

No car zones

To: Strategy & Resources Committee

Meeting Date: 29th March 2022

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director for Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): All

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable

Outcome: The Committee is asked to consider the results of the trial of no car zones outside two schools alongside evidence from the installation of school streets under the Emergency Active Travel Fund and determine if further schemes should be explored.

Recommendation: Strategy and Resources Committee is asked to:

- a) Note the research outcomes from the study undertaken by the Medical Research Council (MRC) Epidemiology Unit at the University of Cambridge;
- b) Support the implementation of additional no car zone / school streets schemes, subject to available funding (outlined in paragraphs 2.5 to 2.7); and
- c) Note the implication of future decision-making by the Council, and its District Council partners, in relation to Civil Parking Enforcement and Traffic Management Act 2004 Part 6 to the potential enforcement of these schemes (outlined in paragraph 2.11).

Officer contact:

Name: Lyn Hesse
Post: Senior Road Safety Officer
Email: lyn.hesse@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 699499

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Lucy Nethsingha and Elisa Meschini
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email: Lucy.Nethsingha@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Elisa.Meschini@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 A trial of no car zones outside schools was approved at General Purposes Committee on 28th January 2020.
- 1.2 The two schools selected for this trial were St Bede's Inter-Church School, Birdwood Road, Cambridge and St Matthew's Primary School, Norfolk Street, Cambridge. At St Bede's, the scheme affected a 450m section of Birdwood Road and St Thomas Road between 08:00-09:00 and 15:00-16:00. At St Mathews, this affected a 130m section of Norfolk Street during the times of 08:30-09:30 and 14:45-15:30. The scheme was implemented using signs only.
- 1.3 Due to delays associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, the trial was implemented on 12th April 2021 using Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders that are in place for 18 months.
- 1.4 An accompanying research study was undertaken by the MRC Epidemiology Unit at the University of Cambridge, which is included in Appendix 1.
- 1.5 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the opportunity to install similar "school streets" schemes was presented through the Emergency Active Travel Fund. These schemes originated in other Local Authority areas such as London Borough of Hackney and differ from the no car zones in that they are implemented and operated by community volunteers who place signs and physical barriers within the restriction zone when it is in operation. Volunteers also escort any permitted vehicles through the zone.
- 1.6 Seven school streets schemes are currently active in Cambridgeshire at:
 - Alconbury Primary School, Alconbury
 - Hartford Junior School, Huntingdon
 - Hatton Park Primary School, Longstanton
 - St Matthew's Primary School, Cambridge
 - St Philip's Primary School, Cambridge
 - Willingham Primary School, Willingham
 - Park Street Primary School, Cambridge
- 1.7 This report summarises the results of the research study and feedback from school streets schemes and recommends the Council supports the introduction of further schemes, subject to community request and available funding.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 A copy of the summary research report into no car zones from the MRC Epidemiology Unit at the University of Cambridge is included in Appendix 1.
- 2.2 The report summarises the following policy implications:
 - 2.2.1 "Results from this feasibility study are encouraging and suggest that it is feasible for these schemes to affect safety outside of schools and levels of walking, cycling and scooting to school."
 - 2.2.2 "Enforcement, practicalities of implementation and effective methods for communication are significant issues, which are likely to affect both acceptability and effectiveness."

2.2.3 “Whilst supportive physical environments for walking and cycling may be important, it is widely acknowledged that supportive social environments are also required. Such schemes are likely to be necessary but not sufficient to encourage changes in travel patterns in children and adults. Wider interventions within the neighbourhood, school and city may be required and a package of schemes might be necessary to foster significant cultural shift and create appropriate infrastructure on routes into schools.”

2.3 Initial feedback from the school streets schemes implemented under the Emergency Active Travel Fund is that the use of volunteers to support the scheme helps provide the social environment referenced above, for example, one Headteacher highlighted:

“It has been wonderful to see the community come together to support us too. We have had volunteers and support from the school itself, parents of our pupils, the residents, the Church and the Parish Council. Families have commented that, in addition to being safer, the journey to and from school is calm and children are more relaxed entering the school site.”

However, it is also recognised this operating method provides a resource barrier for some local communities.

2.4 It is also important to note that both schemes have been supported by additional resources from the Council’s Road Safety Team. Details of available resources at [Road safety education for schools](#)

2.5 Based on the encouraging results from both schemes to date, it is proposed that further no car zones / school streets are supported across the county.

