

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 - Hollymount Primary 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 – ETMO - Hollymount Primary school

Reason for exemption (if any) – N/A

Decision maker

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

Date of Decision

Date report made available to decision maker

15th November 2021

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.

Reason for decision

To maintain and further improve on reducing congestion, risk, pollution outside school gate and continue to encourage active travel.

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.

Documents relied on in addition to officer report

N/A

Declarations of Interest

N/A

Signature

Martin Whelton

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: 15th November 2021

Agenda item: N/A

Wards: Raynes Park

Subject: School Streets – ETMO - Hollymount Primary 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 Mon-Fri Term times only
Hollymount Primary school	Cambridge Rd, SW20 (between Pepys Rd & Lambton Rd)	8.15 -9.15am 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 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 during September 2020.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with making the Experimental Traffic Management Order (ETMO) permanent and retain the School Street for Hollymount Primary school.
- 1.3 This will ensure that vehicular traffic / congestion remains to an absolute minimum; improve road safety / perceived safety, reduced risk and air quality is retained particularly for children outside the school gate during school term time.

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. 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) to 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 [Introducing new school streets 2020 \(merton.gov.uk\)](https://www.merton.gov.uk/news/2020/09/2020-09-16-introducing-new-school-streets-2020)

- 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 including Hollymount Primary school. Cabinet Member decision was made to implement the school street 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 behavior, any survey at the time would not have yielded a true reflection.

3.0 SCHEME

- 3.1 To improve safety and air quality; to encourage active travel and in response to the pandemic, the Council introduced the following school street to include Hollymount Primary school. The school street restricts motorised traffic during specific times based on schools’ starting and finishing times. The restrictions only apply during school term periods.

School	Restricted Roads	Restricted periods Mon-Fri Term times only
Hollymount Primary school	Cambridge Rd, SW20 (between Pepys Rd & Lambton Rd)	8.15 -9.15am 2.45 -4.00pm

- 3.2 Initially the Council intended to use default period of 08.15 - 09.15am and 15.00-16.00hrs. However, the hours are based on the school’s 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 15 minutes.
- 3.3 During these periods, the section of Cambridge Road as set out within the above table is predominately ‘pedestrian and cycle only’ zone. Residents who live within this section of the affected road 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 as 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 schools, residents and other road users to experience the restrictions, thereby allowing

them to make an informed decision prior to responding to the consultation. 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 those properties within the catchment area (see plan in appendix 3). 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 banners set out the details of the restrictions and affected roads. The schools were 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 a total of 152 representations. There were 20 representations from Cambridge Rd, of which 8 are in support, 11 against and one unsure. However, it should be noted that including the school and the substation, there are only 4 residential properties within the restricted section of Cambridge Rd that are directly affected. The numbers, therefore, demonstrate the potential number of residents who wish to use this section of Cambridge Rd rather than using an alternative route that avoids driving past the school.
 - 4.4.1 There were 60 responses from those roads immediately adjacent to Cambridge Road in close proximity to the school, of which 42 are in support and 18 against.
 - 4.4.2 There were 45 responses from the wider Raynes Park and West Wimbledon area of which 25 are in support, 19 against and 1 unsure.
 - 4.4.3 There were 23 responses from from Worple Road area and to the south of Raynes Park, of which 15 are in support and 8 objections. There were four responses from outside the borough, with 3 in support and 1 objection.
- 4.5 Although there is a clear majority in favour of the proposals in principle, many commented on the quality and effectiveness of the signage. Many feel that the scheme and the way it was implemented to be unfair and that there was insufficient warning of the restriction, not allowing people time to take an alternative route and drivers are not offered a safe opportunity to avoid the restricted area. The signs are considered to be too high and wordy, with drivers being unable to safely interpret and act upon whilst driving. There is also dissatisfaction with the perceived ambiguity of hours of operation. Many have commented on the requirement for better enforcement.
- 4.6 Some feel that the project is about income generation through PCNs and other safety measures should be considered, such as zebra crossings outside the school and at the junction with Durham Road.
- 4.7 Whilst there is support for the scheme, there is concern that the junction with Lambton Road has become unsafe, with Pepys Road to a lesser extent, because the problem has been displaced into

the surrounding roads. Many feel that although the traffic problems are caused by parents of school children, it is the local residents who are being penalised. There is scepticism in terms of a reduction in pollution and the suggestion that with Cambridge Road being wide with good visibility, it is far more suitable for vehicles to park than other nearby narrower streets. Some feel that there are already a number of measures in place to reduce congestion and danger and that this scheme does not improve the situation.

4.8 Those who support the scheme do so mainly for the reasons it has been implemented, in that they feel it does make the road safer for children. It has been commented that the inconvenience is slight as there are easy alternative routes. There are some requests for the zone to be extended as this would better address some of the problems the current scheme is seen to be causing.

4.9 In response to the points raised above:

- One of the objective 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.
- School Streets and any other restriction do disperse the localised volume of vehicular traffic and obstructive parking from the vicinity of a school into surrounding roads and it is appreciated that some parents continue to resist the change and have found their way onto neighbouring roads. Since this area is subject to CPZ controls and parking without a permit is not permitted, this behavior can be addressed through 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 areas. With continued enforcement, it is considered that there will be a change in behavior albeit at a slower pace than expected.
- This scheme was not developed to generate income. In fact ANPR cameras were installed several months after implementation due to the fact that many motorists were found to be ignoring the restrictions. As with any moving contravention enforcement, level of contravention always falls as soon as motorists realise that they cannot continue to contravene the restrictions; any income therefore is short term. In response to those who have asked for better enforcement, due to limited available funding and the number of school streets, it has not been possible to have a fixed camera in place across all school streets. However, if the scheme is made permanent, consideration will be given to procuring additional ANPR cameras. Meanwhile apart from the ANPR cameras, the Council is also undertaking mobile enforcement.
- The restrictions are in line with the school's operating periods and it also allows for 15 additional minutes to capture the many parents who arrive early particularly during afternoon pick up periods.
- School Streets are predominately for those roads where it accommodates the school introduced primarily to minimise traffic outside school gates; it is not a form of parking management. The obstructive and illegal parking can be and is being addressed via parking enforcement. Additionally, it is extremely unlikely that the majority of the residents from those roads that do not have a school would accept the various associated restrictions that many consider as an imposition.
- The legal signs plus advance signs have been in place since Sept / Oct 2020 and are clearly visible. The signs at the entrance to the restricted roads fully comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TRSGD) (2016) and are also included in the Highway Code. School streets signs and restrictions are no different to any other moving contravention signs that motorists are obligated to abide by. These signs are used across London and motorists should be familiar with them and abide by them accordingly. There are also advance signs on each approach to the restrictions.

There are many school street related signs in the borough plus many more other moving contravention signs. It is not normal practice to have flashing beacons for any specific moving contravention. Flashers (beacons) are used on approach to schools to alert motorists of school children in the area. Many motorists would not associate such a feature with the restrictions; also there would be those who may complain about them being a distraction. Additionally, the required funding is not available and it is not something that we could consider.

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.

- All the residents who are directly affected by the restrictions were informed of the restrictions and they are exempt. 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. Those who have an alternative route cannot be exempt. To meet the objectives of the school street, it is necessary to minimise volume of traffic and it would not be possible to provide an exemption to anyone who has an alternative route. Additionally, this will do nothing to encourage a change in behavior.
- The purpose 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 motorists are discouraged to drive during the peak periods, there will be reduced traffic on route to and from the restricted roads. Some may even consider a different mode of travel during these periods. Another objective is to improve road safety and perception of road safety not only for pupils attending the school, but also for other road users, residents and their visitors. This can be achieved by minimising volume of traffic past the school and remove the concentration of 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. Household 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.
- The school street restrictions do not prevent residents from accessing their homes, and the system makes provision for exemptions under certain circumstances. 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.
- Other road safety measures including those mentioned by some residents are on our programme but can only be progressed once funding becomes available.

4.10 All statutory bodies have been consulted and no objections have been raised.

4.11 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. The Ward Councillors have made the following comments:

1. Fundamental unfairness - the piecemeal introduction of school streets is fundamentally unfair. It is plainly wrong that access to certain homes should be restricted for 2 hours & 45 minutes each school day on the grounds of ease of implementation i.e. school streets are not being implemented across the whole Borough but only where consequential traffic disruption is easily accommodated, albeit to the annoyance of residents in the immediate vicinity.
2. Whilst the rationale for school streets appears theoretically sound, we are not convinced that this is the case in practice because: (i) motorists are "driving around" the school street thereby adding to pollution, and (ii) dropping-off and picking-up is being concentrated into the "dead-end" at each end of the school street. Of course, if the number of pupils travelling to school by car dropped significantly these dangers would reduce, as of course would the rationale for having a school street in the first place.
3. Residents granting exemptions - the solution to the issue of fundamental unfairness (and many other objections) is to permit residents with valid school street permits to sign into RingGo and grant a 'one-day exemption' to any vehicle on the day that it "visits" the resident's home, in effect to cancel the PCN that would otherwise be automatically issued.
4. Natural justice demands that greatest weight should be given to the views of residents who reside in the school street. In the case of the Hollymount school street this is Cambridge Road from which there were 20 representations. Whilst only 5 properties are within the restricted section of Cambridge Rd, we consider that all 20 households that made representations are directly affected.
5. We note that, of the 20 representations from Cambridge Rd, 8 were in support, 11 were against and 1 was unsure. To our thinking this represents a clear rejection of the scheme by 11 to 8. We believe that the views of Cambridge Rd residents should not be set aside because of the views of those who live elsewhere.
6. In our opinion all households in Cambridge Rd, from the Durham Rd junction to the Pepys Rd junction, should be permitted to apply for school street permits because they have had one end of their stretch of Cambridge Rd closed. They should also be capable of granting exemptions to their visitors as per point 3 above.
7. We note and welcome the intention to "make the necessary improvements to the signage". We believe that, given this admission and intention, the Council should refund all PCN issued to date. We suggest installing signs with lights that flash when access is restricted.

