



Notice of KEY Executive Decision

Subject Heading:	School Streets and associated contracts
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Osman Dervish
SLT Lead:	Barry Francis – Director of Neighbourhoods
Report Author and contact details:	Steve Halsey – Project Manager steve.halsey@havering.gov.uk 01708 434172
Policy context:	Connections making it easy to get around - Delivering a consistent and sustainable approach to parking to meet the needs of residents, businesses and visitors
Financial summary:	<p>The cost of implementing school streets is c£1m excluding CCTV costs. Of which we have to date received £220,000 from TfL for the first 12 schemes.</p> <p>Implementation of school streets will potentially generate £82,500 of income from PCNs, some of which will fund additional staff requirement.</p> <p>The retender of the CCTV contract is likely to be c£4m on off capital over 2 years and the use of ongoing existing revenue for support and maintenance.</p>
Reason decision is Key	Significant effect on 2 or more wards
Date notice given of intended decision:	Decision is urgent, notice of intended decision not given.
Relevant OSC:	N/A
Is it an urgent decision?	This is a decision pursuant to para 11 of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, made under “special urgency” with the consent of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.
Is this decision exempt from being called-in?	Exempt – urgent decision

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Communities making Havering
Places making Havering
Opportunities making Havering
Connections making Havering

[]
[]
[]
[x]

Key Executive Decision

Part A – Report seeking decision

DETAIL OF THE DECISION REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Council has been allocated £220k via grant funding from TfL under its Schools Streets initiative, which is a proportion of the overall grant applied for. This report sets out the proposals for use of the funding and recommends repurposing of existing, surplus street cameras to augment the School Streets implementation together with variation of existing contracts to support the repurposing. Experimental Traffic Management Orders (ETMO) to permit use of the cameras within the proposed school street zones are recommended. Engagement with Head teachers and residents local to the schools prior to implementing the ETMO's is recommended.

This decision is required under "Special Urgency" in order that school and resident engagement may commence prior to end of academic term. This will support delivery of a sustainable CCTV parking enforcement system across the borough and implementation of School Streets in September to enable social distancing outside schools as the September term commences.

The terms of the allocated TfL funding of £220k require it to be spent before the end of September.

Background

TfL recognise reducing the number of journeys made by public transport may encourage increased car usage, and has developed the London Streetspace Plan to support other travel choices that promote a healthier lifestyle such as cycling and walking.

One of the key initiatives promoted by TfL is School Streets which converts the area outside of schools to pedestrian and cycle only for a limited period of time in the morning and afternoons during the school week.

School Street schemes offer a proactive solution for school communities to tackle air pollution, poor health and road danger reduction. A School Street scheme will encourage a healthier lifestyle and active travel to school for families and lead to a better environment for everyone.

Furthermore, School Streets will assist with the issues of social distancing around schools and support children, parents and teachers to be able to social distance comfortably.

Any of the schools in Havering that are located in a suitable area on the road network can have a school street introduced.

They can be enforced using physical restrictions such as temporary bollards, water filled barriers or large planters on wheels.

It is preferable to use camera enforcement to minimise reliance on 3rd parties such as school staff, or other Council Services and to minimise disruption to local residents and the schools themselves. This also makes enforcing the scheme more effective and likely to have a permanent impact on changing behaviour and a modal shift in transport habits.

When considering a School Street candidate, the following key principles apply:

- Road danger was a recognised and significant issue prior to the COVID-19 outbreak
- Where there was a recognised and significant problem with crowding outside school prior to the COVID-19 outbreak.
- Where a large number of complaints had been received, and or a Councillor had highlighted safety concerns raised by residents
- Where there are two or more schools in close proximity to one another.
- Schools with narrow footways posing a safety risk to children.
- Schools with large intake/multi form entry, that even with a staggered start/finish times crowding outside is still likely.

Havering has made an application in 2 phases for School Streets, totalling 59 schools that are eligible for consideration because their place in the road network is suitable and they meet one or more of the criteria listed above.

Key Executive Decision

TfL have allocated the Council £220,000 for school streets which includes the project management, engagement and implementation of 12 school streets. This funding does not cover the CCTV costs for any school street schemes.

The first phase funding application for 22 schools was for £1.6m submitted to TfL on 09/06/2020. The second funding application was for 37 schools at £2.8m submitted to TfL on 18/06/2020.

