that encourages those travelling within the borough to use active and / or sustainable modes of transport and not be so reliant on the use of private motorised vehicles. If the scheme becomes permanent, a newsletter detailing these points will be sent to all the residents.
- 4.16 All statutory bodies have been consulted and no objections have been raised.
- 4.17 All the local Ward Councillors have been engaged during the consultation process. The results of the consultation and officer's recommendations were presented to the Ward Councillors prior to preparing this report.
- 4.18 Ward Councillors submitted the following comments on 27th September 2021 along with Councillor's own survey which is attached as appendix 3 :-

In essence, 63% of residents are against the current school street arrangements and 27% are in favour. However, if residents were able to exempt their visitors on the day of their visit, then 75% of residents would be in favour of the school street and 15% would be against.

I have met with x, Ursuline Head Teacher, and she supports the idea of residents being able to exempt their visitors. She would not at this time support the decommissioning of the school street. There is an anomaly in that the Ursuline closes at 1:30pm on a Friday whilst the school street operates from 2:45 to 4:00pm. Ms x agrees that rather than vary the school street hours on a Friday, which would only confuse, it would be better if the school street operated from Monday to Thursday.

- 4.19 On 10th December 2021, in response to the Council's statutory consultation feedback received by the Council (detailed in appendix 2), the Ward Councillors submitted the following comments:

In terms of the rationale for school streets you state that "The idea is to change behaviour in terms of reliance on use of private vehicles as well as reduce volume of traffic not just outside the school gates but during the peak period which will also affect congestion periods in the area".

This is a laudable intention. However, there is a fundamental unfairness in that residents with homes in the school street are disproportionately impacted in comparison to other residents and it must be admitted that any prohibition of vehicle access for visitors to residents' homes is a significant loss of amenity.

For this reason, we would like the enforcement cameras to be switched-off until it is possible for residents with a school street permit to sign-on to Ringo and grant a "one-day exemption" to visitors to their homes.

Would you please include the results of my survey in your report as I believe that the views of the residents of Crescent Road and Southdown Drive should be given the greatest weight and that some residents who responded to my survey (I live at x Southdown Drive) may not have responded to the Council's survey.

Regarding hours of operation. If the scheme is to be made permanent, we fully support the proposed new hours of operation.

4.20 Officer's comments

Officers are grateful for the additional information provided by Councillors' own survey. According to the information provided, there was a response rate of 66.7%, which is comparable with the statutory consultation response rate of 68.1%. When considering the whole of the restricted area, there appears to be 41.7% of all those within the restricted area who object to the restrictions with 58.3% of residents choosing not to object. Again, this is comparable to the statutory consultation response of 31.9% who objected and 68.1% who decided not to object.

The disparity between the statutory feedback and those provided by the Councillors are the *agree* and *disagree* responses in that when considering the feedback received from those who decided to take part within the statutory consultation, 53.1% of those who responded favour the scheme with 46.9% who oppose the scheme. In comparison, those who decided to take part within the Councillors' survey, 27.1% of those who responded favour the scheme with 62.5% who oppose the scheme and 10.4% unsure. Regrettably, residents' comments from the Councillor's survey have not been provided but as per Councillor summary, reasons for objections are believed to be similar to those received by the Council.

5. OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 Unlike an informal consultation, a statutory consultation is not a vote nor about number of objections; it is about the reasons for objecting to the scheme. When making a decision, consideration must be given to the nature and validity of objections rather than the number of objections. The Council must also be mindful of the objectives of the scheme and the wider policy implications.
- 5.2 Since the majority of those directly affected have chosen not to object and a number of objections can be addressed via the exemption process and considering the Council's overall objectives, it is recommended that the permanent Order is made to retain the school street.
- 5.3 It is appreciated that there are some strong objections from the residents who are directly affected

but it is considered that the benefits outweigh some of the inconveniences some residents / motorists may experience. School streets are in line with other policies and initiatives across the Borough and London, and it is believed to be the right step toward changing behaviour as well as achieving the various benefits. Benefits include improved safety / perception of safety; the removal of the school-associated obstructive parking; reduced risk to all road users; reduced pollution, including noise pollution; improved air quality in the restricted roads as well as reduced traffic in general; after all if parents or other visitors are discouraged from driving particularly during the peak periods, there will be reduced traffic on route to and from the restricted roads.

- 5.4 According to the school, it finishes at 1.30pm on Fridays and ideally the new restricted hours should be 8.00 – 9.00am and 2.45– 3.30pm Monday-Thursday and 8.00am-1.45pm on Fridays; however, the school is adamant for Fridays to be excluded which is in line with the Ward Councillors' wishes. To reflect the change in the school's hours, it is recommended that a statutory consultation is undertaken to change the existing restricted hours to 8.00 – 9.00am and 2.45– 3.30pm Monday-Thursday term time only.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 6.1 To remove the restrictions. This would compromise if not totally undo all the benefits that have been gained thus far and it would do nothing to encourage a change in behaviour. It would also be contrary to the various objectives the Council is trying to achieve.

7. TIMETABLE

- 7.1 A newsletter detailing the results of the consultation and Cabinet Member decision will be distributed to all consultees soon after a Cabinet Member decision is made and published. The permanent Traffic Management Order will be made and published soon after.
- 7.2 The statutory consultation to change the restricted hours will be undertaken soon after Cabinet Member decision is made and residents will be informed accordingly.

8. FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 All the associated costs are covered by the LSP funding provided by DfT / TfL.

9. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the experimental order.
- 9.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published ETMO. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
- 9.3 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.

10. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration

for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, school children and businesses without prejudice toward charitable and religious facilities.

10.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders published in the local paper and London Gazette.

10.3 The retention of the restrictions / improvements affects all sections of the community especially the young and assists in ensuring improved road environment and air quality for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None

12. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There may be some dissatisfaction amongst the objectors but the benefits of the scheme outweigh majority of the comments made against the scheme.

12.2 The risk of not retaining the improvements / restrictions would be a step backward in terms of Council's objectives and will not be in line with the Council's various strategies and programmes.

13. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 When determining the type of schemes to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining improved movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the need to reduce road collisions.

13.2 The restrictions removes traffic from this section of the road that makes it safer and more environmental friendly for pupils, residents and visitors.

14. Public Health Implications

14.1 School Streets and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) have important implications for public health in terms of physical activity, air quality and safety by creating healthy and secure neighbourhoods.

14.2 The implementation of School Streets and LTNs encourage the use of active travel options such as walking and cycling and build physical activity into daily routines. The removal or reduction of traffic from certain roads may encourage residents (particularly children) who would not usually consider active travel options to take these up in a quieter and safer environment ([Aldred, R. and Verlinghieri, E. 2020](#)).