In summary, in our opinion, the Hollymount School Street should only be made permanent if residents of Cambridge Rd, between the Durham Rd junction and the Pepys Rd junction, can grant exemptions to their visitors, as described above.

Officer's comments

1. Given the number of schools in the borough, the extremely limited available resource and time frame, it would be impossible to deliver a borough wide school street simultaneously; in fact, the Council has done exceptionally well in introducing the highest numbers of school streets in London. The School street programme (previously known as School safety zone) started in 2019 when the Council introduced 3 school streets. During the pandemic, TfL / DfT provided funding for certain transport related projects with school street being one. Funding was based on a successful bidding process and was subject to a very tight delivery time frame. Under normal circumstances, projects such as this are often introduced on a rolling programme over a number of financial years. There is an aspiration to introduce more school streets subject to available funding and consultation.

2. Please see comments in section 4.0 of this report regarding objectives of school street and encouraging a change in behavior.
3. For a school street to be effective, it is necessary to restrict movement of traffic and one way of achieving this is to minimise number of exemptions and encourage deliveries and visits using a vehicle are made outside the restricted periods. Although this may be inconvenient, it may lead to a change in behavior in that visitors may decide not to drive but use an alternative mode of travel; after all not everyone drives or has a car. It is appreciated that registering a vehicle could be inconvenient but the alternative would be to close the road to all traffic like some other boroughs have done.
4. Generally those residents who do not have any other alternative for vehicular access are classed as directly affected and those residents with alternative vehicular access regardless of a minor inconvenience are classed as indirectly affected. Within the statutory consultation, it is more about the reasons and validity of the objection.
5. Within a statutory consultation, consideration is given to the content / nature of the comments and the objective of the scheme. Unlike an informal consultation, it is not based on numbers of objections.
6. One of the objectives is to minimise volume of traffic past the school gate; by allowing anyone who can access their destination via an alternative route would be against what the Council is attempting to achieve and it will do nothing to change the mindset and encourage a change in behavior when using a motorised vehicle.
7. The legal signs plus advance signs on every approach have been in place since Sept / Oct 2020 and are clearly visible. The signs at the entrance to the restricted roads fully comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TRSGD) (2016) and are also included in the Highway Code. School streets signs and restrictions are no different to any other moving contravention signs that motorists are obligated to abide by. These signs are used across London and motorists should be familiar with them and abide by them accordingly.

There are many school street related signs in the borough plus many more other moving contravention signs. It is not normal practice to have flashing beacons / signs for any specific moving contravention. Flashers (beacons) are used on approach to schools to alert motorists of school children in the area. Many motorists would not associate such a feature with the restrictions; also there would be those who may complain about them being a distraction. The installation of any additional supplementary signs does not mean that the current signs are insufficient; they are being considered in some areas where additional signs may prove beneficial and further highlight the restrictions. Any additional sign would be over and above of what is required or necessary.

5. OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 When considering the outcome of the statutory consultation, consideration must be given to the nature and validity of the comments / representations and the Council's objectives.
- 5.2 It is considered that the benefits outweigh some of the inconveniences some residents / motorists may experience and every attempt will be made to address the negative impact on the surrounding roads. School streets are in line with other policies and initiatives across the Borough and London, and believed to be the right step toward changing behavior 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 motorists are discouraged to drive during the peak periods, there will be reduced traffic on

route to and from the restricted roads.

5.3 It is recommended that the permanent Order is made to retain the school street.

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 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.

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.

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 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 ([Dajnak, 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

SCHOOL STREETS

Restricted Vehicular access Hollymount 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



NOTES

1. ALL POSTS FOR SIGN BEING SPUN TO BE 60MM DIA, GALVANIZED, 4MM THK, 5.0M LONG, C/W BASE PLATE & CAPS.
2. ALL POSTS FOR SIGN BEING SPUN TO BE 75MM DIA, GALVANIZED, 5.5MM THK, 3.0M LONG, C/W BASE PLATE & CAPS.
3. ALL ZONE DRIVER SIGNS TO BE ROUNDED/FRUSTED AS RECOMMENDED.

KEY

- EX LAMP COLUMN
- EX POST & SIGN
- EX UL/WHITE BACK SIGN POST
- NEW POST & SIGN
- NEW SIGN
- EX TREE

School Streets

PEDESTRIAN and CYCLE ZONE

Mon - Fri
8.15 - 9.15 am
2.45 - 4.00 pm

Except for authorised vehicles

<p style="font-size: 8px;">Sustainable Communities CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">FUTURE WERTON</p>	<p style="font-size: 8px;">PROJECT: SCHOOL STREET RESTRICTED ACCESS HOLLYMOUNT</p>	<p style="font-size: 8px;">Client: NTS</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Map of Client: Client 14 New Point W14 5XJ www.nts.ie</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Contract: A CONSTRUCTION NTS</p>	<p style="font-size: 8px;">Scale: 1:1000</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Date: 10/10/18</p>	<p style="font-size: 8px;">Drawn: [Name]</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Checked: [Name]</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Approved: [Name]</p>	<p style="font-size: 8px;">Project No: [Number]</p> <p style="font-size: 8px;">Drawing No: [Number]</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

Road name	View	REPRESENTATIONS FROM CAMBRIDGE RD _ DIRECTLY AFFECTED
Cambridge Road 6344792	Disagree	I believe this scheme to be unnecessary and in fact detrimental to the neighbourhood and all who use it. Traffic restrictions for a few hundred metres will make little difference to parents and children travelling to the school. The junction of Cambridge and Lambton Roads is now dangerous, owing to drivers realising they cannot continue on Cambridge Road and making abrupt turns. Cars which would normally use Cambridge Road now have to divert to narrow nearby narrow roads. As for air quality and child health, an ice cream van with the engine running continues to park very close to the school. The scheme has been badly implemented. The residents most affected have never been informed about how to apply for exemptions, how to participate in the consultation, and even when it is actually in force. The signage is unclear and difficult to read, and adds to the mass of 'street furniture' already cluttering the pavements. Cambridge Road is already a 20 mph zone with humps, narrowings, and parking restrictions. That is enough.
Cambridge Road 6344261, 6344325	Disagree	I live opposite the school and other than receiving the first introductory letter, I have received no follow up and nor have my neighbours. The scheme is meant to improve the air through pupils/parents walking to school. In practice the surrounding roads are now congested with parents parking close to the school. There has not been a history of accidents involving children outside the school, so why the need for a safety zone now? The time period that the scheme is in operation after school is excessive. ----- I feel this unnecessary as there has not been a history of incidents. In addition I do not believe the notice of safety zone can be deemed as fair to motorists as the signage only appears at the start of the zone and is too high for a motorist to see as a driver would be looking at ground level for traffic and pedestrians. The displaced traffic is being forced to use neighbouring streets and therefore pollution in the area is not diminished. Parents are parking on double yellow lines at the junction of Cambridge and Lambton Roads creating danger to pedestrians. I do not believe the consultation has been adequately advertised to the local community.
		REPRESENTATIONS FROM CAMBRIDGE RD
Cambridge Road 6324248	Agree	School Streets are a very important way to keep children safe on their way to school and send out a vital message that the wishes of drivers are not paramount, despite what many of them may believe. If drivers cannot be trusted to do the right thing then it is duty of the council to impose restrictions. However, it is clear that there are problems with the School Street which need to be addressed. The signage is inadequate, the restriction should be introduced at the junction of Durham Road to give drivers more warning and to stop them all rerouting down Lambton Road and the fact a PCSO was almost hit by a vehicle shows there needs to be a physical barrier to adequately protect the children.
Cambridge Road 6324835	Agree	Create more visibility of the restriction on Pepys and Cambridge road to avoid cars getting nearer the school then realising they can't continue.
Cambridge Road 6324851	Agree	We live on Cambridge Road, diagonally across from the school. It is a great help to have no vehicular traffic on this section when crossing the road with nursery aged children. My only negative comment would be that it makes the section of Cambridge Road between Lambton Road and Durham Road quite congested and not very safe for cyclists and pedestrians.
Cambridge Road 6344551	Agree	It is very important that we restrict traffic round schools. This scheme is better than nothing, but it does not cover a wide enough area nor has it been properly publicised and enforced
Cambridge Road 6344697	Agree	The area round Hollymount school has become increasingly dangerous Cars do not respect the 20mph and there is also large commercial traffic and cars turning from Lampton Road
Cambridge Road 6344700	Agree	The school street should be extended to cover the road from Durham Road to Pepys Road.
Cambridge Road 6344687, 6324249, 6348270	Agree	The immediate area outside Hollymount at drop off and pick up time has been totally transformed. Parents are no longer parking on the crossing, zig zags or double yellows, or able to idle their engines. There's no more cars pulling in and out where children and families are trying to cross. It's so much safer, cleaner and calmer for everyone. Through traffic is also reduced in the section, however, many do still drive through it which is a problem as children are not expecting cars in the road and have a false sense of security. More traffic is also now channeled through the top of Lambton junction now which makes it more difficult for hundreds of children to cross. There needs to be a crossing there, or extend the schools street west to the Durham Road junction.