2.6 Using the learning from the no car zones scheme it is proposed future schemes would be permanently signed in the same way but encourage the use of community volunteers in support of the signed restriction, blending the positive elements of the no car zone and school streets schemes.

2.7 As no dedicated funding is in place to introduce additional schemes it is suggested any new schemes are either fully dependent on third-party funding, through grant applications or community funds, or submitted as bids to the Local Highway Improvement scheme. This includes the assessment, design, consultation, installation, equipment/resources and volunteer training. It is estimated each scheme will cost in the region of £2-5k depending on the complexity of the site.

2.8 Enforcement of the restrictions could become easier in future with the introduction of additional Civil Parking Enforcement areas for those Districts outside Cambridge City that are pursuing such powers, and changes to the Traffic Management Act 2004 Part 6 allowing councils to apply to be able to enforce moving traffic offences within Civil Parking Enforcement areas. This would enable the Council to enforce the restrictions as opposed to being reliant on limited Police resources which are currently prioritised elsewhere.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 Communities at the heart of everything we do

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Community choice is considered important in any additional schemes. As identified in the University of Cambridge report, schemes are reliant on “supportive social environments” to be successful.
- A combination of the no car zones and school streets approach using local community volunteers is proposed to ensure the community is at the heart of any future schemes.

3.2 A good quality of life for everyone

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- A study by the environmental law organisation ClientEarth published in February 2018 revealed that 60% of parents surveyed want traffic diverted away from school gates at the beginning and end of the school day. Parents are concerned because investigations have demonstrated children are being exposed to illegal levels of damaging air pollution outside their schools, mainly from diesel vehicles.
- In addition, the majority of children and adolescents fail to meet the recommended levels of physical activity. Previous programmes delivered through schools to promote activity have showed limited to modest effectiveness and suggest that changes to the wider environment are necessary. Active school transport has been proposed as a way to increase physical activity in children and youth at the population level, with the added benefit of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, other pollutants and congestion.

3.3 Helping our children learn, develop and live life to the full

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Cambridgeshire: a well-connected, safe, clean, green environment

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- A study by the environmental law organisation ClientEarth published in February 2018 revealed that 60% of parents surveyed want traffic diverted away from school gates at the beginning and end of the school day. Parents are concerned because investigations have demonstrated children are being exposed to illegal levels of damaging air pollution outside their schools, mainly from diesel vehicles.
- In addition, the majority of children and adolescents fail to meet the recommended levels of physical activity. Previous programmes delivered through schools to promote activity have showed limited to modest effectiveness and suggest that changes to the wider environment are necessary. Active school transport has been proposed as a way to increase physical activity in children and youth at the population level, with the added benefit of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, other pollutants and congestion.

3.5 Protecting and caring for those who need us

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.7.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

Any required procurement activity will be undertaken in compliance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 2.8.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The schemes will maintain access for residents and for healthcare professionals to visit properties within the closure, as well as for disabled access to the school.
- An equality impact assessment has been undertaken to update the impact assessment for the original trial with learning from the trial and the associated research. See Appendix 2.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The schemes require both informal and formal local consultation

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The schemes will each require both informal and formal local consultation
- Identification of schemes will be led by local communities
- Scheme introduction will require third party investment as outlined in 2.7.
- If the Local Highway Improvement scheme is utilised, these schemes are scored by local member panels

4.7 Public Health Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- A study by the environmental law organisation ClientEarth published in February 2018 revealed that 60% of parents surveyed want traffic diverted away from school gates at the beginning and end of the school day. Parents are concerned because investigations have demonstrated children are being exposed to illegal levels of damaging air pollution outside their schools, mainly from diesel vehicles.
- In addition, the majority of children and adolescents fail to meet the recommended levels of physical activity. Previous programmes delivered through schools to promote activity have showed limited to modest effectiveness and suggest that changes to the wider environment are necessary. Active school transport has been proposed as a way to increase physical activity in children and youth at the population level, with the added benefit of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, other pollutants and congestion.

4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas: not applicable as not a key decision.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes

Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the Head of Procurement? Yes

Name of Officer: Clare Ellis

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes

Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes

Name of Officer: Elsa Evans

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications? Yes

Name of Officer: Sarah Silk

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact? Yes

Name of Officer: David Allatt

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?

Yes

Name of Officer: Iain Green

5. Source documents

5.1 [General Purposes Committee - 28 January 2020](#)

Appendix 1 – University of Cambridge Research Study Report



1. Summary

Back in January 2020, the General Purpose Committee was asked to approve the trial of no car zones outside schools in Cambridge. The trial was implemented and an accompanying research study was conducted by the MRC Epidemiology Unit at the University of Cambridge. This briefing document summarises the findings of the research study.