14.3 Traffic is a key contributor to poor air quality in the borough which can have important health implications. The reduction of traffic in primarily residential areas or streets with schools can improve air quality in local areas and reduce the risk of developing cardiovascular disease and other health conditions. Studies from Waltham Forest found that in particular, there was a reduction in the amount of pollution caused during the school run where these schemes were in place ([Dainak, 2018](#))

14.4 Implementation of these schemes have an important role to play in improving our local areas in

terms of road safety. Reducing the flow of traffic in residential areas or in areas close to schools can reduce the risk of residents being involved in a serious collision with a vehicle.

15. APPENDICES

15.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report.

- Appendix 1 - Newsletter & Plan
- Appendix 2 - Representations to statutory consultation
- Appendix 3 - Ward Councillors' survey

SCHOOL STREETS

Restricted Vehicular access

Ursuline High School



ISSUE DATE : 18 SEPTEMBER 2020

INTRODUCTION

As part of the Council's objective to reduce congestion, pollution, risk of collisions and provide a safe environment within the vicinity of schools, the Council has a rolling road safety and accessibility programme. Measures that are often implemented include 'school keep clear' zig-zag road markings to prevent drivers parking close to the school gates and to improve sightlines; localised 20mph speed zones with accompanying traffic calming measures and road safety education. These measures have been very successful in most areas, as there has been an improvement in perception of safety. Although these measures have been successful in ensuring access and safety, the level of congestion, risk and air quality outside the schools remain a concern. The contributing factor is the high localised volume of vehicular traffic within the vicinity of schools often generated by parents / carers of pupils attending the school.

PROPOSAL

To improve safety, active travel and air quality, and in response to Covid-19 pandemic, the Council intends to restrict motorised access in and out of the identified roads that accommodate school pedestrian gates during the morning school opening and afternoon school closing periods under an Experimental Traffic Management Order (ETMO). During these periods, the road will predominately be a 'pedestrian and cycle only' zone. Residents who live in the affected roads will be allowed access as will staff who are based at the school; those with special needs children who need to be driven to school would also be exempt. Those who are exempt must register with the Council; exemptions would be subject to meeting the appropriate criteria.

The appropriate signs will be in place to inform all motorists of the hours of closure.

The restrictions will be enforced by a camera.

The surrounding roads will be enforced against obstructive / illegal parking.

This measure is introduced to protect children and we would appreciate your assistance and support.

It is appreciated that this may cause some inconvenience and where possible the Council will endeavour to accommodate residents; however, for the scheme to be a success, the Council would require the cooperation of the school, parents and residents. We ask that the school and residents support our proposals and rearrange certain activities such as deliveries and receiving visitors outside the identified hours during each school term.

Consultation process

The proposed measure will be introduced shortly and will operate term times only during the published hours under an Experimental Traffic Management Order.

The Experimental Traffic Management Order will allow the Council to implement the restrictions during the consultation period.

- It allows the Council to assess and monitor the restriction and its impact.
- It will enable the residents and other road users to experience the restrictions thereby allowing them to make informed comments.

www.merton.gov.uk

The restrictions and the Order will be in place for a maximum of 18 months. Anyone can object and make representations within the first six months (the statutory/formal consultation period) of the experimental Order coming into force and the implementation of the works. Consultees are encouraged to make their comments at least 3 months **after** implementation. Consultees will have 6 months to respond to the consultation. All representations will be considered prior to making a final decision which could include its removal, making some modifications or making it permanent.

Additional notices will also be erected within the vicinity of the proposals to inform residents and road users of the start of the restrictions and the statutory consultation

All available information including updates will be posted on the website. <https://www.merton.gov.uk/covid-19-transport-projects>

All representations must be made online using the above link. Please note that you may not be able to submit any comments until mid-October 2020. A response will **not be** made until the consultation is concluded and a final decision is made. The Council will monitor the situation and will make the appropriate adjustments if and when necessary.

To apply for exemptions

Exemptions will be given to residents, teachers and special needs children. Residents and teachers **MUST** register with the Council to qualify for the exemption. Carers visiting residents who live in the road will also be exempt if their registration details are logged with the Council. However, we respectfully request that, if possible, visitors arrange their visits outside the restricted hours.

All residents affected by the new school streets will receive a separate letter advising you on how to apply. You will be given detailed instructions on

how to make your application for the exemption and once you have completed your application, your vehicle will be covered immediately. You can check the website for updates.

ENFORCEMENT

During the restrictions, enforcement will be carried out using cameras. However, please note that full enforcement will not be carried out until residents are given the opportunity to apply for exemptions. We do apologise for the short notification and the fact that the exemption process will not be available immediately but we believe that starting the process will have some benefits.

RAYNES PARK WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Adam Bush
Phone - 0208 545 3396
Email: adam.bush@merton.gov.uk

Cllr **Omar Bush**
Phone - 0208 545 3396
Email: omar.bush@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Stephen Crowe
Phone - 07931 650 424
Email: stephen.crowe@merton.gov.uk

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport.

Cllr Martin Whelton
Phone: 020 8545 3425
Email: martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk

