

# School Street Consultation for St Stephen's Primary Church School

Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)

Public Consultation Report

Bath & North East Somerset Council

April 2026

## Quality information

<b>Prepared by</b>	<b>Checked by</b>	<b>Verified by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
JW	NR	HH	HH

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	19/03/26	Draft report	NR	Neil Rogers	Associate Director
2	10/04/26	Final report	NR	Neil Rogers	Associate Director

## Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:

Bath & North East Somerset Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited  
100 Embankment  
Cathedral Approach  
Manchester M3 7FB  
United Kingdom

T: +44 161 601 1700  
aecom.com

© 2026 AECOM Limited.

AECOM Limited ("AECOM") has prepared this report for the sole use of **Bath & North East Somerset Council** ("Client").

AECOM shall have no duty, responsibility and/or liability to any party in connection with this report howsoever arising other than that arising to the Client under the Appointment. Save as provided in the Appointment, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by AECOM.

This report should not be reproduced in whole or in part or disclosed to any third parties for any use whatsoever without the express written authority of AECOM. To the extent this report is reproduced in whole or in part or disclosed to any third parties (whether by AECOM or another party) for any use whatsoever, and whether such disclosure occurs with or without the express written authority of AECOM, AECOM does not accept that the third party is entitled to rely upon this report and does not accept any responsibility or liability to the third party. To the extent any liability does arise to a third party, such liability shall be subject to any limitations included within the Appointment, a copy of which is available on request to AECOM.

Where any conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by the Client and/or third parties, it has been assumed that all relevant information has been provided by the Client and/or third parties and that such information is accurate. Any such information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in this report. AECOM accepts no liability for any inaccurate conclusions, assumptions or actions taken resulting from any inaccurate information supplied to AECOM from the Client and/or third parties.

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	5
1.1	About School Streets .....	5
1.2	The proposal.....	6
1.2.1	Timed restrictions.....	6
1.2.2	Management of the School Street.....	7
1.3	The TRO public consultation and questionnaire .....	7
1.4	Report structure .....	7
2.	Methodology .....	8
2.1	Receiving responses.....	8
2.2	Analysis and reporting .....	8
2.3	Response overview.....	8
2.4	Response profile.....	8
3.	Findings .....	10
3.1	Level of support for the TRO proposal .....	10
3.2	Number of respondents commenting by category .....	12
3.2.1	Themes from comments about parking .....	12
3.2.2	Themes from comments about traffic .....	12
3.2.3	Themes from comments about safety .....	13
3.2.4	Themes from comments about disturbance .....	14
3.2.5	Themes from comments about the environment .....	14
3.2.6	Themes from comments about access.....	15
3.2.7	Themes from comments about finance .....	15
3.2.8	General comments and other themes .....	16
3.2.9	Suggested changes to the proposals for the School Street.....	16
4.	Information about the proposals.....	18
	Appendix A Official TRO Public Consultation Questionnaire.....	19
	Appendix B Equality monitoring response .....	24
	Appendix C Full coding tables.....	27

# 1. Introduction

Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) Council is proposing to introduce a School Street outside St Stephen's Primary Church School. The School Street would restrict motor vehicle access on the section of Beacon Road between the junctions of Richmond Lane and Richmond Place during school drop-off and pick-up times, while ensuring essential vehicle access for those that need it, including residents living on these streets.

The aim is to create a safer, calmer environment outside the school gates.

Prior to this formal TRO consultation, in December 2025 the council engaged the community on early proposals by circulating an informational leaflet and letter to residents in and around the School Streets and distributing the leaflet to parents and carers of pupils at the school.

From Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> February to Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> February, the council held a three-week Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) public consultation on the School Street proposal, invited the public to attend a drop-in event, and to share their opinions on the proposed scheme via an online survey.

The outcomes of the TRO consultation survey are presented in this report.

## 1.1 About School Streets

School Streets use timed vehicle restrictions outside of schools to create safer, calmer spaces during the school run.

Restrictions can apply to part of a street, the full-length of a street, or several streets, and usually last between 30 and 60 minutes during drop-off and pick-up.

During operating hours, essential access to a School Street is maintained for those that require it via automatic exemptions and permit exemptions. School Streets are typically enforced through signage, trained school and/or volunteer stewards, and temporary barriers.

By restricting vehicle access during the school run, School Streets reduce the number of cars manoeuvring, parking or queueing where children are gathering.

Schools work closely with families to promote safe behaviours, such as careful crossing, considerate parking outside the School Street and slower driving on nearby streets.

Encouraging active travel is another integral part of the School Streets programme that helps to reduce the number of vehicles entering the area at school times, rather than simply moving traffic onto surrounding streets.

### Anticipated benefits of a School Street

- Fewer vehicles outside the school gates, reducing the risk of collisions and improving the safety of children.
- Safer and more pleasant walking, cycling and wheeling routes.
- More children travelling actively.
- Better physical health and focus in class.