		<p>-----</p> <p>My daughter attends Hollymount and we have been walking to and from school every day for the past 6 and a half years. There is far too much traffic coming through that East section of Cambridge Road - particularly on a morning. Until the school street section came in, parents would park directly outside the school, on the zig zags, on double yellow lines, do three point turns, and generally fight for space. There are no protections for the children in the form of zebra crossings, or lollipop patrols so this introduction is a god send. It does need to be enforced by camera or barrier though because non parents drive straight through it.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The scheme makes the road safer for the hundreds of children who use it every day. Any perceived inconvenience caused to other road users is secondary to this. In reality the degree of inconvenience is very slight due to other route options using neighboring roads. I sincerely hope the scheme becomes permanent.</p>
Cambridge Road 6344557, 6344690	Agree	It needs enforcing every day as it's routinely ignored Plus potentially confusing for the public if they drive through illegally and nothing happens the first few times, then they drive through illegally and get a fine. Best to enforce from day 1. Also, would be great to have a pocket park linking Hollymount to Holland Gardens - include SUDS to help avert more flooding
Cambridge Road 6344248	Don't know	Signage inadequate. No leeway given to those living on the border of the zone who have to suddenly change what they have been doing for years. My wife and I have both been fined due to accidentally entering zone early.
Cambridge Road 6334503	Disagree	I live at X Cambridge Road, the area of the road that is not restricted for school access which now means all the cars are parking in this area. We have chosen to keep our front garden as a green space for environmental reasons rather than converting it to a driveway and therefore rely on permit parking. Our children do not attend Hollymount and as such I am never able to park in a permitted space when I return from drop off. I am parking on either double yellow or single yellow lines. I am not opposed to making the area around the school safer however when I pay for a parking permit on my road I would expect to be able to use it. I'd like to propose allocating permitted spaces to houses to ensure we are able to park on our road. I look forward to hearing from you.
Cambridge Road 6344588	Disagree	A large amount of money has already been spent on the roads around Hollymount: removing parking spaces; widening paths; marking double yellow lines; narrowing the road approach to the school; and building a ramp . The unintended result, as no enforcement has been made by the parking authority, has been to provide reserved parking for delivery vans and parents of children attending the school. Closing the road will just transfer even more parental parking to the T-junction with Lambton Road and make it even more difficult for residents to access the houses in that area. The only traffic problems in the school's area are caused by the parents of the children at the school. I do not see why the local residents should be inconvenienced, including the pollution by car engines, when the area opposite the school which faces a park is left free. Surely the polluters and their children should pay the penalty, not the local residents?
Cambridge Road 6344599	Disagree	I think this scheme makes extra traffic on adjacent roads, thus causing extra driver miles. The signage for Hollymount is already huge (20mph, speed humps, zig zags etc) and drivers are taken unawares. The scheme is not necessary as vehicle number are low and cars travel slowly.
Cambridge Road 6344805	Disagree	I think if a scheme like this is introduced; residents who live on the entire road should be exempt from any charges; maybe all issued with a permit. No notice at all has been given to me or my family. I have already had 3 fines and paid due to knowing how these escalating. I am opposed to this scheme if it lacks the sensible measures of residents having freedom to come and go . It is easy to forget when you do not have school age children. The signs are far too high and visitors to the road turn into the road and are not able to see the signage in time. We already pay high council taxes.
Cambridge Road 6344822	Disagree	I think the scheme has the potential to be more dangerous than if there were no traffic restrictions. With the restrictions in place, children and adults will feel that crossing the road is perfectly safe at pick up/drop off times. That is in fact not the case for the following reasons. The signs alerting drivers to the prohibition look very similar to the usual signs you see round schools, so many drivers will assume they say the usual things about parking. Many drivers approach that section of Cambridge Rd by turning in from Lambton Rd or Pepys Rd, so have less time to read the signs in full. The result is that drivers are from time to time going to ignore the signs and drive past the school at times when there are children and adults milling in and around the road, relying on the scheme and therefore not expecting a car. Sooner or later this will cause an accident. I would be fully supportive of a traffic ban on that section of road (despite the increase of traffic this would cause past our house) if the message was reinforced by e.g, road closed barriers, a "lollipop" person, traffic cones, together with more obvious signage.
Cambridge Road 6346358	Disagree	I don't believe that restricting traffic is necessary as the speed limit here is only 20mph. Better to make it 10mph outside the school if safety is the concern. However, if you are going to keep this zone the signage is very poor; it should be much more obvious and colourful to remind people

		who use this road during unrestricted times. Unless of course the idea is to make a bit more money for the council at the same time.
Cambridge Road 6347292	Disagree	This just causes cars to stop 50 yards away - there are still lots of cars and congestion. The warning signs are impossible. They cause more problems than they solve. It is difficult to read until you are next to them and need time to check the times etc. Far more dangerous than before. If this scheme is kept - perhaps a flashing red light or equivalent to warn people not to enter the zone would be helpful or why not bring back lollipop people to help children cross the road - IF this is really considered necessary.
Cambridge Road 6348203	Disagree	Unfair, badly sign posted, totally unreasonable for strangers. Simply moves congestion and pollution elsewhere. Council seen as rapacious.
Cambridge Road 6344097 6344676	Disagree	1) What incidents with regard to safety are on record for each of these zones? I suspect no noticeable changes occur. 2) Pollution arguments are at best nominal and in fact an insult to intelligence. 3) As I live less than two minutes' walk from the Cambridge Road zone we have had our RIGHT OF ACCESS damaged and penalised. 4) The signage is wordy and as a motorist it is dangerous to spend time reading and in fact driving at less than speed limit (20mph) it is impossible to read fully. THIS IS A MONEY SPINNER FOR MERTON. Unethical and greedy. ----- My family and I are very distressed at the imposition of these new restrictions on Cambridge Road. After living here for over 40 years we find ourselves severely restricted in the free use of our local environment. We are strongly opposed to having to remember the odd times which are imposed on us twice daily when going about our life and this cannot be right and proper. As for outsiders using the road, the signage is too small and high up to be seen until they have driven into the restricted area and it is dangerous to be reading the lengthy wording whilst driving. It is sufficient that we have the 20 mph limit here - traffic in the road is slow and not heavy and people are aware of the school. We already have restricted parking rules which throw enough problems and expense on residents. We have been threatened with changes to the Cambridge Road/Coombe Lane junction which residents rightly had dismissed. We feel that the Council is using our (and other) areas as 'cash cows' to increase their coffers and other legitimate ways must be found if this is the case. Many of our neighbours feel the same way as us. I feel full of rage at this imposition and will vote accordingly. Please get rid of this restriction quickly so we can get on with our lives without fear of inadvertently being issued with large fines.
		REPRESENTATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE NEWSLETTER POSTAL AREA
Amity Grove 6324840	Agree	I think it's a great idea. Crossing at the top of Lambton Road / Cambridge Road (an awkwardly wide corner) has always been tricky, so removing the traffic is an excellent solution. We've always had a problem with some parents blocking residents' driveways, so I'm sure this will help improve relations with our local community too. The one area that isn't working well is enforcement. Unfortunately, I think unless we have either a camera, a barrier or a dedicated PCSO, some drivers will ignore or be unaware of the restricted access. Would it be possible to discuss how we can enforce this properly? What are other schools in Merton doing to manage this? It is a great initiative though, so well done for proposing it across the borough.
Amity Grove 6324903	Agree	I totally agree with the circulation ban however I have noticed it is constantly being breaches (unless the police are there). I believe the road signs are not enough as drivers either don't take any notice of them or just drive through out of habit. It would be great to have some bollards (I know it is probably very expensive though) or some barriers/traffic cones perhaps to be put up at the relevant times to physically stop cars from driving through. Signs only could end up being confusing for drivers and children (children might end up being less careful if they think cars are not supposed to go through)
Amity Grove 6325750	Agree	It is very busy at drop off and pick up. Children are excited and anything that can be done to enhance safety on the roads should be done. They often cross the road to Holland Garden. Anything to improve air pollution also a huge benefit. Unfortunately, I am still shocked by the driving I regularly see in the area. The 20 mph zones are not adhered to - I don't think the drivers are even doing 30 much of the time! The council could surely make some money from speed cameras/police checking for speeding - Durham Road being a particular big bear but even on Amity Grove people speed round the corner and down the road. I support anything that can be done to slow drivers down and think about the potential consequences of their reckless driving. Sadly, I think deterrents/more severe punishments would see an improvement.
Amity Grove 6325870	Agree	Encouraging safer schools and independence from kids is related ... if we allow them to walk , the streets need to be safe.. Cambridge road is used as a main road to cut across the high street which is often heavy with traffic but drivers do not observe the speed limit despite the hump , speed signs and it being a school zone. Hence the restricted should remain but residence need to be made aware and signage should be like the well lit sign on Cambridge Road .
Amity Grove	Agree	Especially during Covid it is helpful for space. The signs are not easy to recognise and there are still cars driving passed - a temporary street block would be more helpful. More communication

6324842 6325729		and alternative routes should be provided to cars. ----- It truly makes the school safe, there have previously been a few Near Misses outside the school, when traffic was allowed through. As a father and a doctor, who works on the NHS and see's families torn apart when their children get hurt, ensuring this is a permanent change for the future , makes a massive difference for our school and our wonderful teachers who do the best for our kids .
Conway Road 6344888	Agree	I am strongly in favour of the School Safety Zone on Cambridge Road, Raynes Park. I wonder if the signage should be clearer/bigger and/or whether additional measures could be introduced - such a trees in planters or similar - to indicate that it is a safety zone and not a main thoroughfare.
Conway Road 6346814	Agree	I agree with the scheme but the signage is inadequate. The main signage is not visible to drivers proceeding uphill towards the left hand turning into the Cambridge Rd School Street. It is only visible when the driver has turned left and entered the street: it is then too late. The small yellow warning sign on Pepys Rd is frequently obscured by parked vehicles and it is therefore very difficult to recognise and to assimilate the information in time before making a left hand turn. The Gov uk Traffic Signs Manual states that "it is essential that drivers have an unobstructed view of upright signs". The signage for Cambridge Rd School Streets does not comply with this rule.
Durham Road 6324889	Agree	The less traffic in the school zone the better for safety and air quality.
Durham Road 6325180	Agree	Many drivers don't notice the restrictions. Cones or some sort of cordon should be used.
Durham Road 6325753	Agree	Should have cameras
Durham Road 6325828	Agree	---
Durham Road 6325834	Agree	---
Durham Road 6324839, 6325654, 6344680, 6263014	Agree	I wholeheartedly support this scheme. I am a governor at Hollymount. However, there is little point in implementing this scheme if it is not enforced (which mostly it isn't). Please provide ANPR cameras asap. I also believe the signage is far from clear. There needs to be a much more obvious 'no entry' sign. Making the signage clearer would remove the predictable allegations of "they're only doing this to catch people out and raise money" which is hardly the best way of bringing the community with you. ----- Signage needs to be clearer. Top of Lambton Road has become more dangerous as a result of confused vehicles turning round. I suggest closing Cambridge Road from its junction with Durham Road and blocking the top of Lambton Road. If that is not possible then the next best thing would be to do something which marks the closed section of road out in some way to make it more obvious to drivers that they are entering a 'different' zone. Red tarmac ? Planters at the entry points ? Width restrictors ? Also, a zebra crossing is required at the Durham Road/Cambridge Road junction. This is too dangerous to let primary school children cross on their own. -----
Durham Road 6324867 6325752	Agree	Please introduce additional signage as current signage to not enough and is too late to inform motorist that roads are closed. ----- The signs around all the schools in Merton are very poor. The writing is not large enough and they are not prominent, which makes it very unfair to motorists who are not affiliated with the school to know that they cannot drive down the road
Hunter Road 6325945	Agree	I am in favour of the scheme but feel that it needs to enforced to be more effective.
Lambton Road 6322195	Agree	---
Lambton Road 6324877	Agree	The signage could be improved. As you go up Lambton road there are no signs until you have turned into Cambridge Road. Why not move the signs to be on Lambton road (no right turn) and on Cambridge road before the junction with Lambton road (must turn right). The signs could be improved with clarity on the dates that the scheme operates. I assume term time only but drivers might not know when term time is. Need to make it more obvious to drivers eg change in road