Adam Bush
Omar Bush
Stephen Crowe

Road name	Views	COMMENTS
		REPRESENTATIONS FROM WITHIN THE NEWSLETTER POSTAL AREA
Crescent Road 6347059	AGREE	The scheme needs to be more flexible for residents, to allow for visitors during the restricted times when needed.
Crescent Road 6344008	AGREE	The Council clearly have the right to impose School Streets, but equally under the Human Rights Act https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/human-rights/human-rights-act "Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions" and this explicitly includes one's home. The Council can impose restrictions for the purposes of public safety, but such restrictions must be proportionate. The Council's safety objective is achieved by excluding non-residents during restricted hours. However whilst residents are entitled to exemptions for their own cars, there are times when residents will have unavoidable visits during restricted periods. For example a friend or relative taking a child resident in the road to a school situated elsewhere or delivering such child back. Also residents often do not have control over precise timing of commercial deliveries. Residents must be able to have such external vehicular access without penalty. Crescent Road is a small road and the number of such exemptions will have no material impact on the Council achieving its objectives of reducing congestion, pollution and providing a safe environment within the vicinity of the Ursuline High School. Not to provide for the suggested additional exemptions would cause a degree of inconvenience to residents totally disproportionate to the benefits that Merton seek to achieve. To date Merton Council have been obdurate in not allowing such exceptions. This is unacceptable. Residents must be allowed peaceful enjoyment of their homes. Please ensure that residents are given the associated exemptions noted above. It is noted that the formulation and management of such a system of additional exemptions will impose additional cost on Merton Council, but it will be necessary for the Council to shoulder such additional burden if it is not to contravene the Human Rights Act and run the significant risk of legal action.
Crescent Road 6324801	AGREE	The scheme benefits the environment, students and residents.
Crescent Road 6324707	AGREE	Generally makes sense but only if it is more flexible for local residents -specifically, local residents should be able to easily grant access (by going online) to service providers (e.g. builders, gardeners cleaners, deliverers etc.) who often need to start work before 0900, as well as friends and family. Also the restriction time windows are unnecessarily long - should be 0800 to 0845, and 1500 to 1545.
Crescent Road 6345901	AGREE	For resident approval this needs PROOF. i.e. a 'before and after' survey to prove pollution has decreased due to the scheme; a survey of school students that demonstrates that there has been a change of mode of travel to/from school; and a survey of the impact - positive and negative - on neighbouring streets. Without this proof of concept, residents won't be able to accept the changes. But I'm sure the council wouldn't want to instigate the changes unless they had the evidence that the changes actually achieved the objectives that everyone would support.
Crescent Road 6346452	AGREE	I agree that with the closure of the road at the specified times in principle. The road always got too congested with cars dropping off children. And too many cars had engines running while waiting. However, it is totally unworkable if we are not allowed to request exemptions for work people. Gardeners in particular frequent the road and we need some way to EASILY add them as an exemption so they do not get fined.
Crescent Road 6325430	AGREE	I fully support the environmental benefits and improved road safety of the scheme but am concerned about the impact of having tradespeople and visitors to my property during the restricted access hours. I would support a more nuanced

		approach to the proposed restrictions with the use of visitor permits or vehicle registration recognition using a similar platform to the Ringo parking app to allow us as residents not to be unnecessarily penalised by this scheme.
Crescent Road 6346478	AGREE	While I support the limitation of traffic in the road for access to the school, it has been done without consideration for the residents of Crescent Road. Many houses have families of school age children who need to be able to use friends and family members to help with transport to and from other schools within the same hours. There should be some way of registering their number plates to avoid penalty charges. It is extremely difficult for tradesmen and regular gardeners etc to guarantee being able to get in to the road before 8 due to the heavy traffic on Worple Road. These should also have an exemption scheme. The time zones being applied are incorrect for this school: most children have left by 3.30 therefore there is no need for the time to go to 4pm. On Friday the whole school closes at 1pm and therefore the afternoon restriction is unnecessary.
Crescent Road 6324881	AGREE	I think it is a great idea so we can reduce excess traffic in the drop-off / pick up times. I do however object to what is difficult to manage in terms of residents visitors, trades people, deliveries etc. I understand that we can apply for exemptions - I personally don't have a car but am often picked up and my partner stays overnight almost every day - subsequently takes me to the station around 8-8.30 - I find it a hassle that we then have to apply for exemption..!? Is there a limit to how many cars you can register per residents? And more importantly - the appeal process for a fine needs to be possible and manageable should we get a fine for driving to or from our own house. I suggest that should you get a fine - as a proven resident we should be able to appeal without having to pay such fine. Thank you
Crescent Road 6325501	AGREE	Comment not provided
Crescent Road 6325848	AGREE	While the scheme has improved conditions in the roads concerned, I do have some reservations regarding the impact on deliveries, taxis, tradesmen etc; I am concerned that the restrictions may have a negative impact on life in these streets. Would i not be possible to arrange exemptions should it be necessary? I am also concerned that the website for registering residents' exemptions is unhelpful - I and several neighbours have received no confirmation and are unsure if we have been successfully registered. Other concerns have also been mentioned about the process.
Crescent Road 6325038	AGREE	Primarily because people sit in the cars with the engine on for 20+ minutes on Crescent Road and the Downs . I'm fine with the drop off but people parking with the engine on is unfair to residents
Crescent Road 6324710	AGREE	Fully support scheme - the only issue is as the cameras are yet to be installed there remain many cars that are not abiding by the new rules. Being a no through road the scheme has definitely alleviated congestion of parents entering the road, then blocking the exit for residents and teachers. There remain parents coming into the road and idling in car parking spaces/across driveways and across the school markings (though I believe it is much better than this used to be).
Crescent Road 6325148	AGREE	It restricts access to local residents which is an infringement on their rights to have access to their property, good and services. Students should only be dropped off by car if they are incapable of walking into school. These public roads for everyone to have access.
Crescent Road 6324917	AGREE	This is a good scheme which has already helped safety of school pupils and the ability of residents to park in their own street . It should be made permanent . At the moment the restrictions aren't being observed by every parent and some continue to drop off and pick up children to / from the Ursuline Convent during the hours when the restriction applies . Hopefully this will cease when APNR cameras have been installed in Crescent Road . But meanwhile it would be helpful if a parking officer from the borough staff could visit the road from time to time to scan the road for illegal parking . It is also the case that too many parking permits are provided unnecessarily to teachers and assistants at the school . These should only be provided to staff members who live a certain distance from the school - teachers living nearby should be discouraged from driving to work .

Southdown Drive 6325425	AGREE	---
Southdown Drive 6325447	AGREE	Has been working really well
Southdown Drive 6325420	AGREE	The scheme has greatly improved the area and benefits not only the environment with a much reduced amount of vehicles engines idling in not only Crescent Road and Worple Road but it is also a safer environment for Children. Crescent Road and Worple Road benefit from freely moving traffic.
Southdown Drive 6325012	AGREE	It concerns me greatly that visitors of residents and deliveries to those residents, who are not aware of the restrictions, would be fined. It's not enough to simply expect drivers to notice the signs or residents to inform everyone who could potentially visit them. I assume this is an attempt to stop the school run traffic clogging up and polluting the roads, not simply another money making scheme targeting legitimate visitors to residents. Trying to leave or gain access to my home at these times has always been a major problem, and also creates a potential problem for access by emergency vehicles, so I totally support the scheme. However, non school run traffic should not be penalised. And if fined, should at least have the opportunity to confirm who they were there visiting/ delivering to and any fines in these circumstances should of course be waived. It would be helpful to know that such instances would be treated as legitimate access.
Southdown Drive 6324900	AGREE	Comment not provided
Southdown Drive 6324828	AGREE	It has greatly improved the quality of life for local residents without the congestion in the road.
Southdown Drive 6325137	AGREE	Restriction of access to non- residents during the school run will prevent unhealthy car pollution, double parking in front of houses on the street and general congestion. Essential for residents!
Southdown Drive 6325556	AGREE	Comment not provided
Southdown Drive 6325429	AGREE	Comment not provided
Southdown Drive 6325428	AGREE	Comment not provided
Southdown Drive 6324765	AGREE	Implementing the school safety zone stops amazon and other deliveries, taxis and ubers, tradesmen and visitors during key journey times of the day for residents like me. The purpose of the scheme, I understand, is to 'improve' air quality for the students as they walk or cycle to school. However, Crescent Road/Southdown Drive is a cul-de-sac that has no through traffic and usually is very quiet outside of school drop-off times. Furthermore, Crescent Road runs off Worple Road, a busy traffic route filled with vehicles, including HGVs, during these peak journey times. I would argue that Worple Road is a greater risk to the students' health than walking along Crescent Road to the school gates, a 3-minute walk for fit young students keen to get to school. Moreover, this scheme is unlikely to encourage bicycling, certainly not among the Ursuline students (has a survey been conducted to establish how practical cycling is for these students?) I have never witnessed a student ride to the Ursuline on a bike (and I have lived on this street for 12 years). Most Ursuline students commute to school by bus or are dropped off by their parents. Many get off at the stop near the Sainsbury Local to buy confectionary before school, an eight to 10-minute walk from the school gates. That's quite a long time walking along a busy main road during rush-hour, where there are no schemes in place to prevent emissions from vehicles. The scheme is, from my point of view, ineffective, poorly administered and disruptive. As a resident, the registration