- A calmer start and end to the school day.
- A calmer environment for residents living in or near school streets due to fewer vehicles.

## 1.2 The proposal

The council is proposing a School Street outside St Stephen's Primary Church School to tackle congestion, encourage more active travel, and improve children's safety at drop-off and pick-up times.

### 1.2.1 Timed restrictions

To create the School Street, the council is proposing to restrict motor vehicle access on Beacon Road between its junctions with Richmond Place and Richmond Lane during the times set out below. Essential access is maintained for those who need it.

Proposed restriction times (Monday to Friday, term-time only):

- Mornings: 8:15am to 9:00am
- Afternoons: 3:00pm to 3:45pm

**Figure 1** shows the extent of the proposed School Street, the location of temporary barriers and position of School Street signage.

**Figure 1: Proposed School Street**



Source: <https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/ststephens-schoolstreet>

## 1.2.2 Management of the School Street

Clear signage would be installed at all entry points to the School Street to show when restrictions are in operation. The proposed sign locations are shown in **Figure 1**.

Trained volunteer and school stewards would be present during operating hours to welcome families, put up and remove temporary barriers (stored at the school), and manage access for authorised vehicles and permit holders.

## 1.3 The TRO public consultation and questionnaire

The aims of the scheme and a full summary of the proposals, including an annotated map (Figure 1) and who would be exempted from the restrictions were available throughout the consultation at [bathnes.gov.uk/ststephens-schoolstreet](https://bathnes.gov.uk/ststephens-schoolstreet)

A drop-in event was also held at St Stephen's Primary school on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> February. The event provided members of the public an opportunity to meet the team and to ask questions about the design and how School Streets work. The event was attended by 39 people.

The council informed 117 residents of the TRO public consultation by letter on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2026. The TRO was also publicised on the street, to the local press via a statement on the council's newsroom on 5 February <https://newsroom.bathnes.gov.uk/news/council-proposes-two-new-school-streets> and promoted on the council's social media channels. The public consultation was open to everyone.

A printed postcard promoting the opportunity to 'have your say' was distributed to 350 parents and carers at the schools (via the children's book bags) and B&NES provided the school with content to promote the consultation via the school's newsletter and other communication channels.

The TRO public consultation questionnaire was available on the council's website from Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> February to Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> February (5pm) with print and alternative formats available on request. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in **Appendix A** at the end of this report.

## 1.4 Report structure

The structure of the report shows:

The method of receiving and analysing responses.

The findings for the level of support or objection to the trial.

Provided comments summarised to coded themes.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Receiving responses

The TRO public consultation questionnaire was hosted on the council's website [bathnes.gov.uk/ststephens-schoolstreet](http://bathnes.gov.uk/ststephens-schoolstreet). To ensure inclusivity, the council accepted responses via email and the hard copy questionnaire as well as online. Paper copies of the questionnaire were available to complete at the event, though none were completed.

### 2.2 Analysis and reporting

The public consultation was open to all and therefore respondents were self-selecting and made their own decision on whether to provide a response. This means findings should not be considered representative of the population, either for the local area or Bath and North East Somerset. The purpose of this report is to summarise the views of those who responded and the main reasons why these views were held.

#### Free text (open) questions

AECOM developed a robust framework to analyse the free text comments and ensure the frequency and strength of feeling is accurately reported. This process is known as coding; a list of themes was developed based on comments received. All responses received were read by a professional coder and grouped into themes, to allow meaningful analysis. Over 10 per cent of each coders work were checked as part of our quality control procedures.

Findings are reported by the number of comments made about each theme. It is important to bear in mind that a single response can have comments both in support and in objection to the scheme and raise concerns. A single response could mention more than one theme, and this explains why the number of comments may add up to more than the number of responses. It is important to bear this in mind when interpreting the public consultation findings.

#### Closed questions

Closed questions are those with a set list of possible answers for a respondent to select from to complete their response. The percentages shown only include those who responded to each question.

Where percentages do not sum to 100% in the main body of the report, this is due to rounding.

### 2.3 Response overview

There were 75 responses to the TRO public consultation, 74 of these responses were provided using the public consultation questionnaire, one was received by email.

### 2.4 Response profile

**Table 1** shows an overview of the respondents who provided a response to the TRO public consultation. Almost half of respondents (45%) were a parent or guardian (n=33), 41% were local residents (n=30), 12% lived elsewhere or on neighbouring roads (n=9), and 3% were answering in another capacity, not listed in the survey (n=2).