TfL have assessed and responded to our applications on 10/07/2020 and have granted funding for a total of £220,000 for all schools.

The 12 shortlisted schools using the existing Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) cameras can be delivered for a total of £195,000 inclusive of designing, signing, lining and project management costs.

It is intended that a funding application for the remaining 47 schools will be resubmitted in September for further consideration by TfL. The amount will be less the 12 schools shortlisted as they are part of the phase 1 funding application. The remaining schools in phase 1 and those in phase 2 will be reassessed to reduce costs and enhance the likelihood they will receive some funding at the second attempt.

The first 12 schools for phase 1 includes the schools that were part of the PSPO pilot project that has since expired. The cameras located around these schools do not operate as the traffic management orders are no longer valid and are not enforceable.

This report proposes a move away from PSPO enforcement around schools. The rationale behind this is twofold, firstly whilst this was an extremely innovative schemes when it was introduced, schools streets have become common practice for tackling school parking and traffic congestion. Furthermore it is much easier to enforce and implement.

The second element to this is that financially PSPO schemes are much more expensive in that they can cost up to £100k per school, whereas a school street scheme can be as low as £18k per scheme (excluding CCTV cameras).

This means the Council can not only increase the number of school streets across the borough, but with the support of TfL funding (should this be agreed) can also ensure social distancing measures are in place at 59 schools across the borough.

The PSPO schools and their equipment:

School	Cameras
Engayne	9
Parsonage Farm	4
James Oglethorpe	5
Harrow Lodge	13
Total	31

It has recently come to light that any funding provided by TfL for School Street schemes will need to be realised by the end of September, which limits the number that can practicably be implemented. Whilst the phase 1 and 2 schools of 22 and 37 respectively will still to be considered for a programme of works, initially we have identified 12 schools that are to be completed by the end of September deadline.

School	Cameras required	Notes
Engayne	3	Previously PSPO
Parsonage Farm	2	Previously PSPO
James Oglethorpe	2	Previously PSPO
Harrow Lodge	4	Previously PSPO
Hylands	1	Already in School Streets discussions

Key Executive Decision

Oasis Pinewood	2	Already in School Streets discussions
Drapers Academy / Drapers Pyrgo / Drapers Maylands / Lime Academy	1	Already in School Streets discussions and access to all 4 from Settle Road
Branfil	2	Already in School Streets discussions
Squirrels Heath infant and junior	2	Narrow pavements
Concordia Academy	2	Closure of main entrance for safety
Mead	2	Large school 681 pupils
Clockhouse	3	Large school 694 pupils
Towers Federation - Infant School and Towers Junior School	4	Large school and already in School Streets discussions
Total	30	

Should any of the shortlisted schools not wish to be considered for a School Street after further consultation, the following have been identified as viable alternatives:

- Crowlands Primary School
- Rise Park Infant School / Rise Park Junior School
- St Edward's Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School / St Peter's Catholic Primary School

The schools shortlisted are attached as an appendix A.

Subject to agreement with the Cabinet Member for Environment, the remaining schools will be programmed in for school streets engagement and implementation.

Engagement

Engagement will be carried out for a period of four weeks with the Head Teacher of the relevant school and local residents to understand their concerns and comments on the scheme.

Post this, an ETMO will be put in place for the 12 school streets to go live in September 2020 for when schools reopen. An ETMO allows for a scheme to be in place for a maximum of 18 months with objections and comments on the scheme welcomed within 6 months of the experimental scheme going live. The reason the scheme is being implemented in this manner is to allow for a review of the schemes and design over an 18 month period, whilst taking on board objections and concerns and allowing for the scheme to be amended based on those comments.

This will allow for the schemes to meet the objectives set out and ensure it also meets the needs of local residents.

A full communications and engagement plan is attached at appendix C.

Benefits

Congestion outside of schools at the beginning and end of the school day is experienced at almost every school across the whole of the United Kingdom. As a consequence the road traffic network is heavily congested which increases pollution levels around schools and causes major disruption at peak times that negatively affect motorists and residents living in close proximity.

A study carried out by Kings College in October 2019¹ show children are exposed to pollution levels 5 times higher on the school run in London than at any other time. This impacts on the long term health of children's lung development that can persist into adulthood and is often associated with other health problems including chronic obstructive lung disease in later life.