		process to drive up my own street without getting fined during 'zone times' was painful and disjointed. I have had deliveries delayed; I have had one delivery driver park on Worple Road and carry parcels to my door in the snow and ice because he feared incurring a fine. I've had to walk to the end of Crescent Road from my house in bad weather to meet an Uber driver because he wouldn't drive up the street. And when we're allowed to have v.....
Crescent Road 6325381	DISAGREE	Most of the flats in this block (mine included) are rented. The workman and visitors including our landlords etc will not have access to our car park area during prime work hours. During lockdown this has been vital for me to have my support bubble drive over and park in my spot around the same time as the afternoon school restrictions as this corresponds nicely with our working hours/sunlight. While lockdown will eventually ease, my need as someone living alone to have visitors drive over is vital to my mental wellbeing. Additionally with rented flats most change occupancy every 6-12 months making it harder to register a permanent car. I do not have a car but frequently use Zipcar & rented services. Again this would make it impossible for me to use my own car park space as a rented car cannot easily be registered for access since it will not always be the same car registration. I would also not be able to move in or out of rented accommodation within these times, making house moving very impractical. I would recommend that if any restrictions are taken, they are started after the 2 blocks of flats at the beginning of the street to allow us access but not prohibit the efforts around the school which is further down the road.
Crescent Road 6344095	DISAGREE	While it may stop additional congestion in the road arising from unnecessary school traffic, it is too over-reaching in its impact on the residents and their right to access to their homes - not just as residents themselves (who can be white-listed), but all their necessary and at times vital support - e.g. emergency tradesmen, parents / in-laws picking up and looking after their grandchildren, friends and family visitors etc. We are already subject to controlled parking which already limits visitor congestion. There really should be a way for bona fide residents to be allowed (perhaps through secure verified log-in) to make temporary additions to the 'white-list' (which might automatically expire at the end of each day?) to allow them to continue their normal lives and freedoms.
Crescent Road 6323998	DISAGREE	Please advise how visitors to my property during the restricted periods showed gain access without penalty - ie workmen?
Crescent Road 6345739	DISAGREE	While I agree the restrictions are generally a good idea to reduce pollution and for the safety of the school children and I am happy with the general implementation, I feel it is too rigid for the residents as it does not allow for exceptional situations where access is required for family, tradesmen and visitors etc. These would be rare occurrences and I think the council should be flexible and not issued fines in these circumstances.
Crescent Road 6346682	DISAGREE	Bizarrely the busiest roads where there is most pollution and which are the most dangerous are excluded from the scheme. It is apparent that roads have not been chosen with regard to either existing pollution levels or safety risk but by ease of implementation. This is therefore blatant discrimination. Vehicle movements, including visitors, deliveries and tradesmen, to residential addresses in Crescent Road are insignificant and pose no significant safety or pollution risk. Penalising residents for such movements cannot be justified either in logic or in equity. The experience of residents of Crescent Road SW20 is that the restriction imposed by Merton Council can be unduly onerous. Residents are protected by the Human Rights Act, under which they are specifically entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes, which includes travelling to and fro and receiving visitors etc, without undue interference from the authorities. The School Streets scheme as currently operated amounts to a disproportionate restriction of residents of Crescent Road and is contrary to the Human Rights Act. The restrictions should only apply to vehicle movements associated with the Ursuline High. Instead of automatically issuing PCNs I suggest that 1. A Notice of Potential Contravention [NPC] should be issued requiring the vehicle owner to justify the movement of their vehicle in the School Street within restricted hours. 2. The NPC itself would list examples of