The schemes restricted access for motor vehicles on road sections outside two schools and were implemented in April 2021. The acceptability of the schemes were relatively high but motorist's compliance and the lack of enforcement remained a real issue and one which is likely to influence whether or not and how much it impacts on travel behaviour. We found that there were only small changes in the total number of children using active modes of travel such as walking, cycling and scooting to school, however the schemes did improve the safety for pedestrians and cyclists around schools. It is likely that schemes such as these implemented with enforcement are necessary but not sufficient to encourage changes in travel patterns in children and adults. Wider interventions within the neighbourhood, school and city may be required, for example a package of schemes might be necessary to foster significant cultural shift and appropriate infrastructure on routes to schools may need to be constructed.

2. Research questions posed by the research study

- 2.1 The study set out to assess the acceptability and implementation of the trial and the feasibility of studying the impacts of schemes in a larger research study outside other schools. The specific research questions addressed were:
- (i) How was the scheme implemented and what would be the challenges of a wider roll-out?
 - (ii) What is the acceptability of the scheme to a range of stakeholders?
 - (iii) What is the potential effectiveness of the scheme on children's active travel to/from school?
 - (iv) What are the main pathways by which levels of active travel may change? Are there any unintended consequences of the scheme?
 - (v) How useful could data routinely collected by local authorities be to any larger research study aiming to assess the health impacts of such schemes?

3. Principle findings

3.1 How was the scheme implemented and what would the challenges of a wider roll-out be?

- 3.1.1 The scheme was implemented through the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) as described in the original proposal which mandated the creation of a pedestrian and cycle zone outside schools.
- 3.1.2 Two schools were selected: St Matthew's Primary School and St Bede's Inter-Church School. Schools were selected based on a shortlist using criteria including risk assessment and school and community buy in. At St Bede's, the scheme affected a 450m section of Birdwood Road, and St Thomas Road between 08:00-09:00 and 15:00-16:00. At St Mathews, this affected a 130m section of Norfolk Street during the times of 08:30-09:30 and 14:45-15:30. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic these schemes were delayed but finally implemented on 12th April 2021 and will be active for 18 months.
- 3.1.2 New signs were erected and road markings were painted on the roads to inform drivers of the road closures. There were no other enforcements implemented.

- 3.1.3 Both schools received sustainable travel materials and support from Cambridgeshire County Council's road safety team including materials from Modeshift STARs¹. St Matthews were also running another scheme (School Streets) on Broad Street concurrently, but we have not reported on that here.
- 3.1.4 Based on interviews with councillors, Council officers, residents and businesses we identified three main factors that could affect the effectiveness of wider roll out to other schools:
- *Practicalities of implementation* including administrative and procedural challenges, including sign off, procurement and funding
 - *Effective methods for communication* including strong marketing, clear headlines of the scheme including exemptions and enforcements, and ensuring that all groups within the community are communicated to at the same time
 - *Conducive and supportive context* for action and change including school and parental support and engagement as well as political willingness and support from local leaders

3.2 What is the acceptability of the scheme to a range of stakeholders?

- 3.2.1 We had over 450 responses to our online survey from parents, residents, school staff and businesses and they indicated high acceptability of the scheme (74% reporting it was acceptable). Views were mixed between the stakeholder groups; parents had the highest levels of acceptance (77%) and school staff the lowest at 53%.
- 3.1.2 The main concerns that affected acceptability were primarily around a lack of enforcement.
- Our audits and reports from interviews suggested that initially compliance was high until *"one or two cars by error come through"*. Interview participants went on to highlight how *"once some people realise, they can do it and get away with it they tell their friends"*, and there were individuals who use the road as *"there is almost no traffic"*. This created safety issues as speeds along these sections were often higher than posted limits.
 - There were also concerns about terminology as exemplified by one parent *"What does that mean, 'except for access'. If you want to drop your children off at school, are you still allowed to do that?"*
 - Physical 'forewarning' signs placed in advance of the scheme were suggested which might help drivers be aware of the scheme, plan their route and make diversions.