¹ <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/news/worlds-largest-study-to-monitor-air-quality-exposure-of-250-children>

Key Executive Decision

Walking or cycling to school also promotes social distancing which is of paramount importance for limiting the transmission of Coronavirus.

Enforcement for School Streets is carried out using the Traffic Management Act 2004 which is a civil law already enforced by Parking Services.

Scheme Management

School Street schemes restrict access to streets that have a main entrance to a school at specific times of day to only pedestrians and cyclists. The times will depend on the school opening and closing times at each location but will be for an average of 45 minutes in the morning and 45 minutes in the afternoon.

It does not restrict a person living or visiting a household within the scheme from exiting during the times the School Street is in operation.

A list will be put in place for all residents in the controlled area to prevent them receiving a PCN. Blue Badge Holders will also be exempt from the restrictions.

However, deliveries, taxis and any other vehicles will not be permitted during the hours of operation.

School Streets are monitored using automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) cameras that record vehicles contravening the restrictions. This will then produce a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) which will be sent directly to the registered keeper of the vehicle that has contravened the prohibition. This is normally an automated process with a sample taken on a regular basis for auditing purposes.

Scheme Designs

The provisional designs for the shortlisted schools are attached in appendix A and B.

CCTV Contracts

There are currently 2 contracts with P. Ducker Systems Ltd (PDS) namely the Public Space Protection Order contract (PSPO contract) and the Moving Traffic Contravention contract (MTC contract) both of which are specific in their requirements.

The PSPO contract allowed for enforcement outside 4 stated schools to take place in accordance with the PSPO. However, the PSPO itself expired in November 2019 and has not been renewed. As it has expired it cannot be extended. This means that the Council cannot enforce as there is no legal basis to do so. The cameras remain on street but are not in use. This contract is no longer fit for purpose, based on the council moving to a school streets programme.

The value of the contract is £249,700.00 with £147,994.55 having been paid to PDS leaving an amount of £101,705.45 remaining outstanding to be paid

The MTC contract with PDS is specific in its requirements which are:

- Twenty unattended cameras and associated equipment
- Two attended CCTV cameras and associated equipment to supply new or existing CCTV enforcement vehicles
- An interface which facilitates the download of data from the attended equipment sited within the CCTV enforcement vehicles to the back-office systems.

To date 18 cameras have been sited with 2 complex cameras and the vehicle software outstanding. Since procuring the contract, the Council has ceased to operate vehicles in this service. This aspect of the contract is no longer required. The redundant software will be offset against 3 additional cameras.

Termination of the PSPO contract in conjunction with extension of the MTC contract to incorporate the 31 redundant PSPO cameras into the MTC contract is recommended. PSD have indicated that on the basis that the MTC contract will extend as the PSPO contract terminates, they agree this approach with no penalty to the Council. A limited variation would be required to cover some of the additional services. The value of these additional services which will be added via variation `is £139,964.

Key Executive Decision

Further Development of the existing CCTV network

As set out above, it is intended that a further funding application will be made to TfL in September. Dependent on the outcome of that application, it is intended that authority will be sought for procurement of a further CCTV contract to enforce moving traffic contraventions including in relation to supporting the school streets initiative and.

Recommendation

It is recommended Cabinet agree :

1. To accept grant funding of £220k from TfL for utilisation for the school streets initiative as set out in the body of this report.
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods to carry out resident and school engagement and to implement ETMO zones as set out in this report and to enter into any other ancillary legal agreement using statutory powers to place and maintain the CCTV or paraphernalia within the Street or highway'
3. Subject to 1 and 2 above, to terminate the PSPO contract and to vary the MTC contract as set out in the body of this report.

AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH DECISION IS MADE

Article 9 Power of the Executive to make decisions

STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Due to the recent pandemic outbreak of Covid-19 across the world, measures continue to be taken by the Government which are being actioned by the London Borough of Havering to protect the workforce and residents.

School streets will be a vital part of the recovery in ensuring social distancing outside schools and protecting children, teachers and residents.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

Extend the Public Space Protection Orders

Unlike all moving traffic contraventions enforceable under the powers granted by the Traffic Management Act 2004, Public Space Protection Orders are implemented through the powers afforded by the Anti-social Crime and Policing Act 2014.

The important difference to consider between the two Acts, is firstly, the Traffic Management Act 2004 is civil legislation created after the decriminalisation of parking with the adoption of the Road Traffic Act 1991. This is adopted and enforced by almost every local borough in the United Kingdom for the last 30 years through their traffic and parking services or similar.