		surface in some way.
Lambton Road 6325876	Agree	Pls do driving speed limit signs on Lambton road. Too many cars drive too fast.
Lambton Road 6325891	Agree	I agree this is a good idea but it isn't working because the signage and the enforcement needs to improve.
Lambton Road 6325748, 6325747	Agree	Much safer and quieter ----- Much better for children, less pollution and safer for them crossing. Especially now more people are having to wait outside the school grounds due to Covid.
Lambton Road 6344543	Agree	The scheme changes should be accompanied by extending the controlled parking zone to include Lambton Road and the whole of Pepys Road
Langham Road 6324921, 6325827	Agree	---
Montana Road 6324849	Agree	Such a fantastic idea to remove vehicles from directly outside the school at the busy morning and afternoon opening and closing of school. It is very easy, as a motorist, to avoid this stretch of road at these times. Only one concern I have is that the signposting is difficult to spot, leading to lots of cars (and often vans) continuing to use this stretch. I feel this currently makes the street even more unsafe, than it would have been before the restrictions, as children & families have a false sense of security. A great idea but needs to be properly enforced.
Montana Road 6344561	Agree	I think this is an amazing idea, and greatly improves both air quality and safety for the children. Plus this helps nudge parents to walk their children to school. I have seen a few people each week driving through during the restricted times; I hope that the council starts to enforce controls more often.
Pendarves Road 6325874	Agree	Adequate signage on both end of the road Physical blocking if necessary
Pendarves Road 6324836	Agree	The current implementation is not good. There needs to be physical barriers or road markings, and the signage needs to be earlier and clearer.
Pendarves Road 6324886	Agree	It's a great idea, but disappointed that some cars seem to be ignoring it. It seems to need policing - or cameras
Pepys Road 6324897, 6325758	Agree	I've witnessed parents and others driving without due care and attention at drop off / pick up before and now this scheme is in place. The scheme is a good idea but it must be enforced with barriers / cameras / fines or it will be seen as ineffective and ignored. Drivers claim they can't see the signs, so this needs to be addressed. When people start returning to the office the traffic will be worse and the safety of the children will be compromised further as they have got used to some degree of pedestrian freedom outside school. If not enforced rigorously then this is now an accident waiting to happen, which will be in front of many children whom will be traumatised. ----- To be effective there needs to be a physical barrier each end of the zone during the given times. This could be a gate, cones, timed bollards rising or people. In addition the school and council must clearly state where parents can park and/ or stop to drop off that is safe for all otherwise you just move the problem or make a bigger problem
Pepys Road 6322268	Agree	I am surprised at the number of vehicles still driving through the road during the restriction period, so much so that it feels as busy as before. It would be more beneficial if it could be monitored and policed more rigorously. Is there any need in this instance to provide exemptions when there are many alternative routes close by? It feels unnecessary, if exemptions have been given, for such a short and easily-avoided stretch of road.
Pepys Road 6324866	Agree	---
Pepys Road 6325771	Agree	As a parent it makes me feel much better. Drivers have a large number of alternative routes which would not pose any inconvenience.
Pepys Road 6325846	Agree	Clearer signage would be helpful.
Pepys Road	Agree	In favour, but the current signage at both ends is poor and unfair to drivers who are unaware of restrictions.

6325958		
Pepys Road 6343577	Agree	Poorly communicated to wider residents/motorists. Signage prior to committing to turning into affected road Very poor bordering on a 'trap' for making money. If serious put automatic signage timed to turn on 2 minutes prior and turn off on ACTUAL days in operation. Also make ALL schools the same start and end times such as 08.00Hrs-09.15 etc across Merton, very confusing as I had got use to the scheme only to have to pay £65 at Ricards on a unfamiliar road just after 08.00Hrs. Confusion also on school dates/holidays will the signs be covered during holidays when there is NO OFFENCE committed?
Rosevine Road 6325773	Agree	I think the restricted access has been successful in preventing the road from being a cut-through for cars during drop-off and pick-up times.
Tolverne Road 6325835	Agree	The signs are very poor indeed and if you did not have children at the local school, you would have no idea about the scheme which seems unfair to motorists. In addition, it would be more effective to have two lightweight barriers that came down, or even to place traffic cones across the road at the relevant times, to alert motorists. While the recent presence of PCSOs outside Hollymount School at the relevant hours is welcome, it seems a waste of valuable resources when what is really needed (and surely more cost-effective in the long run?) is good signage and barriers/traffic cones. The PCSOs would be far more useful patrolling the local parks (Holland Gardens and Cottenham Park) after school, where there have been a number of recent cases of suspicious activity (strangers approaching children with a puppy, apparently to lure them away) which parents have reported to the police. I have never seen PCSOs or police officers in the parks at this time, when dozens of children pour out of the school gates and cross the road to the park.
Tolverne Road 6344684, 6347060, 6344825	Agree	I am fully supportive of this scheme. Ideally the scheme would be enhanced with a more visual barrier. For example this could be: planters would be placed by either side of the road at the entry points to the zone, narrowing the road, with additional road markings (e.g. a painted band of colour) - this would more clearly mark to drivers that there is "something different" about that section of the road and may help to improve compliance with the signage. ----- This response is on behalf of Merton Residents Transport Group (MRTG). We strongly support the school street at Hollymount. 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. - Permanently close one end of the School Street at the junction of Pepys Road and Cambridge Road to permanently remove through traffic so that children have a safe, clean street all day - 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 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 ----- I don't have a child at Hollymount but as someone who lives locally, it's wonderful that children are able to more safely cross the street between the park and the school, and aren't as crammed onto the pavements. I'm happy to slightly alter my driving patterns to accommodate this wonderful measure!
Tolverne Road 6325737	Agree	The signs should be lowered to ensure motorists can see them clearly.
Tolverne Road 6325911	Agree	---
Tolverne Road 6325918	Agree	---
Trewince Road 6325755	Agree	100% agree. But execution can be improved. Poor signage. It must be bold & clearly seen from miles away for motorist. Say something like "Pedestrian Zone between Time X - Y" and make it CLEAR FOR MOTORIST. Existing signage is too small/unclear/non-eye-catching. If you can color the tarmac with something obvious (as obvious as zebra crossing), it will help motorist be extra vigilant.

Trewince Road 6325910	Agree	I am extremely supportive of this scheme. It makes school drop off and pick up much safer.
Amity Grove 6344818	Disagree	Utterly lunacy to block an entire road because of the use of one building on that road. The school needs to ensure the safety of the children by means of scholar patrols etc. There are a number of schools in the area, are you going to block all the roads? Schools & parents need to take ownership of their own / their kids safety and teach them how to cross a road safely.
Devas Road 6346328	Disagree	This scheme merely pushes the problem of parking and drop off into surrounding streets. It's confusing and disruptive and in my view unnecessary.
Dunmore Road 6302830	Disagree	I believe that this represents another revenue generation exercise for Merton Council to trap drivers. There is inadequate signage of these traffic control orders - in particular no details as to term dates for which these restrictions apply. It is extremely unreasonable for drivers to know the term dates for any and all schools on routes that they may drive.
Durham Road 6344886	Disagree	The speed limit is now 20mph so no need to close the road, instead teach children and their parent's safety when crossing the road. Parents just push their buggies out on the road while not looking. The more controls that you put the more irresponsible people become it's called human behaviour. Education is the answer and not walking around on your mobile. An alternative would be to put in a crossing.
Durrington Avenue 6345032	Disagree	There has been a lamentable lack of publicity about the scheme and its enforcement with a camera. As a very local resident I was completely unaware of its installation.
Durrington Park Road 6345915	Disagree	The junction between Pepys Road and Cambridge Road has become very dangerous as a result of the school safety zone. Parents park on double yellow lines at this junction because they can no longer drive along Cambridge Road to drop their children off directly outside Hollymount school. Parents also double park on Pepys Road along side Holland Garden, again to pick up/drop off their children. The Council should come and see for themselves how dangerous drop off and pick up times are. Using a "vehicle counter box" does not show how badly and selfishly these people park. There is no regard for the safety of the children walking to school and other road users, who have to swerve into the road around the badly parked cars. Also cars that would otherwise use Cambridge Road now use other narrower roads as cut throughs - Kenwyn and Pedarves Road. The problem of the rise in traffic at drop off and pick up times, in this normally quiet neighbourhood, is purely down to parents who do not walk their children to school. The Council have previously stated that the majority of Hollymount Children live within walking distance of the school. It is disappointing that a sizeable majority do not, and local residents suffer the consequences.
Kenwyn Road 6344732	Disagree	Parents now abuse the local parking restrictions as they deliver their children to school. They park illegally in Pendervas & Kenwyn Roads as they park up to walk the children to the school. I have never seen Traffic Wardens monitoring the junction at Lambton and Cambridge Roads which can cause traffic congestion. If the Council introduce new systems they MUST be observed. It can be chaos at the top of Lambton Road with illegal parking.
Lambton Road 6344827	Disagree	The restrictions are hidden and will catch people out. Unnecessary and overbearing.
Lambton Road 6344928	Disagree	The times are too long. I appreciate school hours but the times are much longer than that.
Langham Road 6346311	Disagree	I do not see this as necessary as it is a wide road with good visibility however if it is retained the signage must be improved as many people are unintentionally turning into the road from Pepys Road and ending up with unfair fines
Montana Road 6344836	Disagree	It is impossible to see the sign on Pepys road and read it before entering Cambridge Road. Once you have turned into Cambridge road, there would not be time, whilst driving the car, to read all the small print detailing if and when you can enter the road. The sign is at the entrance to the road and a car stopping to read the sign could end up causing an accident to other vehicles unknowingly turning into the road. Fines of £65 are far too high and by the time the unsuspecting driver has received the fine, three weeks later and been made aware of the situation they have probably incurred numerous other fines in that time. (I am a victim of this appalling situation myself) A simple no entry sign would be much clearer, so perhaps the road should be banned from entry at any time rather than having a confusing half and half situation for the unsuspecting driver.
Montana Road 6345834	Disagree	The Scheme has not been thought out. There was no publicity about the scheme and the first a lot of people knew about it was when they were fined. The signage is badly placed...too high and at the wrong angle. Lastly it is hardly environmentally sound, there are groups of cars forming on Pepys Road and the top of Lambton Road.... often sitting with engines running. Green? ..I don't think so... cash cow more like !!