		allowable movements, which would include visiting a residential address 3. A sample of such justifications could be checked with residents 4. In the absence of reasonable justification a PCN would be issued 5. Fraudulent justifications would receive a large fine It is impractical to expect residents to apply in advance for vehicle exemptions. Merton Council must either implement a scheme which respects the full rights of residents, or abandon the scheme in Crescent Road.
Crescent Road 6347966	DISAGREE	The negative impact of this scheme to me, as a resident, has far outweighed its benefits. During the restricted times, I have been unable to return home in a work colleague's car or in a friend's car. My son has been unable to car share to his workplace in Basingstoke. We have suffered a family crisis and it was very distressing to have to discuss it with 'Parking Permit' personnel in order to arrange access to our home for support. To allow residents to carry on their daily lives, there needs to be a simple process for residents to input car registration numbers that can then be removed from PCN data. The Council needs to realise that this scheme has caused much anxiety and disruption to some residents and it is essential for an exemption process to be implemented - the software is already used by TFL and Ringo. Living in a lovely home does not make us immune to life's challenges and the Council has disregarded our absolute need for visitors to access our homes during the restricted times. Thanking you for your consideration.
Crescent Road 6347579	DISAGREE	While I agree with the aims of the scheme its implementation is wholly and completely unacceptable as a resident. It means I am unable to arrange for pick up or drop offs for my school children, and impacts my ability to work if I am the only person who is able to use the road. There must be a process that allows for exemptions on behalf of the residents to allow for the often unpredictable changes life throws at you, and enabling this for the residents of the road would in no way compromise the aims of the scheme, but until the needs of the residents including myself are met I remain opposed to the scheme.
Crescent Road 6348263	DISAGREE	We live on Crescent Road, opposite Ursuline High School, a residential street of approximately 22 houses. In principle, most of the residents of Crescent Road backed the school streets scheme. The stated aims of improving air quality and enhancing the environment for everyone seemed very positive, as well as reducing congestion and the risk of collisions within the vicinity of the school. Crescent Road is part of a cul-de-sac so would get very congested in the half an hour before the school starts at 8:35am and when it finishes at 3:05pm with parents dropping off and picking up the secondary school students. Becoming a designated school street seemed a safer solution for the 1400 girls that attend Ursuline High School and would also mean that us, the residents, would enjoy a quieter street and would reduce pollution for everyone. However, the implementation has been nothing short of draconian. Merton Council say they are committed to accommodating residents. We understood that this would mean rearranging deliveries and not receiving visitors between 8 and 9am and 2:45 and 4pm. What we did not anticipate was the enormous and unfair disruption. Trying to apply for the exemption pass has not been easy. One of the residents was issued with a fine because they had been unable to complete it online and were discouraged from coming in person to the Merton Civic Centre due to Covid. When they needed to leave the house during one of the designated times - because they had been asked to come in early to her volunteering commitment on behalf of Merton - they were issued a fine. Several others have also been issued with £130 penalty charge notices (PCN) when trying to get on with their daily lives. One of the residents - a working mother with primary age children - was penalised when she unable to get home from work and asked her mother to drive from Surrey to look after the children at the last minute. Another resident has had a particularly difficult time trying to
Crescent Road 6346780	DISAGREE	To reduce road traffic, I have been doing car shares to work and have had to stop doing this during school term time. For the Council to put such restrictions in place to stop school traffic, it is only responsible and reasonable that the Council have a system in place so that residents are not negatively impacted as a result. On a day when I was unwell recently and needed to be brought home from work early by my colleague, it was upsetting and ridiculous that I either had to walk up my road or

		pay a £65 fine.
Crescent Road 6345752	DISAGREE	While I strongly agree with the principal of restricting motorised access to these streets during school morning opening and afternoon closing periods I very strongly disagree in how they are being implemented to the detriment of residents on these roads. And these is a common feeling amongst the other residents of our street - Crescent Road. I very strongly agree with the stated aims of improving air quality and enhancing the environment as well as reducing congestion and the risk of collisions within the vicinity of schools. Crescent Road where I live is part of a cul-de-sac so would get very congested in the half hour before school starts and half an hour after it finished in the afternoon. The school street scheme seemed a safer solution for the 1400 girls that attend Ursuline High School and would also mean the residents would enjoy a quieter street and would reduce pollution for everyone. However, the implementation has been nothing short of draconian. It is very difficult to use our street for two and a quarter hours of each business day. This seems much longer than necessary and longer than many of the other school streets in Merton. On Fridays the girls at Ursuline High School go home at lunchtime but this is not reflected in the restricted times. Trying to apply for the exemption pass has not been easy. And the issuing of PCNs to various residents has been very unfair when they are just trying to live their lives. We feel like we are now being punished for living on a street with a school on it.
Crescent Road 6344026	DISAGREE	The Council clearly have the right to impose School Streets, but equally under the Human Rights Act https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/human-rights/human-rights-act "Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions" and this explicitly includes one's home. The Council can impose restrictions for the purposes of public safety, but such restrictions must be proportionate. The Council's safety objective is achieved by excluding non-residents during restricted hours. However whilst residents are entitled to exemptions for their own cars, there are times when residents will have unavoidable visits during restricted periods. For example a friend or relative taking a child resident in the road to a school situated elsewhere or delivering such child back. Also residents often do not have control over precise timing of commercial deliveries. Residents must be able to have such external vehicular access without penalty. Crescent Road is a small road and the number of such exemptions will have no material impact on the Council achieving its objectives of reducing congestion, pollution and providing a safe environment within the vicinity of the Ursuline High School. Not to provide for the suggested additional exemptions would cause a degree of inconvenience to residents totally disproportionate to the benefits that Merton seek to achieve. To date Merton Council have been obdurate in not allowing such exceptions. This is unacceptable. Residents must be allowed peaceful enjoyment of their homes. Please ensure that residents are given the associated exemptions noted above. It is noted that the formulation and management of such a system of additional exemptions will impose additional cost on Merton Council, but it will be necessary for the Council to shoulder such additional burden if it is not to contravene the Human Rights Act and run the significant risk of legal action.
Crescent Road 6346673	DISAGREE	It affects all of our daily life
Crescent Road 6325377	DISAGREE	I strongly disagree with the school street because I have not seen evidence that shows it has had a beneficial impact on the environment, or improved the health and safety of local families, in both our road and surrounding roads. I think if the goal is to minimise car use locally, good public transport links and education are a better way forward. I dislike the extra street furniture and think the signage at the end of the road is too complicated, as drivers have to know the exact time of day and know whether it's term time (which lots of people don't) and then make a quick decision, possibly forcing them to turn back into the main road. If there is evidence to show that this is the best way to improve the local environment and health and safety of young children, I might change my mind.