The Anti-social Crime and Policing Act 2014 is criminal legislation that is typically enforced by the police or staff specifically trained anti-social behaviour and requires officers that are trained in Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) interviewing and to attend court when necessary, which is not what Parking Services Appeals and Challenges team members are trained to do.

The legal PSPO orders that are in place at each school were valid for a period of 3 years from the date of making in November 2016. This was for The James Oglethorpe, Harrow Lodge and Parsonage Farm Primary

Key Executive Decision

Schools. Engayne Primary School was introduced in January of 2017 at the school's request because of building work taking place on site.

An order can be extended if the purpose it has been installed for remains relevant and it is reasonable to assume the behaviour deterred by the order will return if it is no longer in place. To extend an order, the intention must be advertised not later than 3 months before the expiry in accordance with section 72(3) of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

The orders were not extended and are no longer enforceable. It is therefore not possible to extend the existing orders as they have expired.

For the PSPOs to be enforceable again, the orders will have to be treated as new and adhere the section of the legislation as referenced above, and follow the guidelines for implementing a new PSPO as per the statutory guidance² for front line professionals from the Home Office published in August 2019.

"Before making a Public Spaces Protection Order, the council must consult with the police. This should be done formally through the chief officer of police and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The council must also consult whatever community representatives they think appropriate. It is strongly recommended that the council engages in an open and public consultation to give the users of the public space the opportunity to comment on whether the proposed restriction or restrictions are appropriate, proportionate or needed at all. The council should also ensure that specific groups likely to have a particular interest are consulted, such as a local residents association, or regular users of a park or those involved in specific activities in the area, such as buskers and other street entertainers."

Based on the complexity of PSPOs to enforce, the costs associated and the fact that these have now expired, officers are recommending that these are replaced with School Streets moving forward, funded in part by the TfL funding Havering have bid for.

CCTV Contract

Do Nothing – if the Council take this option, they will be required to continue to pay the outstanding amounts on the PSPO contract as they are specified in the contract. In respect of the MTC contract some equipment cannot be installed as the vehicles are not fit for purpose. Without the variation to the MTC and repurposing of the PSPO cameras, there will be no additional finances available to deliver requirements under school streets. This option is not recommended as this does not represent value for money or provide the Council with a sustainable solution.

PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION

A formal public consultation is not required to implement an experimental traffic management order. However schools nominated for School Streets will be engaged to gain agreement for the schemes detailed in the body of this report. The communications plan is attached at appendix C.

NAME AND JOB TITLE OF STAFF MEMBER ADVISING THE DECISION-MAKER

Name: Steve Halsey

Designation: Project Manager

Signature: Steve Halsey

Date: 09/07/20

Part B - Assessment of implications and risks

² https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/823316/2019-08-05_ASB_Revised_Statutory_Guidance_V2.2.pdf

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996

Unlike all moving traffic contraventions enforceable under the powers granted by the Traffic Management Act 2004, Public Space Protection Orders are implemented through section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.

The important difference to consider between the two Acts, is firstly, the Traffic Management Act 2004 is civil legislation created after the decriminalisation of parking with the adoption of the Road Traffic Act 1991. This is adopted and enforced by almost every local borough in the United Kingdom for the last 30 years through their traffic and parking services or similar.

A PSPO under The Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 can be enforced by local authority officers specifically trained in this area. It also requires officers to be trained in Interviews under Caution under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) and to attend court when necessary, which is not what Parking Services Appeals and Challenges team members are trained to do.

The PSPO's which were in place at each school were valid for a period of 3 years from the date they were implemented in November 2016. This was for The James Oglethorpe, Harrow Lodge and Parsonage Farm Primary Schools. Engayne Primary School was introduced in January of 2017 at the school's request because of building work taking place on site.

A PSPO can be extended or a fresh Order made if there are grounds and evidence to do so and it is reasonable to assume the behaviour deterred by the order will return if it is no longer in place. A local authority must carry out the necessary consultation and necessary publicity and necessary notification before making an Order in accordance with section 72(3) of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. In addition statutory guidance³ for front line professionals from the Home Office published in August 2019 states:

"Before making a Public Spaces Protection Order, the council must consult with the police. This should be done formally through the chief officer of police and the Police and Crime Commissioner. The council must also consult whatever community representatives they think appropriate. It is strongly recommended that the council engages in an open and public consultation to give the users of the public space the opportunity to comment on whether the proposed restriction or restrictions are appropriate, proportionate or needed at all. The council should also ensure that specific groups likely to have a particular interest are consulted, such as a local residents association, or regular users of a park or those involved in specific activities in the area, such as buskers and other street entertainers."