3.3 What could be the potential effectiveness of the scheme on children's active travel to/from school?

- 3.3.1 Overall there were small changes in children's travel modes to/from school based on parental reports.
- At St Bede's, there were no parent-reported changes in children's travel modes. Before the scheme, 59% of parents from St Bede's reported that their child actively travelled to and from school and this remained constant.
 - At St Matthew's, the majority of parents (93%) reported that their child used active modes of travel to and from school before the scheme, which increased by 2% after implementation.
- 3.3.2 In line with the findings from parental reports, data from the hands up survey of children in schools indicated small changes in children's travel modes to/from school after the scheme was implemented.
- Levels of walking and cycling increased by 2% (from 57% to 59%) at St Bede's. Cycling was the most common travel mode used before the scheme (43%) which increased by 4% after the scheme was implemented.
 - Levels of walking and cycling increased by 3% (from 86% to 89%) at St Matthew's. Walking was the most popular travel mode used before the scheme was implemented (52%) which increased by 2% after implementation. Cycling remained constant at both times at 29%.

¹ [Modeshift STARs - Travel Plan in Education, Business & Communities](http://www.modeshiftstars.org) www.modeshiftstars.org

3.4 What are the main pathways by which levels of active travel may change? Are there any unintended consequences?

- 3.4.1 The main ways in which the scheme may act to change levels of walking and cycling to school were through improvements in safety conditions and a chance to reconsider habits.
- 3.4.2 We found some evidence that the scheme led to reductions in dangers from traffic from our audits and observations. Audits during the school run period before and after the scheme indicated that conditions had improved outside both schools, with better visibility, fewer near misses, fewer vehicles turning in the road and fewer instances of illegal parking.
- 3.4.3 In the online survey, 43% of respondents reported that safety for walking had improved, 48% that safety for cycling had improved and 46% that safety for crossing the road had improved. 31% of respondents perceived an improvement in vehicles illegally parking during pick up and drop off.
- 3.4.4 One main unintended consequence was mentioned by interview participants. Interviews and observations confirmed a small minority of drivers flaunting the rules, as one interviewee said *“ironically a scheme which is designed to increase safety may inadvertently have made it worse”*. This was especially apparent for Birdwood Road (St Bede’s) where there is a long road leading up to it.
- 3.4.5 No consequences were reported by business owners on the day-to-day running or footfall.

3.5 How useful could data routinely collected by local authorities be to any evaluation?

- 3.5.1 Data on traffic volume were collected by Cambridgeshire County Council for between 9 and 13 days at three separate time points: one before implementation (October 2020), and two after implementation (April 2021 and May 2021) at both schools. More monitoring would have been desirable but not possible here because monitors were required in other locations and COVID-19 restrictions prevented some travel. Even if we had analysed this data we would not be able to say if any of the differences observed were due to changes in traffic attributable to the schemes, COVID-19 restrictions or seasonal differences. Continuous time series data summarised at weekly level for at least a year would allow us to understand the overall aggregate impacts on traffic accounting for any seasonal differences and would be recommended for future studies.
- 3.5.2 Air quality data were collected continuously between October 2020 and September 2021 using diffusion tubes and AQ Mesh sensors provided by Cambridge City Council. This data would prove very useful for a longer-term study, especially because there is other diffusion tube data collected from a variety of other proximate sensors which provide historical backdrop and concurrent measures in the absence of road closures. The continuous monitoring period with a greater number of data points provide fine grained temporal data over a long range and would be very useful for more detailed studies evaluating the health impacts of such schemes.

4.0 Policy implications

- 4.1 Results from this feasibility study are encouraging and suggest that it is feasible for these schemes to affect safety outside of schools and levels of walking, cycling and scooting to school.
- 4.2 Enforcement, practicalities of implementation and effective methods for communication are significant issues, which are likely to affect both acceptability and effectiveness.

- 4.3 Whilst supportive physical environments for walking and cycling may be important, it is widely acknowledged that supportive social environments are also required. Such schemes are likely to be necessary but not sufficient to encourage changes in travel patterns in children and adults. Wider interventions within the neighbourhood, school and city may be required and a package of schemes might be necessary to foster significant cultural shift and create appropriate infrastructure on routes into schools.