Crescent Road 6325674	DISAGREE	<p>With the covid-19 pandemic there is much more reliance on deliveries and online shopping therefore it is unreasonably impractical to restrict vehicular access to Crescent Road. There are many delivery companies e.g. Hermes, DPD, Royal Mail where it is not possible to demand/exclude delivery time slots. If access is not available at the time of delivery then parcels would be taken back to the depot and would require residents to make unnecessary trips to retrieve the undelivered items. During this uncertain time over the next year or more, when contact with others are supposed to be restricted you are putting residents at risk of catching & spreading covid-19 as well as increasing the local pollution levels in forcing residents to make unnecessary trips to depots. If deliveries are re-attempted on a different day, this will increase the pollution levels locally. In addition if emergency services like plumbers, electricians, builders etc need to be called out by residents, by stipulating restricted access time it will put tradespeople off from accepting the job. If estate agents wish to show properties to a prospective buyer/tenant and have to exclude times when access can't be provided then this will put off buyers/tenants off from wanting to live on Crescent Road. This may lead to a devaluation of properties on Crescent Road. It seems that the root cause are parents wanting to drop off their children using cars and therefore it should be the School's responsibility to man the entrance to the street and prevent any parents with their cars from accessing Crescent Road. It would be better to devise a scheme where the council gives the School new powers (like a traffic warden) to fine parents who enter Crescent Road with their cars to drop off/pick up their children. It is not fair to penalise the residents of the street for the behaviour & actions of a few parents. The current ill-conceived proposal is un-workable long term and should be removed as soon as</p>
Crescent Road 6325672	DISAGREE	<p>With the covid-19 pandemic there is much more reliance on deliveries and online shopping therefore it is unreasonably impractical to restrict vehicular access to Crescent Road. There are many delivery companies e.g. Hermes, DPD, Royal Mail where it is not possible to demand/exclude delivery time slots. If access is not available at the time of delivery then parcels would be taken back to the depot and would require residents to make unnecessary trips to retrieve the undelivered items. During this uncertain time over the next year or more, when contact with others are supposed to be restricted you are putting residents at risk of catching & spreading covid-19 as well as increasing the local pollution levels in forcing residents to make unnecessary trips to depots. If deliveries are re-attempted on a different day, this will increase the pollution levels locally. In addition if emergency services like plumbers, electricians, builders etc need to be called out by residents, by stipulating restricted access time it will put tradespeople off from accepting the job. If estate agents wish to show properties to a prospective buyer/tenant and have to exclude times when access cant be provided then this will put off buyers/tenants off from wanting to live on Crescent Road. This may lead to a devaluation of properties on Crescent Road. It seems that the root cause are parents wanting to drop off their children using cars and therefore it should be the School's responsibility to man the entrance to the street and prevent any parents with their cars from accessing Crescent Road. It would be better to devise a scheme where the council gives the School new powers (like a traffic warden) to fine parents who enter Crescent Road with their cars to drop off/pick up their children. It is not fair to penalise the residents of the street for the behaviour & actions of a few parents. The current ill-conceived proposal is un-workable long term and should be removed as soon as</p>
Crescent Road 6325020	DISAGREE	<p>It's not practical, given the number of services, deliveries and trades people who need to use the road. For drivers, it's too much information to digest (day of the week, times, is it school term?) before turning into the road. In some cases fines will be passed onto residents (e.g. by trades people). My other observation is that, with reduced car traffic, school pupils have taken to loitering in the street, which is a hazard for any vehicles who are using the road.</p>
Crescent Road 6324709	DISAGREE	<p>It is essential for cars to access our house during hours of restriction for several important circumstances including: car share to/from work; collection/drop off of school run car share; visits from elderly parents who then are accompanied to/from appointments; collection/drop off of items relating to our business operation; collection/drop off of pets by dog walkers; to name a few. The system must allow</p>

		residents to log in and input the number plate(s) of such visitors to our homes, as and when required. Otherwise, the system is an infringement of access to and from our homes. Also, I would be interested to know for how long the data is captured and stored and how this affects data protection laws.
Crescent Road 6324763	DISAGREE	In my opinion this restriction is more about collecting fines than the safety of either children or the residents, or the air pollution or the often used excuse under the name of 'covid'. I hope that the Councillors have taken into consideration that the children are now dropped in Worple road causing traffic jams with children running around all over the place getting in and out of cars. When, and I think it is when not if, a child gets caught up in an accident I hope that the Councillors will personally take responsibility for having caused the situation
Crescent Road 6344912	DISAGREE	I strongly disagree with restricted access for resident visitors as I have a car share with colleagues at work. I can't be part of the car share as the timings conflict with pickup. Also, I often have hired kit pickup and drop offs which timing do not help the client, so I am losing out of business. There must be a exception process In place for residents to be able to live and function on a Daily basis
Southdown Drive 6324792	DISAGREE	deliveries cannot be exactly scheduled to fit in with your school street timing. You cannot expect delivery personnel to park in another street and have to walk up Crescent Road to Southdown Drive. Also, mini-cab or taxi used by people living in Crescent Road & Southdown Drive, should be allowed during school street timing if transporting a passenger living in these street/drive. Plate recognition would not work and is therefore not sufficient. There has been no incident with school children and cars so why this unwanted time restriction
Southdown Drive 6325917	DISAGREE	If there is a problem with school traffic that should be dealt with, without banning deliveries and visitors to residents for 2 hours & 15 minutes every week day. For example the school could monitor traffic in Crescent Rd at the start and end of the school day, and speak to the parents causing the problem. NB. The largest concentration of traffic occurs on a Saturday morning when the Polish School is in residence. There should be a way for residents to exempt visitors from the school street hours of operation.
Southdown Drive 6324725	DISAGREE	(i) That a one-way traffic system be implemented for vehicles to enter The Downs from Ridgway and exit at Worple Road end. This will provide for parents to drop-off their children at the Ursuline High School entrance on The Downs and pick them up from the same point in the afternoon. If the children need to enter/leave the school from the Crescent Road entrance, then, they can walk the few metres along the footpath between Southdown Drive and the school. The footpath is safe, is lit during dusk and there is a security CCTV.
Southdown Drive 6325017	DISAGREE	The problem is not going to be solved by stopping vehicles entering the road. You will simply have moved the congestion to Worple Road where the very same children we be dropped by parents. The congestion will create more pollution than leaving the road as it is. Have you polled parents on their likelihood to require their kids no longer to rely on lifts but instead to cycle in? By contrast the inconvenience to residents will far outweigh the current problem of getting past the cars entering the road. By denying access during the times specified you are restricting deliveries, collection by taxi or mini cab, tradesmen etc. You are making it harder for the people who live here to go about their normal lives based on restricting access by legitimate visitors. We have already had a delivery man walk up the road having parked up at the bottom and another refuse to deliver to our door. What happens when we need furniture delivered? What evidence have you gathered that tells you this is a solution to a problem? The problem would best be addressed by improving public transport, not penalising residents, damaging the attractiveness of their homes and probably having an impact on the values. Please think about alternative solutions to this very blunt instrument.
Cottenham Park 6325427	AGREE	That road gets extremely congested, limiting traffic is an excellent idea
Lansdowne Close 6325435	AGREE	As a No through road, Crescent Road used to be totally jammed at the beginning and end of each school day, with consequent pollution as cars were idling. Total transformation now.