The PSPO's were not extended before they expired and are no longer enforceable. If the Council wishes for these to be in place again, the same process will have to be undertaken for new Orders i.e. evidence gathering and consultation as set out above etc.

Given the lengthy process in implementing new PSPO's and the costs associated with this, since they have now expired, officers are recommending that these are replaced with School Streets moving forward, funded in part by the TfL funding Havering have bid for.

The process of making an ETMO is shorter than for making a permanent TMO, however this does not mean that scheme preparation is less important. Arguably, the ability to put restrictions 'on the ground' without public consultation makes planning and key stakeholder involvement even more important.

As with permanent TMOs in, LAs must ensure that they have appropriate procedures in place for approvals and internal consultations that are suitably robust yet not unduly officious or lengthy.

³ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/823316/2019-08-05_ASB_Revised_Statutory_Guidance_V2.2.pdf

Key Executive Decision

It is necessary to consult with the police and relevant bodies in accordance with regulation 6 of the LATOR (EW), see. However, regulations 7 and 8 do not apply to ETMOs, therefore there is no requirement to publish a formal Notice of Proposals and to invite objections and representations before the restrictions are implemented. This does not stop a LA from consulting more widely as appropriate, which would be encouraged.

Under regulation 22(2), the order is made and a Notice of Making must be published in a local newspaper, in the same way as for a permanent TMO. The provisions of an ETMO cannot come into force until seven days after the Notice of Making is published.

Once an ETMO comes into force, there is a six month period in which objections can be made. If the ETMO is subsequently modified, objections can be made in this period starting from the date of the changes.

There are no circumstances under which a public inquiry has to be held before making an ETMO. However, a public inquiry will be required if an objection is received within the first six months of making the ETMO and not withdrawn, and the authority intends to make the order permanent without any modifications to address the objection. Making modifications or the withdrawal of the objection following correspondence with the objector will remove the need for an inquiry.

Where it is decided to hold a public inquiry before making the order, or one is required after making the order following an objection as above, the requirements for permanent order public inquiries apply with the exception – under regulation 22(1) – of requirements relating to the giving of notice and publication of proposals and the right to make objections in response. In practice, however, the public inquiry process diminishes the benefits of using the ETMO process. If a public inquiry appears likely then perhaps the permanent TMO process would be more appropriate.

As with permanent TMOs, the national authority's consent is required under certain limited circumstances as detailed in Schedule 9 Part II of RTRA84.

An experimental order cannot be made for more than 18 months. For experimental orders below this maximum, an authority can extend the order up to the maximum 18 months provided that it is still in force at the time it was extended.

An ETMO order can be made permanent under regulation 23. As long as the requirements specified in paragraph 3 of regulation 23 have been complied with, there is no need to comply with regulations 6 (consultation), 7 (notice of proposals) and 8 (objections) when making the order permanent.

An ETMO has a lifespan of up to 18 months unless revoked, amended or made permanent. There are circumstances in which the natural expiry of an ETMO is desirable but they are few. Unless they are carefully monitored then signs and lines left on-street will give the impression of the presence of an extant TMO, leading to unlawful enforcement. Therefore, the timely removal of signs and lines – and the associated costs – need to be factored into the creation of ETMOs.

A review of the CCTV cameras will be undertaken to assess whether they are attached to private property or the highway, including lamp posts and street furniture. Any additional consents will be obtained from the relevant authority in accordance with the Highways Act 1980 and an ancillary secondary legislation.

There are statutory grounds for challenge in relation ETMO and TMO including an inquiry, appeal and Secretary of State challenge to a final outcome.

Termination and Variation of the Contracts

Termination of the PSPO contract is permitted under the terms of the contract. It is open to PSD to agree to waive any termination penalties.