5.0 Methods of the research study

- 5.1 Data for analyses consisted of new data collected specifically for this project as well as other data from Cambridge County and City Council. New data were collected using a range of methods to ensure strengths and limitations of specific methods were outweighed by others and to give a broad picture. These included:
- Online survey responses from 455 participants which included parents, staff, residents and business owners available between May 2021 and July 2021
 - 13 interviews with a sample of parents, senior school staff, residents and business owners, primarily sampling from those who completed online surveys (April 2021 to July 2021)
 - Hands up surveys with school pupils in attendance at two schools before (April 2021) and after (June 2021) scheme was implemented
 - Observations and audits outside schools by researchers to assess environmental conditions and potential impacts on several days and at different times before (December, Jan and Feb) and after (April and May) the implementation of the scheme
- 5.2 Recruitment for the study was through flyers delivered to local residents on affected or boundary streets, media coverage on BBC Radio Cambridgeshire and Cambridge News as well as school newsletters and noticeboards.
- 5.3 Other data made available for analysis by Cambridge City and Cambridgeshire County Councils included data on air quality & traffic volumes in two areas outside of the schools as well as other data monitoring points in the city to understand background trends. This data is also publicly available through Cambridgeshire Insights.²

² <https://data.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/dataset/cambridge-schools-no-car-zone-feasibility-study>

Appendix 2 – Equality Impact Assessment

This EIA form will assist you to ensure we meet our duties under the Equality Act 2010 to take account of the needs and impacts of the proposal or function in relation to people with protected characteristics. Please note, this is an ongoing duty. This means you must keep this EIA under review and update it as necessary to ensure its continued effectiveness.

Section 1: Proposal details

Directorate / Service Area:		Person undertaking the assessment:	
Transport Strategy & Network Management – Road Safety		Name:	Lyn Hesse
Proposal being assessed:		Job Title:	Senior Road Safety Officer
No Car Zones / School Streets		Contact details:	Lyn.hesse@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Business Plan Proposal Number: (if relevant)		Date commenced:	03/03/2022
		Date completed:	03/03/2022
Key service delivery objectives:			
<p><i>Include a brief summary of the current service or arrangements in this area to meet these objectives, to allow reviewers to understand context.</i></p> <p>The Council's Road Safety Team offers a programme of resources to support safe and sustainable travel to school, in particular focusing on overcoming safety barriers to active travel.</p> <p>As part of this programme, trials have been undertaken of both 'no car zones' and 'school streets' schemes to restrict traffic outside schools at start and finish times, creating more space for those walking and cycling and a safer environment for these active modes.</p> <p>'No car zones' are where signage is installed only, relying on individual compliance with the signed restrictions during their times of operation.</p> <p>'School streets' involve volunteers putting out signage and barriers as part of the restriction.</p> <p>Both schemes are supported by Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) with the trials being undertaken through either temporary or experimental TROs.</p>			
Key service outcomes:			
<p><i>Describe the outcomes the service is working to achieve</i></p> <p>The service aims to achieve an increase in travel to school by active travel modes and a reduction in travel to school by car. This supports wider Council objectives around physical activity, climate change and air quality.</p> <p>The service also aims to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on the county's road network.</p>			

The service has also embraced the Think Communities approach and is providing communities with the tools and support to tackle local issues themselves.

What is the proposal?

Describe what is changing and why

Following a successful trial of No Car Zones and School Streets proposals are being put forward to enable wider use of the schemes where the school and community want them.

What information did you use to assess who would be affected by this proposal?

For example, statistics, consultation documents, studies, research, customer feedback, briefings, comparative policies etc.

Research undertaken by University of Cambridge alongside the 'No car zones' trial, including consultation with schools, parents, residents and local businesses.

Feedback and observations from school streets schemes implemented using the Emergency Active Travel Fund from the Department for Transport (DfT).

Reports and feedback from similar schemes nationally e.g. Birmingham, Hackney, Solihull.

Are there any gaps in the information you used to assess who would be affected by this proposal?

If yes, what steps did you take to resolve them?

The evidence is from a small number of schemes so may not be representative of all schools or local communities. This is why local consultation and community support in proposing potential scheme sites is important for any new schemes to be taken forward, in addition to full assessments from Council officers to consider potential unintended consequences at each individual location.

Who will be affected by this proposal?

A proposal may affect everyone in the local authority area / working for the local authority or alternatively it might affect specific groups or communities. Describe:

- *If the proposal covers all staff/the county, or specific teams/geographical areas;*
- *Which particular employee groups / service user groups would be affected;*
- *If minority/disadvantaged groups would be over/under-represented in affected groups.*

Consider the following:

- *What is the significance of the impact on affected persons?*
- *Does the proposal relate to services that have been identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics / who are rurally isolated or experiencing poverty?*
- *Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?*
- *Does the proposal relate to the equality objectives set by the Council's Single Equality Strategy?*

The proposal would be to make the scheme available countywide but locations would require assessment as to their suitability for this type of scheme in relation to unintended consequences and risks associated with specific road layouts or traffic behaviours.