Montana Road 6346308	Disagree	I understand there is a need for this but it needs better signage and warnings. I have already been fined coming back from a Dr appt. It needs a flashing light or bollard in the road to warn motorists at the appropriate time. The current signs are too high up and the times are not highlighted enough.
Pendarves Road 6347769	Disagree	We make our overall comments on the scheme as local residents with 3 children who have recently attended Hollymount. Prior to the scheme being introduced a 20 mph limit was in force in Cambridge Road and restrictions on parking in front of school were in place which would normally be considered adequate safety measures. The best safety enhancement would have been to put a pedestrian crossing in place between Hollymount and Holland Gardens which would have improved overall road safety in the area. Instead of this there is a half-hearted and potentially dangerous solution for pedestrians crossing the road opposite the school. The scheme has also moved traffic and drop-off of children onto adjoining residential roads which are less equipped to handle them and potentially more dangerous at a busy time of day. Cambridge Road is a comparatively wide road with good visibility and non-residential parking spaces available opposite the school. In our opinion it seems that this scheme has been implemented without proper reference to the needs of this particular situation. It is confusing to follow and has conditions which are difficult to comprehend which could potentially compromise road safety. Regarding implementation the partial hours of operation during 'term time' are complicated. To prevent contravention and ensure compliance flashing warning lights should be installed to operate when the zone is in force and entry is denied. Existing road signage is complicated and hard to follow when you are looking out for traffic and pedestrians and is in itself a distraction to road safety in a busy area. Much of it is poorly presented, particularly the signage relating to the left turn on the approach to Cambridge Road from Pepys Road which is completely inadequate. If you inadvertently enter the zone it is impossible to do anything about it and enforcement cameras are deployed immediately regardless of how you are proceeding.
Pepys Road 6344909, 6325517, 6344823	Disagree	The restriction is making parents park down Pepys and lambton road, making it much more dangerous for both pedestrians and other drivers on both of those roads. I've had school parents parking in front of mine and my neighbours drive as they can no longer stop outside Holland Gardens! ----- The scheme is poorly thought out. Cars are now parked far down Pepys Road, often over driveways. I have been verbally abused by a school parent who I asked not to block my drive as I have to drive to another school to collect my child. People park illegally every day as they want to minimise the distance that they have to walk to collect their children. They sit outside my home with their idling engines - still polluting the air around the school! I find it very dangerous trying to cross Pepys Road with my small children given that there are now a large number of cars parked there at pick up and drop off time. We often walk and cycle to our school and that is pretty dangerous in the morning now because of the illegal car parking from Hollymount parents on Pepys Road. Moreover, the signage for people turning in to the affected part of Cambridge Road is very bad. I know many people - quite a few have been guests coming to visit my home - who have been fined for driving through the school street because they didn't understand or even see the signage. One friend has been fined 3 times before the first fine arrived in the post - I assure you she wouldn't have driven through there had she actually seen and understood the signage. Another acquaintance has been fined as English isn't her first language and she didn't understand the sign. You are not minimising the number of cars in the area, you are just pushing the cars on to surrounding roads. Money would be better spent encouraging more people to walk, cycle and scoot to school. At the very least you should reduce the hours of operation which are currently overly long.
Pepys Road 6324876	Disagree	These measures just push traffic onto other nearby roads. The money would be better spent and our children better protected by installing a zebra crossing across Cambridge Road outside Hollymount
Pepys Road 6344186	Disagree	1)The scheme for Holymount School like other schemes merely diverts traffic to other residential roads that children, parents and scooters may go up eg Lambton,Pepys, Pendarves/Kenwyn etc and increases the length of journeys for card to avoid the closure thus increasing pollution. 2) it is quite difficult to quickly see the closure times especially if new to the area. I therefore expect many people will be fined.
Pepys Road 6347347	Disagree	whilst the traffic may be less on Cambridge Road itself, closing Cambridge Road at school times means chaos and even more traffic on the surrounding roads. We live on Pepys Road, opposite Cambridge Road, and cars stop on double yellow lines, over drive ways and do 3 point turns in the road due to the restrictions. it is an accident waiting to happen. our quality of life has suffered commensurately.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS FROM WITHIN THE RAYNES PARK & WIMBLEDON AREA

Camberley Avenue 6322172	Agree	---
Cambridge Close 6325940	Agree	---
Coombe Lane 6325732	Agree	---
Cottenham Park 6324918	Agree	So much safer
Cranford Close 6325877	Agree	Camera would be the best deterrent, if the community support officers are not present then cars just ignore the signage.
Melbury Gardens 6325011	Agree	Signage is not sufficiently prominent to be seen by all drivers meaning that it is ignored.
Melbury Gardens 6325868	Agree	More visible signage to alert drivers unfamiliar with the area
Oakwood Road 6317486	Agree	---
Panmuir Road 6346677	Agree	---
Parkfields Avenue 6325847, 6325912	Agree	Road signs should be lowered so they are more visible. There should be traffic wardens or police for a few consecutive days to make sure the rules are complied with.
Parkfields Avenue 6324838	Agree	---
Parkfields Avenue 6324841	Agree	---
Richmond Road 6344969	Agree	Much clearer signage or warning system needed for the public
Somerset Avenue 6324834	Agree	---
Stanton Road 6325733	Agree	---
Stanton Road 6325754	Agree	---
Barham Road 6347255	Agree	I think that this is an excellent idea - both specifically in the case of Hollymount School (on which I am commenting) and more generally in relation to other schools in the Borough. I cannot think of a single reason not to enforce such schemes as risks of injuries to children and other pedestrians (and cyclists) will be reduced. Cars must either go elsewhere during the (very limited) hours of enforcement or perhaps people could just drive less, which I guess is the fundamental and most important point.
Beverley Way 6263775	Agree	Restrictions to cars on the school road should reduce traffic on drop off and pick up and encourage more parents to walk if they can
Hampton Close 6346867	Agree	This scheme has made an immeasurably positive difference to the safety of the children and community surrounding Hollymount. Please continue the scheme, enforce this scheme and ensure that there is signage to ensure people respect the scheme and are penalised if not.
Heights	Agree	There needs to be some way of enforcing it - currently no cameras are up so drivers continue to

Close 6325010		speed down Cambridge Road knowing they won't get penalised. Once cameras are up and people are fined, the scheme will work fine.
Arterberry Road 6325869	Agree	---
Landsdowne Road 6344884	Agree	Not enough promotion of scheme Signs not big enough or at suitable height for drivers How do drivers know dates of term time and holidays? when presumably driving in this area will be permitted?
Ridgway 6325886	Agree	---
Southdown Drive 6325423	Agree	There is not adequate signage. Many vehicles still drive up and down the road, completely unaware.
The Drive 6346333	Agree	Please put clearer signs in place well before cars turn into the road - at present it looks like a fundraising process catching people unawares to make them contribute to Council coffers. I am happy to avoid the road but we need to be warned properly please.
Woodhays Road 6347807	Don't know	What an absolute cash cow. You need to make signs like this really obvious. There are so many instructions at the side of roads which take too long to read while motorists are trying to focus on seeing what is in the road Ex children in a school zone. These should be either lit up when in effect or have some sort of bright colour. You should see the threads on this on the Next Door App. People are furious.
South Ridgway Residents Association	Disagree	<p>I and several of our members have filled in your survey with regard to School Streets especially Cambridge Road and Crescent Road.</p> <p>I would however like to air the views of the SRRA in more general terms. There is no doubt that the whole scheme has not been thought through. There is this obsession with jumping on every green bandwagon without thinking of the consequences.</p> <p>It is very obvious that these streets are causing polluting build ups in their environs. You only have to go to Pepys Road or Lambton Road at school times at Holymount to see hordes of badly parked cars with their engines running and the same at the bottom of Arterberry Road when Crescent Road is shut.</p> <p>The signage is ridiculous much too high and not visible until one is in the prohibited area.</p> <p>Lastly but by no means least, there was no advance publicity only the residents of the designated roads were advised. People found out by being fined. I find this sort of deception verging on the corrupt and combined with the argument that the signage apart from being too high is not totally compliant with the Highway Code puts Merton Council on rather shaky ground.</p>
Arterberry Road 6347781	Disagree	<p>1 The express rationale of the order is to encourage parents to walk, cycle or scooter to school. In order to deal with a small minority, you are punishing the majority of road-users. 2 That being so, the council is using traffic restriction on the majority in order to encourage behavioural change of a minority. That manner of policy implementation is undemocratic and inappropriate. 3 It is more likely that this is imposed to deal with the behaviour of parents who create the traffic problems around drop-off/pick-up time. Again, in order to deal with a small minority, you are punishing the majority of road-users. 4 Suspending vehicular traffic moves the traffic onto neighbouring roads. The roads most likely to be affected by diverted traffic are those of the Lambton Road Conservation Area (e.g. Pendarves road) which are ill-suited to such use. 5 Cambridge Road is a wide road with space for parking either side while leaving room for free traffic flow. It is adequately equipped with existing traffic management measures – speed humps, road constriction, yellow zig-zags, 20mph limit. Failure to enforce these adequately should not enable the council to deal with the issue by restricting the rights of other road users. 6 Notwithstanding the indication on the road sign on Pepys Road that the restrictions are only in place during “term time” (an imprecise expression which means nothing to any road user who does not have children of school age), the regulations are not restricted to school days only, so are needlessly restrictive. 7 The imposition of this restriction is consistent with an unnecessarily overbearing approach to traffic management by this administration. The failed attempt to impose an LTN on the part of Cambridge Road to the west of Durham Road is a case in point. These restrictions, for the reasons which have been given, are inappropriate in a democratic country.</p>
Hood Road 6346671	Disagree	Outrageous I have been a resident for over thirty years and have travelled this road safely during that time. The signs are too high to see and I have received a fine This should be rescinded until better signage is in place
Drax Avenue 6346785	Disagree	Signage is very poor. This scheme does not tackle the large numbers of parents who drive their children to school. The costs of the scheme outweighs the benefits. Will there be a pre and post survey conducted and published to show numbers who have switched mode of travel ? Will a