**Table 1: Capacity each respondent is providing response**

Type of respondent	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the online public consultation survey	<b>74</b>	<b>100</b>
I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends St Stephen's Primary School and I live on Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road	5	7
I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends St Stephen's Primary School and I live elsewhere	28	38
I work or volunteer at St Stephen's Primary School	0	0
I am a resident living on Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road	30	41
I live elsewhere/on neighbouring roads	9	12
I am responding on behalf of a local business	0	0
I am responding on behalf of a local stakeholder group	0	0
Something else	2	3

There was an option to answer equality monitoring questions in the survey, 64% of respondents (n=47) provided this information. The responses to the equality monitoring questions are provided in **Appendix B**.

### 3. Findings

This section describes the findings from the TRO public consultation survey.

#### 3.1 Level of support for the TRO proposal

Respondents were almost evenly split between those who supported and objected to the proposal (n=39 and n=32 respectively). The low sample size does not enable statistical analysis to be completed, however, indicatively:

- Among parents or guardians, more supported than objected to the proposal (n=29 and n=4 respectively).
- Among all residents, fewer supported than objected to the proposals (n=8 and n=28 respectively).
- Of those who live on either on the School Street, Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road, irrespective of whether they were a parent / guardian or resident, fewer supported than objected (n=9 and n=23 respectively). All parents who lived on these roads supported the School Street but most residents (n=23 out of 30) objected to it.

This is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Level of support or objection to the proposal (N)**

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Parent / Guardian living on local roads*</b>	<b>Parent / Guardian living elsewhere</b>	<b>Resident living on local roads*</b>	<b>Resident living elsewhere</b>	<b>Something else</b>
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>
I wholly support this proposal	31	4	22	2	2	1
I partially support this proposal	8	1	2	2	2	1
I neither support nor object to this proposal	3	0	0	3	0	0
I partially object to this proposal	12	0	1	9	2	0
I wholly object to this proposal	20	0	3	14	3	0
<b>Total: Wholly or partially support</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total: Wholly or partially object</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

\*Parents/Guardian or Residents who live on the School Street, Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road

## 3.2 Number of respondents commenting by category

This section shows the number of times a theme was mentioned in respondents' comments, arranged by category, using the list provided in the public consultation survey. More detail on the themes is provided for each of seven categories below. In total, 67 out of 75 respondents, including the one response by email, provided a comment to the TRO public consultation.

### 3.2.1 Themes from comments about parking

Table 3 shows main themes from comments provided by 33 respondents survey on the theme of parking. Comments regarding parking included both current issues and potential ones should the School Street be implemented.

**Table 3: Number of comments provided per theme about parking (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking</b>	<b>33</b>
Issues around parking on double yellow lines/ parking illegally / parking enforcement	28
Parking currently is a problem for residents	4
Will cause parking to issues/ reduce the number of places to park	3
Will lead to more cars parked in other areas	3
Concern people will arrive early to avoid restriction	3

Some respondents (n=28) felt that there were issues around poor driver behaviour, in particular parking on double yellow lines and the impact this has on safety or for other cars to pass through.

*“Numerous parents flagrantly ignore the road markings and signs every day and park directly outside of school. This makes it harder for the children to see and be seen when approaching school”*

### 3.2.2 Themes from comments about traffic

Table 4 shows main themes from comments provided by 41 respondents on the theme of traffic. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**.

**Table 4: Number of comments provided per theme about traffic (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about traffic</b>	<b>41</b>
Will displace traffic / increase traffic elsewhere	25
Will cause congestion / Will not reduce congestion	22
Will not discourage parents from driving to school	8
One way system should be put in place	7
Will require camera enforcement / ANPR should be used	4

The primary theme about traffic was the anticipated impact on the nearby roads, in particular Richmond Place and potential increased congestion on those roads which were considered to be narrow.

There were comments from some respondents that parents would park on these roads to drop off children and then walk back.

*“Both Richmond Lane and Mount Beacon will bear the brunt of all school traffic - drivers will likely circle around Richmond Lane - Beacon Lane (open section) - down Mount Beacon whilst others will go the opposite direction and cause severe traffic issues/conflicts as all of these roads are but narrow lanes unable to accommodate two-way traffic”*

One traffic related suggestion (n=7) was to create a one-way system in the area to allow a free flow of traffic.

*“A one-way loop during peak times could allow for continuous flow, reduce dangerous manoeuvres, and discourage long periods of stationary parking. Solutions like this may address safety concerns without simply displacing congestion into neighbouring streets.”*

### 3.2.3 Themes from comments about safety

Table 5 shows main themes from comments provided by 53 respondents on the theme of safety. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**.

**Table 5: Number of comments provided per theme about safety (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about safety</b>	<b>53</b>
Pavements/ roads are too narrow	21
Will make the area less safe for children	14
Will make the area safer for children	13
Will improve safety (not specific to children)	7
Will cause accidents / reduce safety (not specific to children)	7
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with walking	6

There was a split among the general feel from respondents whether the School Streets would improve or reduce safety.

Those who felt that safety would be improved for children commented on the anticipated benefit of having vehicle free streets outside the school making it safer for children.