Regulation 72(1)(b) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (PCR 2015) permits variation of a contract for additional works, services or supplies by the original contractor that have become necessary and were not included in the initial procurement, where a change of contractor

Key Executive Decision

- (i) cannot be made for economic or technical reasons such as requirements of interchangeability or interoperability with existing equipment, services or installations procured under the initial procurement, or
 - (ii) would cause significant inconvenience or substantial duplication of costs for the contracting authority,
- provided that any increase in price does not exceed 50% of the value of the original contract

The proposed variation of the MTC contract is caught by both limbs of 72(1)(b) as set out in the body of this report. As the value of the variation will not exceed 50% of the value of the contract, the variation is considered permissible.

Regulation 72(3) requires that where a modification has been made in reliance on Regulation 72(1)(b) or 72(1)(c), a contract notice in accordance with Regulation 51 must be published. If the extension is approved, such a notice should be published. The notice must contain sufficient information to inform the reason(s) that the Council considers that the Regulation 72(1)(b) and (c) criteria are met.

The Council's legal team will assist with drafting of the termination and variation documentation.

The terms of the grant agreement from TfL should be reviewed and approved by the Council's legal team.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

This reports recommends implementing 12 School Streets. The Council applied for TFL funding as follows and has been allocated £220,000.

Date of TFL Funding Application	Funding application - details	Amount Bid For	Bid Agreed
09.06.2020	22 School Streets	£1.6m	£0.220m
18.06.2020	37 School Street	£2.8m	0
Sept 2020	47 School Street	Revised amount	

The £220,000 will cover the set up costs for the first 12 school street schemes, excluding CCTV cameras which will be implemented by redeploying the PSPO cameras.

The Implementation of school streets will potentially generate £82,500 of income from PCNs. This is based on the number of PCNs and FPNs issued in 2019 / 2020 of 1,359 and a recovery rate of £60 per PCN.

2 additional staff will be required to respond to appeals against PCN. Therefore, of the additional £82,500 income the costs of these staff will be netted off against this to employ 2 additional officers at £32k each per annum (including on costs).

CCTV

The value of the PSPO contract is £249,700.00 with £147,994.55 having been paid to PDS leaving an amount of £101,705.45 remaining outstanding to be paid. This value will be transferred to the MTC Contact and be used to deliver the School Street Scheme for the 12 schools.

HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS (AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS WHERE RELEVANT)

Converting the existing camera enforcement scheme to school streets will not impact staffing. However, due to the additional PCNs that this may generate, 2 additional staff will be required to respond to appeals against PCN. Therefore, of the additional £82,500 income the costs of these staff will be netted off against this to employ 2 additional officers at £32k per annum (including on costs).

Key Executive Decision

Recruitment to these two new posts will be carried out under existing HR policies and procedures.

TfL's Streetspace Plan encourages the use of Experimental Traffic Orders in the interest of introducing emergency measures to manage the road network for the benefit of the community.

EQUALITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

As such, external stakeholders such as members of the public and parents / guardians of the pupils attending the proposed schools will not be consulted before implementation. However schools shortlisted will be engaged to ensure they are in agreement.

The Police Commissioner and the emergency services will also be consulted as required under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 section 6.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have due regard to:

- (i) The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- (ii) The need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not, and;
- (iii) Foster good relations between those who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

Note: 'Protected characteristics' are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnerships, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex/gender, sexual orientation.

The Council is committed to all of the above in the provision, procurement and commissioning of its services, and the employment of its workforce. In addition, the Council is also committed to improving the quality of life and wellbeing for all Havering residents in respect of socio-economics and health determinants.

HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Restricting vehicular access to schools during pick-up and drop-off time will encourage walking and cycling for parents / guardians and children which will contribute to improving their health.

This will also reduce the pollution caused by traffic and idling vehicles which will benefit all those living in close proximity, and those travelling to and from, the schools.

APPENDICES AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix A and B – Scheme designs

Appendix C – Schools Streets communications plan

Appendix D – engagement pack

Part C – Record of decision

I have made this executive decision in accordance with authority delegated to me by the Leader of the Council and in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

Decision

Proposal agreed

Delete as applicable

Proposal NOT agreed because

Key Executive Decision

Details of decision maker

Signed

Name:

Cabinet Portfolio held:

CMT Member title:

Head of Service title

Other manager title:

Date:

Lodging this notice

The signed decision notice must be delivered to the proper officer, Debra Marlow, Principal Committee Officer in Democratic Services, in the Town Hall.

For use by Committee Administration

This notice was lodged with me on _____

Signed _____