		similar study into air quality also be conducted ? The main purpose seems to be to collect revenue.
Chester Road 6345912	Disagree	Note: My comments refer to School Streets in general and not just this one. Shifts the problem onto other roads. Signage is appalling - drivers need to concentrate on the road and pedestrians, not on reading detailed high-up signage and checking what the time is! No publicity about it - we can't be expected to know where all schools are and their opening/closing times - and what about visitors? How are they expected to know?
Copse Hill 6344639	Disagree	all it seems to have done is move where kids and their parents cross the road to busier roads either side. I can understand the thinking behind the streets but Hollymount is on a quiet road and all the activity has simply moved to Pepys Road
Copse Hill 6346816	Disagree	It is very difficult for those unaware of school term times to know when this is enforced and when not. It seems the signs are not obvious enough for drivers, and with too much info to take in in one go. Cambridge rd is a through road, and it is easy to get caught out. Were it a cul de sac like at St Matthews, or the Ursuline, that would be different. For very local residents it is difficult to know who should have a pass. Unforeseen circumstances mean those residents are liable to have friends and relations get caught, which is quite an attack on their civil liberties.
Copse Hill 6346669	Disagree	A further restriction on motoring accompanied by difficult to see notices
Cottenham Park Road 6344678	Disagree	Undoubtedly there are benefits to reducing traffic along school roads at specific drop off and pick up times. However, the implementation on Cambridge Road seems defective for at least two reasons: - The times at which traffic is restricted along Cambridge Road seem overly long. I recently inadvertently drove down Cambridge Road shortly before 4pm and received a penalty notice. At that time no children were exiting or entering the school. The street was in fact completely deserted. There seems little point in restricting traffic along streets for reasons of school drop off and pick up when those things are not actually happening! - The signage of the school street is insufficient. At the turning from Pepys Road into Cambridge Road so much information is displayed on the boards at the head of Cambridge Road it is very difficult to understand when turning either right or left. In particular, in the action of turning onto the street the motorist's attention will (rightly) be primarily on the road around them, other car users, pedestrians and cyclists. There is simply insufficient time whilst turning to absorb the myriad information provided on the sign at the same time as turning from one street to another. If this street is to be maintained, much clearer signage is required on Pepys Road itself so that a decision can be made not to turn into Cambridge Road BEFORE a turn has been initiated. Once initiated it would be far more dangerous to attempt a U turn or to reverse back into Pepys Road than it would be to continue down the street (and therefore receive a penalty notice).
Beverley Avenue 6347786	Disagree	This scheme is under consultation until 31st July but is already being enforced - that doesn't sit right. In principle, I understand why there is a scheme but as these are local schools, children should already be walking to school and the scheme does not stop parents from parking in other areas making those more congested and still exposing children to pollution. As much as there are signs, they are very word heavy (who can digest all that information without causing a traffic accident) and high up so not easily seen at eye level by drivers particularly turning right from Lambton Road to Cambridge road as you are already in the zone before you can do anything about it. It should be more obvious to motorists travelling in this direction. Also, how can a member of the public keep track of the different times for all the Merton schools and the school holidays? Merton is becoming a more difficult place to navigate around and, in my experience, not any safer. We want to support our local community but this is yet another scheme that makes moving around the borough even more difficult and another revenue stream for the council. Are the funds going to be ploughed back into schools to help support reducing the gaps in their education from Covid? Or schemes to support young people's mental health? Aren't these more pressing issues given that we live in a built up area so already accept it will be more polluted than the countryside and one block of no traffic a few hours a day isn't going to change that hugely.
Stanton Road 6310997	Disagree	There is little or no evidence of adverse traffic problems on Cambridge Rd outside Hollymount school. This action is an over-reaction and would adversely impact the local residents in the local area. I and my family would therefore like to object to this proposal.
Richmond Road 6344672	Disagree	You do not give fair notice to motorists, in that the signs are well above eye level that a motorist would be looking at when they turn into Cambridge road from any of the entrances. In addition it would seem the restrictions apply Monday-Friday for the entire year, but the school is shut for 14 weeks, almost 25% of the year. It is not clear who you have consulted with, as it not only affects residents close to the school but those in the surrounding area. As a result of these restrictions, parents are now parking on double yellow lines, across driveways and on the junctions which creates more danger rather than reducing danger.
Panmuir Road 6324914	Disagree	---

Oakwood Road 6325009	Disagree	no where to park, traffic is awful worse then ever , parents park in front of residents driveways. Really bad idea
Oakwood Road 6346675	Disagree	It is easy for people visiting to not know about these restricted areas, and signage is almost always inadequate. Also, being closed for 1.5 hours in the afternoon seems rather long for school pick-up.
Orchard Lane 6344800	Disagree	People are parking their cars on other roads around the area , causing congestion everywhere else.
Melbury Gardens 6344797, 6346339	Disagree	The speed limit is slow enough to be safe already. The restricted access is inconvenient. The sign is far too small; many people I know only found out about the restrictions by getting a fine since there was absolutely no publicity or warning. More concisely: It is inconvenient, unnecessary, and a thinly veiled money grabbing exercise; please get rid of it. -----
Coombe Lane 6325862	Disagree	I agree with road closures IF: we have crossing, where each car driver would stop! Right now it's madness! Not only children can't cross the road, also adults can't because drivers are very rude, don't stop to let us cross the road.
Cambridge Court 6347694	Disagree	Firstly, I live only metres from the school and I am impacted by all the traffic immediately outside. But if this IS agreed upon pls realise that people who drive up and down their own street the WHOLE time don't look at their clocks and watches every minute of the day as they drive around THEIR OWN STREET THAT THEY PAID HALF A MILLIONS POUNDS MINIMUM to live on. We are busy. So if you are going to do it, bring a boom down at the sacred hour of children crossing. Because I can take a detour if I MUST and dont expect to be fined for driving on my own street and not watching my clock to the minute or when it is quarter-to some random hour. So if you must do this, do it properly or not at all!!
OTHER REPRESENTATIONS MOSTLY FROM WORPLE ROAD & SOUTH OF RAYNES PARK		
Midmoor Road 6344899	Agree	---
Worple Avenue 6325884	Agree	---
Worple Road 6325955, 6325824	Agree	Clean air and road safety for children are high priorities for me. I hope that the scheme will be made permanent and will be used to further encourage families to walk to school where possible.
Worple Road 6325896	Agree	We are strongly in favour of this change. The signage around the area would need to be significantly be upgraded to guide motorists too so that it does fairly. This will give Children so much freedom for this specific locality.
Carlton Park Avenue 6302741	Agree	The restrictions provide greatly improved safety for children and elderly while crossing Cambridge Road, encouraging cycling and walking to and from Hollymount Primary School and access to Holland Garden. Please enforce the restrictions as it is being largely ignored.
Dupont Road 6325831	Agree	My daughter attends Hollymount School. Scheme benefits: increased safety outside the school gates, reduced number of cars dropping off and picking up pupils, improved air quality.
Edna Road 6325856	Agree	Please improve the signage or have cameras -motorists don't understand the limits
Prince Georges Avenue 6346936	Agree	---
Vernon Avenue 6325744	Agree	Strongly support the scheme. The signage is not very clear so vehicles still pass through the roads. Perhaps moveable barriers or additional signage would help with enforcement?
Grand Drive 6348012	Agree	This is a great scheme that will make a real difference to child safety. However, too many motorists are ignoring the signs as they are overly complex. There is a strong case to close this section of road permanently at all times of the day, treating the area as an extension of the park.
Douglas Avenue 6346938	Agree	Whilst I agree in principle the signage is totally inadequate. I don't have school children and don't even know where all the schools are - I have observed that where I'm turning right into a road that is closed the signage is on the left hand side of the road I'm leaving - not a natural spot. Markings should be on the roads and made much larger and clearer otherwise school roads will just have panicking drivers making unpredictable maneuvers in their attempt to escape the zone.