Oakhill Court 6324323	AGREE	I strongly support the schemes to reduce traffic on school streets during the beginning and end of school. The council have a duty to ensure pupils, parents and staff can travel to the school safely and to encourage active travel and the reduce the reliance on private vehicles for short journeys as much as possible. Please consider doing the same for edge hill.
The Downs 6300333	AGREE	In order for the School Streets programme to be effective for the Ursuline (and indeed Neighbouring Ursuline Prep and The Hall), a school street needs to be in place on The Downs. To close off Crescent Road to through traffic should not be the definition of a successful scheme here - it is not a through road. Meanwhile, a major entrance to Ursuline, and their main car park sits on The Downs which continues to have the usual high volumes of through traffic and parental parking.... and pollution too. I understand that the decision to make The Downs a school street was not approved by the incumbent councillor due to concerns from the schools - but given the sucess of the roll out of schools treets across the borough, and fantastic stories of more children and teachers walking / cycling to school - I would ask you to please reconsider this road as a School Street. Thank you
Tolverne Road 6347850	AGREE	This response is on behalf of Merton Residents Transport Group (MRTG). We strongly support the school street at Ursuline High. School streets such as this one play a critical role in reducing road danger to children, improving air quality and enabling walking, cycling and scooting for a wider range of people of different ages doing the school run. They additionally reduce the number of motor vehicle journeys, lower pollution near the school, and reduce congestion. Additionally, we would encourage Merton to take further measures to enhance the visibility and effectiveness of the school street: - Ensure consistent enforcement with the use of permanent cameras; these could pay for themselves and provide funds to further enhance the school street - Create new areas of trees and soft landscaping into the carriageway space - these could be parklets, pocket parks or planters to improve the air quality, sustainable drainage to reduce risk of flooding. - Install planters at the entrance to the school street to narrow the road width and create a gateway into the school street, enhancing its presence - Provide signage at a lower height, and more clearly delineate the zone Additionally we continue to advocate for the closure of Lower Downs Road to motor vehicle traffic at the railway bridge, to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly children travelling to Ursuline High and schools on The Downs and Edge Hill. We look forward to the continued safety and health benefits arising from the school street, and encourage Merton to further expand the scheme to schools not currently covered. Sincerely, MRTG
Devas Road 6344592	DISAGREE	I disagree with the restricted motorised vehicular access because the street, Cambridge Road in front of the school, is broad and can accommodate pedestrians and vehicles, just as it accommodates pedestrians and cyclists now. The cyclists speed. The pedestrians are not careful and cross the street while looking at their phones and not being watchful of the children. The signage is illegal as it is hidden until you turn into the street, emergency brake and can cause an accident in Pepys Road, which is still a 30 MPH zone. Signage is needed in Pepys Road before the turning. Also, the trees and their foliage hide the signs. (I have not been ticketed, but am concerned by the devious nature of the Council.)
Burstow Road 6347036	DISAGREE	There are 9 schools in this and surrounding streets. Will you be restricting access to just streets with state schools? This will push traffic accessing the other schools onto the neighbouring streets causing higher levels of air pollution to those pupils and residents. This is not well thought through and another solution should be found.
Edge Hill 6346377	DISAGREE	My child goes Ursuline Prep school - in which many of the students attending are not local to Wimbledon. Restricting access to the school could potentially impact enrolment in the school which is already under strain. Please keep this restriction away from Edge Hill as this will have negative financial implications to the school. In favour of a one way system around Edge Hill and The Downs to keep traffic flowing better but closing it off completely will cause chaos on the road which are already jam packed. Please re-think this.
Lower Downs	DISAGREE	I live a road away from the school, traffic on my road during school times is

Road 6307638		horrendous. Parents will now use my road to drop their children off if they cannot get access. My road is a single file railway bridge with little room to maneuver with but carriages during rush hour as it is. If the road to Ursuline is blocked, my road will be used as a drop off zone which will have a huge effect on the traffic flow
Pepys Road 6346908	DISAGREE	There is apparently a live statutory consultation on the scheme which is due to end on 31 July 2021, however very few people know about this and it is certainly not a transparent or democratic process. I recently contacted Mitra Dubet of Future Merton regarding exemptions for residents, as several of us did not receive the necessary information to apply for these. In her reply she stated that newsletters to residents were sent in September 2020, however it is unclear how many 'newsletters' were sent to local residents and over how wide an area, and from conversations with people living in the area it would seem the answer is very few. X also stated as follows: Residents were also advised that all updates would be available on the website - https://www.merton.gov.uk/streets-parking-transport/traffic-management/school-streets-programme The statutory consultation that started in October 2020 is still live until 31st July 2021. A final decision regarding the school street is yet to be made. If you have not already, you are advised to make your representation using the on line feedback link https://consult.merton.gov.uk/kms/elab.aspx?noip=1&CampaignId=809 Without the above information I would not be aware that the consultation is closing in a week's time. The link to the website states that notices regarding the consultation will be posted in the street, however there are no such notices in Cambridge Road and there never have been since October 2020 when the consultation is said to have started. This scheme affects everyone in the local area, not just residents of Cambridge Road, and if a consultation is in progress then I believe all local residents should be properly informed and given the chance to comment. This has not been the case so far, and it would seem the council is not keen to advertise the fact that the consultation is due to close at the end of July. It is not acceptable to expect people to seek updates on a website they
Ridgway 6325234	DISAGREE	This will simply push traffic onto surrounding streets which are already blocked with school traffic. There are around 8 or 9 schools less than a mile away. Most within 100s of yards away. The only way is to prevent all school traffic coming off the ridgeway and the roads up and down the hills to wireless road. Between Wimbledon hill road to cottenham park road. Anything else is just squeezing a bump to create another bump a few hundred yards away.
Wimbledon Close 6266902	DISAGREE	You already charge us for resident parking and fine us for any infringement however you ignore the nonresidents, mainly schoolchildren's parents dropping off their children and using our resident parking areas without any penalties and on many occasions belligerent parents attitude. Now, you are restricting our parking and access further by closing off the roads which in my opinion is a disgraceful misuse of council powers. If the council spent more time in managing the appalling congestion caused by the parents and not by the residents, there would be no need for road closures. This scheme is just a fantasy dreamt up by time and money wasters responding to a small number of WOKE individuals.
Worple Road 6324847	DISAGREE	The onus of this problem should really fall more with the school, but seems like your proposal to implement this scheme has a much higher impact on the resident. I would urge you to please consider other suggestions before going "down this road".
Worple Road 6325662	DISAGREE	Imposing the restriction on Crescents road during 8-9am and 2.45-4pm will cause even more traffic on worple road, where there are no cameras. Secondly, Motorcycles do not have emissions big enough to even be detected, so it is not harming the environment. Worple road is jammed as it is during rush hours, and adding this time restriction will cause even more traffic jams.
Worple Road 6347247	DISAGREE	It's too confusing for motorist to be expected to follow all these complicated rules and see the signage etc especially if new to an area and i am concerned there will be an unintended adverse impact on the environment (yes you can care about the environment and need to own a car). These measures just worsen overall congestion by pushing traffic into other roads. I have not seen any concrete evidence, despite searching online, to reassure that these scheme do not worsen pollution which I would expect as they force cars to be on the road for longer than