- Hands up surveys with school pupils in attendance at two schools before (April 2021) and after (June 2021) scheme was implemented
- Observations and audits outside schools by researchers to assess environmental conditions and potential impacts on several days and at different times before (December, Jan and Feb) and after (April and May) the implementation of the scheme

Consultation evidence

State who was consulted and when (e.g. internal/external people and whether they included members of the affected groups). State which potentially affected groups were considered. Append consultation questions and responses or equivalent.

Consultation through Traffic Regulation Order process in the trial.

Based on consultation evidence or similar, what positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

This includes impacts retained from any previous arrangements. Use the evidence you described above to support your answer.

From the research undertaken the following benefits for specific groups were identified:

- Active travel (walking/cycling) increased slightly at both trial schools showing a small health benefit to those children and their parents
- The safety of the area outside the schools improved, reducing the risk of injury to children, parents and other road users at these times

Based on consultation evidence or similar, what negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

This includes impacts retained from any previous arrangements. Use the evidence you described above to support your answer.

From the research undertaken the following negative outcomes were identified:

- Where non-compliant driver behaviour occurred this was observed at higher speed, increasing risk of injury to children, parents and other road users if this was the case.

It is also known negative perceptions exist around access to the area for residents, people with disabilities, or for carers and the potential increase in journey times for people needing to use cars/taxis to travel to or around the affected area. Evidence to support or reject these potential impacts was not available from the trial data as traffic patterns changed during the trial due to the pandemic, therefore they are included as potentially negative for transparency.

How will the process of change be managed?

Poorly managed change processes can cause stress / distress, even when the outcome is expected to be an improvement. How will you involve people with protected characteristics / at risk of poverty/isolation in the change process to ensure distress / stress is kept to a minimum? This is particularly important where they may need different or extra support, accessible information etc.

All new schemes will require local support to be put forward and therefore have an element of community support at the outset.

All schemes will require access to properties within the restriction to be maintained for residents, although they will be encouraged to avoid school times if possible. Access to the schools and any affected businesses will be maintained for disabled badge holders.

Risk assessments will be undertaken by Council officers to ensure locations are suitable before they are approved for implementation.

All schemes will require local consultation related to the TRO.

How will the impacts during the change process be monitored and improvements made (where required)?

How will you confirm that the process of change is not leading to excessive stress/distress to people with protected characteristics / at risk of isolation/poverty, compared to other people impacted by the change? What will you do if it is discovered such groups are being less well supported than others?

It has been identified in the trials that the schemes work best when they have community ownership, with volunteers operating the schemes allowing them to engage with those who require assistance/access while maintaining safety.

Monitoring and feedback will be based on any potential site-specific risks identified, such as long alternative routes, as well as results of the consultation at the scheme implementation stage.

Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment - Action plan

See notes at the end of this form for advice on completing this table.

Details of disproportionate negative impact (e.g. worse treatment / outcomes)	Group(s) affected	Severity of impact (L/M/H)	Action to mitigate impact with reasons / evidence to support this or Justification for retaining negative impact	Who by	When by	Date completed
Reduced safety from non-compliant road users	Children (and their parents)	M	<p>Volunteer-operated schemes use barriers and escort any vehicles requiring access reducing likelihood of non-compliance – these will be encouraged as the best-practice model.</p> <p>Enforcement likely to be infrequent based on threat, risk and harm assessment against other enforcement priorities but could be enhanced through Civil Enforcement in Civil Parking Enforcement areas if Traffic Management Act part 6 powers are requested.</p>	Road Safety Team	ongoing	In proposal
Potential increased journey times for vehicle users needing to travel through the area – and potential impact on taxi fares	Poverty & disabled	L	In most cases this is expected to be minimal as school locations will mainly be away from main through routes and those on main roads are unlikely to be in scope – if a through route location is proposed the consultation will need to engage these users to understand any potential need for mitigation	Road Safety Team / Policy and Regulation Team	As required	

Section 5: Approval

Name of person who completed this EIA:	Lyn Hesse	Name of person who approves this EIA:	David Allatt
Signature:		Signature:	
Job title:	Senior Road Safety Officer	Job title: <i>Must be Head of Service (or equivalent) or higher, and at least one level higher than officer completing EIA.</i>	Assistant Director – Transport Strategy and Network Management
Date:	03/03/2022	Date:	11/03/2022