Estella Avenue 6348179	Agree	We strongly support the school street at Hollymount School and at all the sites in Merton. 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 - 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 - 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 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. I am very sad that at West Wimbledon Primary and Raynes Park High, that there are few measures in place to reduce traffic danger to students. Unfortunately the 20 mph speed limit is frequently not adhere to and parked cars on pavement and cycle lanes make active travel very problematic.
Link Way 6325775	Agree	The roads should be closed, however signage has very poor visibility and needs improvement.
West Barnes Lane 6324831	Agree	Traffic cameras need to be installed as drivers ignore road signs.
Bernard Gardens 6324848	Agree	---
Wilberforce Way 6342934	Disagree	The COVID-19 and climate change reasons given as justification for these school safety zone insult the intelligence of the general public. This very much appears to be yet another underhand way to penalise getting from A to B in a car. The fine of £130 is utterly disproportionate.
Langley Road 6347942	Disagree	Poor signage. Too much information to digest whilst driving along especially when new to the area and not aware of schools on that particular road. Not obvious enough. Why not a flashing no entry sign which can be seen from further away? There are already amber flashing lights outside schools to indicate a school crossing. Lack of publicising this scheme to residents of Merton who may not have children and therefore not be aware of the scheme and school term dates.
Southway 6324890	Disagree	This restriction causes major traffic and I don't think is well considered how the vehicles could turn from Cambridge toad to lambton road especially vans as the parked vehicles don't leave much space that turn causes lots of risks
Westway 6347809	Disagree	As a mother of 4, whilst I agree that roads should be made, I disagree with the way in which they have been implemented. I am a Merton resident but don't live in the areas surrounding schools and as such, the only time I was aware of such a scheme was when I received a PCN for an alleged contravention code: 53J, location: MTC Cambridge Road. I was shocked. I went back to see what warning was in place and only found the one on Pepys Road. The sign that is alleged to have been contravened in this instance is so close to the junction on Cambridge Road that by the time one has made the turn there is only a split second to be able to see and read the signage and there is a great amount of information to take in, in the meantime whilst concentrating on the road itself (as is evident in the attached video). Once one has made the turn and committed to the maneuver, it is too late to turn around and by that stage there is no real scope to take evading action or an alternative route. There is another sign on Pepys Road directly opposite Cambridge Road, however, that signage is textual and long to read and comprehend properly whilst the car is moving (as is evident in the attached photo), rather than diagrammatic. A regulatory no right turn sign with an appropriate time plate would be far clearer and would unambiguously convey the prohibition. In the alternative a proper advance warning sign on a white background could incorporate the road layout and the no motor vehicles sign, this again would convey the restriction in an unequivocal manner that could be understood immediately by motorists. In such circumstances a textual sign is clearly inadequate.
Bronson Road 6345009	Disagree	Totally unnecessary
Worple Road 6345490	Disagree	This is very inconvenient for local residents. The scheme is ridiculous and ill thought through. Signs were put up with no prior warning and are not easy to see in a low car and no clear warning about a change in road markings of this significant nature was clear. People have been working from home and not driving in to the office and often have differing start and end times so it's wholly inconvenient for the drivers on the local areas who are now returning to work. This is a primary school. Parents are with their kids. The road is not a danger. Not at 20 miles an hour. This is a school in London. Air quality wont be improved by closing a road for two hours each

		day. Holly mount children all reside in Raynes Park...a busy London suburb. This doesn't encourage people not to drive it just blocks up the surrounding roads. I have two tickets as didn't know about the scheme. If it's still under consultation ...why are we being given fines?
Worple Road 6345392	Disagree	Children need to learn about how to use a road. They need to know that roads are dangerous & to approach them with caution. I worry that all this wrapping up in cotton wool will create children who have no idea how to fend for themselves & will have no common sense. For Hollymount in particular, I would increase safety around the school gates by building a barrier between the pavement & the gate that everyone exits from & paint the speed hump with hazard lines to make it more visible. I also worry about people who are non residents, perhaps from out of town, travelling through the area, who are unfamiliar with the restricted access idea. They will not recognise it for what it is & drive on through. The parents & children will not be expecting them, making it even more dangerous.
Salisbury Road 6346573	Disagree	Signage is far too high and not visible through window when I also need to concentrate on speedometer to maintain a speed of 20mph. Signage is too small and unclear. No information about outside school terms. All Merton residents should have been informed of changes when the scheme started. Particularly since it affects a number of roads in my area, varies from road to road and I no longer have children of school age. Have the road residents and parents of school children already been consulted? Why did I recently receive a penalty charge when the scheme is still out for consultation?

REPRESENTATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE BOROUGH

Poplar Grove 6325743	Agree	---
Barlby Gardens 6324894	Agree	There will be confusion with drivers who live on the said road and who will naturally be exempt from the restriction. It is not clear how these drivers will be expected to drive on the street during restriction times. As the street essentially becomes a pedestrian zone during those hours, it will be important to clarify that pedestrians will have prioritised access over vehicles. At the moment, cars that enter the zone during restricted hours do not seem to be doing so very cautiously. Maybe entry barriers of some form should be used.
Cotsford Avenue 6325751	Agree	I'm in favour of the idea As it will be good for the kids, but the signage is poor and it is unfair to motorists who are unaware of the rules or don't have children in the school and if that remains, people will continue to drive down the road, which will cause accidents as the kids will have a false sense of security that the road is traffic-free during those times. Especially the warning signs on the Pepys road side is inadequate as turn is immediate and the larger warning signs would only be visible once you've already turned into the roads. I have a child at the school and therefor know about it, but I actually accidentally turned into the road from the Cambridge road side early on when the signs just came up and realised that nothing from the signage stopped me from doing so as I had forgotten being told by the school. Something needs to be done about the signage or else children's lives are at risk.
Cotsford Avenue 6307827	Disagree	I do not think this is practical as it's almost impossible to see the boards installed at the ends of these roads. Parking is already a huge problem during pick-up and drop-off and this limits parking options even more.

In addition to those who followed the correct procedure in submitting their representation on line, the owner of one of the properties within the School Street who is not a resident, contacted Council officers and the Cabinet Member via email raising a number of issues objecting to the scheme. The appropriate correspondences are detailed in this section of the report but other email communications that are more of an on going dialogue (a variation what had already been submitted) have been excluded as the objector did not specify that they can be included within the report. Also, within a statutory consultation, it is normal practice to include the objector's statement rather than an on-going dialogue.

My local councillor Adam Bush kindly forwarded to you my email of 25 July giving my concerns about the school streets schemes which were introduced across the borough under Experimental Traffic Management Orders last September. Councillor Bush also forwarded to me your response below in which you claim that there has been an open consultation for nearly a year and that there has been ample opportunity for residents to comment. You stated in your email to Councillor Bush that you would ask for a response to the points raised in my email, but I have received no further response.

I do not accept or agree with your claim that there has been an open consultation on the school streets proposals for the following reasons – please see also my comments at paragraph 1 of my email of 25 July below which still stand:

1. You state that '*Residents were made aware through newsletters about the scheme*'. However, only residents who live in the roads affected by the scheme were notified of the proposals, whereas all residents in the surrounding area should have been consulted, since the schemes affect traffic flow and free movement throughout the whole area
2. There were no notices in the road advertising the consultation, which is a requirement for a public consultation

Without formal notices being displayed in the street giving details of the consultation and the closing date, this consultation cannot be considered to have been valid, open or democratic. Most people living in the vicinity of one of the affected schools only became aware of the scheme when street signs were put up in September / October 2020, and will have had no idea that there was a consultation in place allowing them to comment on the proposals. The council may have been aware that a consultation was in place which closed on 31 July 2021, but the majority of residents in the area were not aware of this. No final decision should be made on whether or not these schemes should be made permanent until a full, open and democratic consultation is undertaken which involves all residents in the borough. I will be raising a formal complaint through the council's complaints procedure that the consultation that supposedly took place between October 2020 and July 2021 was not publicly advertised as required. There is a contradictory statement on the council's website that: *'Experimental orders came into effect on 8 October 2020. Statutory consultations will run for 6-12 months'*. Why is this timescale approximate, and why are the consultations not running in a transparent way until October 2021 at the earliest? The effects of the restrictions, in terms of hundreds of motorists receiving penalty notices for unwittingly straying into the affected roads at the wrong time, were only felt when the council put up enforcement cameras 2-3 months ago. People are rightly angry at receiving penalty notices when there is no visible sign at any given time that the scheme is in operation.

I understand from the council website that in certain locations these schemes have not been put in place because the schools in question did not want them. In the case of Edge Hill / The Downs for example, it seems that schools have arranged 'displacement parking' and 'car pooling' as alternatives. Perhaps, in addition to asking schools whether they wished these schemes to be put in place, the council could have asked residents for their views before the schemes were imposed on them.

These schemes have been introduced across the borough without sufficient thought for the consequences and effects on the normal lives of residents and their right to freely use public roads. The inability of residents to receive visitors or deliveries for 2.5 hours of the working day is a major inconvenience and a curtailment of rights and civil liberties. Traffic is displaced to surrounding roads, causing danger and obstruction beyond the affected roads. Property values in the school street zones are adversely affected. I am currently trying to sell my house and am advised by estate agents that potential purchasers are put off by the signage and restrictions. As stated above, there is a major problem with large numbers of people receiving penalty notices without justification as there is no sign that the scheme is operating. I understand from speaking to the caretaker at our local school that the school term begins tomorrow 2 September, but the general public will not know this and will not be aware that the scheme is operating again after the summer holiday. Likewise there is no information advising people that if they are already in the road before the restricted times, they may leave without penalty.

I understand that the council will be reviewing these schemes in September. In doing so, they will have to balance the needs of all parties including the hundreds of residents across the borough who are currently living with these schemes through no choice of their own. The council will also have to assess whether the schemes are achieving what they set out to do. School street zones are not traffic free zones, despite the implication that they are, and the misleading signs as you leave the affected roads stating: 'End of pedestrian and cycle zone'. Residents, staff and authorised vehicles are permitted to use the affected roads during the restricted times, and in some densely populated roads this will still mean a substantial number of vehicles, both in terms of parked vehicles and moving traffic. This in itself causes danger to children and parents who expect the area to be traffic free and are therefore less vigilant about road safety than they would otherwise be.