		needed in order to detour and traffic builds on alternative roads as ultimately total car volume is not reduced. As a resident with a parking permit for this road i do not support the scheme introduction, I do not want restricted access for a road I contribute to heavily via taxation, parking permits etc and I would like my visitors, tradespeople, carers etc to be able to drive to me without risk of getting fined in the event they have inadvertently gone down a schools street. If you're from another area you may not even know what schools streets are a thing and so unlikely to be on alert to look for those signs - there are already so many signs/orders eg variable speed limits, parking restrictions, heavy goods vehicle restrictions etc there is a limit on what drivers can realistically process whilst safely keeping an eye on the road and all the going on there. I don't think ant be editing to schools of the Scheme is significant enough to outweigh the negative of sequences of school streets. With all of these things I do work der whether there is any point filling these consultations is as the outcome already feels set in stone and these consultations feel just paying lip service to consulting residents. I hope that you actually take into account all feedback and are willing to not go ahead if the consultation says so, even if it goes against the council's preferences. Until then I remain cynical.
Worple Road 6325136	DISAGREE	Visitors to residents are not part of the problem and should not form part of the solution. This problem should be addressed more directly. Many elderly and sickly residents in our building rely on taxis and friends to help get around for shopping, appointments etc. This will add massive inconvenience and unnecessary stress to their lives. Preventing access to residents properties for over 10 hours a week is unacceptable!
Worple Road 6325146	DISAGREE	As an elderly lady of 85, I have lived in this building for over 20 years, I am completely opposed to this scheme as it will significantly effect my life.
Merton Hall Road 6323290	AGREE	I lived in Southdown Road for 5 years, and saw and experienced dreadful levels of traffic during school hours. There were many times I was unable to get in or out of my road by car, often with a young baby in the back. It was unpleasant and noisy, and I would fully support traffic being restricted
East Road 6313773	DISAGREE	---
Hogarth Crescent 6260589	DISAGREE	My daughter attends Ursuline Prep primary school The Downs as our local primary schools were heavily oversubscribed, We live 2.6 miles away our school start time is 8:10am but during this corona virus pandemic school buses only start at 7:30am which would make us late. can we not implement until the covid-19 is over !
Leeward Gardens 6329777	DISAGREE	Will make life very difficult for grandparents like ourselves doing childcare duties.
Westway 6344935	DISAGREE	The idea to close The Downs would affect the viability of two of the schools. Many families attend from far away which would make it prohibitive for them to attend. Furthermore this incentive will just push the traffic onto neighbouring roads as it has done in the other areas in Merton and Wandsworth that are trialing this scheme.
Brickhouse Lane 6347019	DISAGREE	I understand this scheme will have a severe impact on the people living in the United Response Home in the Road. The restriction times stated at the end of the road are incorrect in any case. People living in the home could need urgent medical attention, a taxi, or other transport to take them to and from appointments, medical or otherwise. They cannot walk or get public transport. Badly thought out scheme!! Review please!
Mandrake Road 6344923	DISAGREE	There are 3 schools on The Downs, two of which are private meaning that families do not travel from local areas. By restricting cars, this will prohibit many pupils from being able to attend the school. I have 3 children under 6 that I take on the school run in the morning from tooting. It would not be possible for me to either walk, cycle or take public transport. Families will still drive but the congestion will be pushed out to neighbouring roads. I strongly disagree with this proposal.
Mandrake Road 6344929	DISAGREE	Many of the schools including the one our daughters attend are private schools with large catchments and primary school children can't use public transport independently - the only way to get these children to School is by private motor vehicle Closing the road doesn't just inconvenience those students - it moves the problem To adjacent roads - on that basis the rationale is flawed

Southdown Drive
London, SW20 8EZ

2 September 2021

Dear Neighbour,

Results from my School Street survey

Of the 72 homes in the Crescent Road / Southdown Drive cul-de-sac I received responses from 48 (66%), as follows:

Crescent Road	22	(100%)
Southdown Drive	22	(88%)
Crescent House	3	(25%)
Daytone House	1	(8%)
	48	

The responses in respect of each of the 4 questions in the survey were:

Qt 1 Do you support the current school street arrangements?

13 (27%) Supported or Strongly supported
30 (63%) Against or Strongly against
5 (10%) Indifferent or Don't know

Of those Against or Strongly against, 23 would support a school street scheme if they were able to grant exemptions to visitors to their own homes.

Qt 2 Would you support the school street only operating for 30 minutes before the start of the school day?

15 (31%) Supported or Strongly supported
15 (31%) Against or Strongly against
18 (38%) Indifferent or Don't know

This is clearly inconclusive.

Qt 3 Would you support the school street only operating for 30 minutes either side of the end of the school day?

14 (30%) Supported or Strongly supported
17 (35%) Against or Strongly against
17 (35%) Indifferent or Don't know

This is also inconclusive. NB. Several residents commented on the fact that the Ursuline closes at 1:30pm on a Friday and yet the school street restrictions are from 2:45pm to 4:00pm.

Qt 4 Would you support the school street arrangements being extended to include Saturday?

5 (10%) Supported or Strongly supported
26 (55%) Against or Strongly against
17 (35%) Indifferent or Don't know

Residents do not support extending the school street arrangement to include Saturday. NB. Many residents commented favourably on the use of marshals by the Polish Saturday School to deter cars carrying their pupils from entering Crescent Road.

Conclusion and recommendation

63% of residents are against the current school street arrangements and 27% are in favour. However, if residents were able to grant exemptions to visitors to their own homes, 75% would be in favour and 15% against.

I will therefore recommend that unless residents are able to exempt their visitors, the Ursuline School Street Scheme should be decommissioned.

Best wishes,



Stephen Crowe
Raynes Park Ward Councillor
stephen.crowe@merton.gov.uk

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

2. Which of the principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution has not been applied? (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution - tick all that apply:

(a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);	
(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;	
(c) respect for human rights and equalities;	
(d) a presumption in favour of openness;	
(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes;	
(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;	
(g) irrelevant matters must be ignored.	

3. Desired outcome

Part 4E Section 16(f) of the constitution- select one:

(a) The Panel/Commission to refer the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns.	
(b) To refer the matter to full Council where the Commission/Panel determines that the decision is contrary to the Policy and/or Budget Framework	
(c) The Panel/Commission to decide not to refer the matter back to the decision making person or body *	
* If you select (c) please explain the purpose of calling in the decision.	

4. Evidence which demonstrates the alleged breach(es) indicated in 2 above (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution:

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

7. Signed (not required if sent by email):

8. Notes – see part 4E section 16 of the constitution

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council.

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision.

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent:

- **EITHER** by email from a Councillor’s email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
- **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy and Electoral Services, 1st floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy and Electoral Services on 020 8545 3409