The aims of the school streets scheme in improving safety for children and reducing traffic pollution are of course sound and positive. However, as stated on the council's own website, a TFL study shows that 25% of morning rush hour traffic comes from parents dropping children off at school. I suggest a complete rethink of the school streets initiative with the onus being placed on schools to stop parents driving their children to school except in an emergency, with the children being educated to train their parents to walk them to school or use public transport - children are highly aware of environmental issues nowadays - and the re-introduction of the 'Walking buses' which used to be widely used some years ago. This should be perfectly possible for primary school children, who mainly live within a local catchment area. When Hollymount School doubled in size a few years ago, we were assured that this would not result in an increase in traffic because the majority of children attending the school live within 500 metres, which is clearly walkable. Older children can clearly use public transport to get to school if they live beyond walking distance. Once it becomes the accepted norm to walk to school, it is those who use cars who become the exception. It is public policy in the Netherlands that children must walk, cycle or use public transport to get to school, and there is no reason why we cannot make this work in the UK too. It is the parents who cause the traffic problems around schools, and it is the responsibility of the parents and the school to stop the resulting problems, rather than imposing unreasonable restrictions on hundreds of residents across the borough who happen to live in the vicinity of a school.

The school streets scheme in its current form in Merton is untenable, with confusing signage, insufficient information, and unfair penalties being issued to motorists who cannot be expected to know the exact time of day and whether or not it is term time. It greatly concerns me that a decision which could potentially restrict permanently the normal use of public roads in the borough, and affect the lives of thousands of residents, is apparently to be taken by one person, and that the council considers that an adequate public consultation on this has already taken place. In view of the long-term importance of this decision, a full public consultation should remain open for at least the whole of the coming academic

year, with notices displayed in the affected roads giving full information on how comments can be made. It is essential that the many people who were unaware of the prematurely closed 'consultation' should be given the opportunity to comment before any permanent decision is taken on these experimental schemes. Judging by the large number of comments on forums such as nextdoor.com, there is a huge amount of frustration and distress about the introduction of these schemes, which you may not be aware of, but should be. We do need safe streets, but we also need streets with contented people, not streets where residents require a permit to access their own homes and are prevented from receiving visitors and deliveries for a substantial part of the day. It is not within the remit of the local authority to restrict the lives of residents in this way.

As for the streets themselves, I suggest removing all unnecessary signage and replacing it with simple 'School – please drive slowly' signs at the approach to schools, with the visual image of children crossing that used to be in common use, and 'Smiley face' signs to keep cars at a safe speed. This would have much more effect than the mass of signs often seen currently. There are ten separate signposts at the junction of Lambton Road and Cambridge Road in West Wimbledon, causing obstruction to pedestrians and visual confusion. With so many signs to take in, of course no-one is able to register any of them.

I am writing to you directly as yours is the only name that appears on the Merton website in connection with School Streets. It would be helpful to know the name of the contact person at Future Merton who deals with the school streets schemes, if there is one, as this information is not available on the website and no-one on the council switchboard is able to provide a name.

I do not expect a full reply to this email but would request that my comments be noted and taken into account.

I am very concerned about the way the 'School Streets Scheme' has been introduced and dealt with by Merton Council, and would be grateful for your advice on the following points:

1. 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.

Ms Dubet 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 are probably not aware of. I would be grateful for your views on this, as the current 'consultation' cannot be considered to be valid or democratic if people are not aware of it. The risk is that such schemes tend to become permanent by default if the council does not receive many comments from the public.

2. The school street schemes are extremely onerous for residents in the affected streets, preventing them from receiving visitors, tradespeople or deliveries for 2.5 hours of the working day. This is highly inconvenient and imposes unreasonable restrictions on the normal life of people living in the road. I know that this is causing problems across the borough where similar schemes have been introduced. Is the council entitled to unilaterally impose such restrictions on residents and their visitors, and on members of the public wishing to access or drive along a public road ?
3. It seems that the school streets schemes have been selectively introduced for some schools in the borough and not others, with for example the roads around Dundonald Primary School not affected, nor The Downs and Edge Hill, which suffer from large amounts of school traffic. I would be interested to know what criteria have been used to select the schools where these schemes have been introduced.

Having lived with the scheme in place for most of the past school year, my personal view is that while such schemes may work where schools are located in smaller side streets or cul de sacs such as the lower part of Cottenham Park Road (St Matthews) or Crescent Road (the Ursuline), they are not suitable for a through road such as Cambridge Road. Preventing cars from driving through this section of road for an hour in the morning and 1.5 hours in the afternoon is unreasonable to the general public and puts pressure on surrounding roads, diverting traffic into narrow roads such as Pendarves and Rosevine Roads to the south, or round three sides of a square to the north. Parents still drive their children to school but park dangerously on double yellow lines at the junction of Cambridge Road / Pepys Road and at the top of Lambton Road, and across driveways in neighbouring roads. This causes congestion and actually increases the danger to children arriving at or leaving the school.

The scheme is also unnecessary. Virtually the whole of the school side of Cambridge Road from Pepys to Lambton Road has either yellow zig zags or double yellow lines preventing parking, and there are very few parking spaces available anyway on the other side of the road. There is a raised safe crossing area with road-narrowing bollards outside the school gates, and the road is wide enough to have good sight lines in both directions. The road is not in an area of high pollution. If all other road signs were removed (there are far too many) and replaced with a simple 'School - please drive slowly' sign at each end of the road, combined with encouragement by the school for children to walk to school, then this should suffice to ensure safety. The current plethora of signs, unclear restrictions and cameras penalising normal motorists is very unwelcome.

On the subject of clarity, both the signage and operation of the scheme are currently very unclear. The tall signs at either end of the affected road state that the restricted hours apply from Monday to Friday, with no indication that they apply during term time only. New yellow signs have recently been put up close to the entrance to the road stating that the restrictions apply during term time only, however most drivers do not know whether it is term time or not, nor should they be expected to. There is currently no indication during the restricted hours that the scheme is in operation, and consequently many drivers have understandably entered the road inadvertently and received penalty charge notices. I do not see how these notices can be enforced when there is no indication of whether or not it is term time. Furthermore, apparently vehicles already parked in the road before the restricted hours are allowed to leave without penalty at any time, but nowhere is this made clear. Many times I have seen vehicles stop at the junctions at both ends of Cambridge Road, causing an obstruction while they try to work out what the signs mean, what time of day it is, whether or not it is term time and thus whether they can enter the road at that time.

The above are my personal views and I will include them as feedback on the council's website. The principles of improving safety for children and reducing pollution are of course sound, but in the case of Cambridge Road I do not think these aims are achieved as the traffic has simply moved to the surrounding roads, while at the same time the scheme is causing unnecessary inconvenience to residents in the local area. A better approach would be for the school to adopt a positive message of encouraging more parents to walk their children to school or use public transport, unless there is an urgent reason for them to drive, rather than the current confusing restrictions which are causing unnecessary stress and worry to everyone living in the area.

No comment is sought on my views above, but I would be grateful for any brief comments you may have on the three points raised at the beginning of this email, particularly in relation to the supposed consultation, which I believe should be recommenced now that the scheme has been in place for several months. This is somewhat urgent given that the council apparently intends to end the opportunity for comment in a week's time.

OFFICER'S RESPONSE

The school street programme was rolled out across the borough during September and October 2020 under Experimental Orders which came into effect on 8 October 2020. An experimental order allows the Council to introduce and enforce the scheme during the statutory consultation period which is 6 months. All the signs (the legal signs as well as the advance signs) were erected during September 2020 and all the residents who are directly affected by the restrictions were informed at the time. On 28 /08/2020 (via an email) you were advised of the roll out of the School streets including one relating to Hollymount school. You were advised of a provisional time frame of September 2020 for implementation and exemption process in October 2020. You were also referred to the website for updates.

In terms of affected residents, only those who have no alternative route in and out of their homes are classed as directly affected; all others who have an alternative vehicular route are classed as indirectly affected.

Newsletters to residents setting out the consultation process were posted on 21st September 2020 first class Royal Mail and the exemption letters were sent to all that are directly affected on 9th October 2020. We are also aware that you had attempted to register for an exemption but this was refused as you could not provide any evidence to demonstrate that you reside within the school street.

During a statutory consultation, the Council is not legally obligated to do any form of newsletter drop. However Merton has adopted the practice to advise those residents who are directly affected via a newsletter.

The period for the statutory consultation under an Experimental Order is for 6 months but due to the pandemic, on this occasion we extended the consultation until end of July 2021. In an email dated 14/07/2021 you were informed of the closing date of the consultation being 31st July 2021 and were referred to the website and advised to submit your representation accordingly. Given the volume of feedback received, it can be considered the local residents many of whom

simply use this road as a through route are fully aware of the restrictions and have participated within the consultation.

In terms of publicising the school streets programme there was an article on School Streets in My Merton magazine [the Winter 2020 edition](#), on page 25. 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](#) on page 5 which was published on 25 March 2021. Notices were erected on the lamp columns which we believe may have been taken down by those who disagree with the scheme. This does happen in some cases.

The legal signs plus advance signs have been in place since Sept / Oct 2020 and are clearly visible. The signs at the entrance fully comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TRSGD) (2016) and are also included in the Highway Code. The London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act (2003) grant London authorities, and Transport for London civil enforcement powers to undertake the enforcement of these contraventions in place of the Metropolitan Police. None of these pieces of legislation contravene residents' human rights.

School streets signs and restrictions are no different to any other moving contravention signs that motorists are obligated to abide by. These signs are used across London and motorists should be familiar with them and abide by them accordingly.

The purpose 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 road. 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.

The school street restrictions do not prevent residents from accessing their homes, and the system makes provision for exemptions under certain circumstances. 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.

Response from Cabinet Member

The consultation on the school streets was opened until 30 July and had been publicised to people within the area impacted and on our website. We have received many responses which I am currently considering before making a final decision.

Any resident that lives within the school safety zone is exempt provided they are registered. Visitors and deliveries will not normally be permitted during restricted periods. Exceptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis. I don't believe it is a curtailment of civil liberties especially as it is to improve the environment outside schools but also to reduce air pollution and emissions. It has also helped make the streets outside schools safer for children and encourages walking and cycling

The signage follows legislation and if anyone believes they have been incorrectly issued with a penalty charge notice they can appeal to the council, but also ultimately to an independent parking tribunal. I am satisfied that the signage is correct.

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