*“The presence of vehicles on the road during school drop off and pick up can make it dangerous for pedestrians especially young children when crossing the road. At times the road can be very busy and I would feel much safer if vehicles could not pass through during those times.”*

Those who felt it would reduce safety commented that their expectation that traffic volumes will increase on neighbouring roads which, combined with an increase in children walking and crossing roads, will make this less safe. Some respondents also thought vehicles would turn around once they'd dropped off their child by car, adding further risk to safety.

*“Concern regarding safety for many children/families who access school on foot from surrounding area. When access has been restricted this has caused additional traffic on narrow roads surrounding the school with increased danger to pedestrians with cars trying to pass/turn.”*

### 3.2.4 Themes from comments about disturbance

Table 6 shows all the themes from comments provided by 19 respondents on the theme of disturbance.

**Table 6: Number of comments provided per theme about disturbance (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about disturbance</b>	<b>19</b>
Will have a negative impact on residents in adjacent/surrounding neighbourhoods	15
Affects parents work/ work hours	4

When commenting on perceived disturbance, respondents were concerned that the perceived increase in traffic in the surrounding areas around the School Street could impact the lives of local residents.

*“Local residents should not face increased traffic, restricted access, or reduced safety if avoidable car use is contributing to the problem.”*

### 3.2.5 Themes from comments about the environment

Table 7 shows all the themes from comments provided by 12 respondents on the theme of environment.

**Table 7: Number of comments provided per theme about the environment (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about the environment</b>	<b>13</b>
Will cause air pollution / Will not reduce air pollution	7
Will reduce air pollution	6

Respondents felt that the area around the school would benefit from the School Street due to less traffic in the area during pick-up and drop-off times.

*“We are lucky at St Stephen’s to be on the hill, away from the city’s pollution and it would be lovely to protect that just a bit more by reducing the car emissions directly outside at such a busy time of day.”*

Conversely, six respondents believed that congestion from displaced traffic would increase air pollution in the area or impact elsewhere.

*“No explanation nor assessment has been given as to how air quality will actually be improved rather than simply relocated. Shifting vehicle movements to adjacent residential streets does not reduce pollution, it merely moves it to streets whose residents have had no say in this decision”*

### 3.2.6 Themes from comments about access

Table 8 shows the one theme about access provided by two respondents, specifically the concern for emergency service access.

**Table 8: Number of comments provided per theme about access (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about access</b>	<b>2</b>
Negative impact on emergency service vehicles	2

### 3.2.7 Themes from comments about finance

Table 9 shows the one theme about finance provided by three respondents, specifically that the money for the scheme should be used elsewhere or is a waste of money.

**Table 9: Number of comments provided per theme about finance (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about finance</b>	<b>3</b>
Scheme is a waste of money/ costs too much	3

### 3.2.8 General comments and other themes

There were 45 comments provided which were general or did not fit into any of the categories listed in the official TRO public consultation questionnaire. These are shown in Table 10. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**.

**Table 10: Number of comments provided per theme which did not fit into any of the categories (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who provided at least one other theme or general comment</b>	<b>45</b>
More information required	13
Support the School Street trial / should be permanent	11
Scheme is unnecessary / not needed	7
Oppose making the trial permanent/will have a negative impact	6

Respondents, particularly residents, felt they had not been provided with sufficient information about the School Street. Examples of this were from traffic counts, air quality and other evidence of the problem and how the School Street would resolve them. Other examples were the expected routes and places for parents to park or drop-off and pick-up school pupils.

*“There has been no clear explanation of how traffic will be expected to reroute, how congestion may shift into surrounding streets, or what responsibilities will fall on parents, staff, and commuting residents.”*

A number of respondents (n=7) felt that the scheme was unnecessary. Reasons for feeling the scheme is not needed was the perception that there have been no accidents in the recent past.

*“No traffic and very low speed. There is no risk for the kids. There is no risk to children and blocking a street will congest even further all the nearby streets and the area.”*

### 3.2.9 Suggested changes to the proposals for the School Street

Whether respondents supported or objected to the School Street, some made suggestions to enhance or adapt the School Street. These are shown in Table 11.

**Table 11: Number of comments provided suggesting changes to the School Street (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who suggested changes to the School Street</b>	<b>13</b>
Expand the scheme area / include Richmond Place	11
Alternate suggestion/ more measures needed	7
Walking bus / walking schemes should be implemented	3

Suggestions for alternative solutions included increasing the size of the School Street, with Richmond Place often mentioned to be included.

*“I propose that ‘the street’ should include the whole of Richmond Place. The main reason is that many children walk to school along this road from both ends. The pavement is narrow, and it would encourage them to walk along the road rather than over the green.”*

*“The only way you can stop parents from driving up to and parking around the school and to ease the congestion they cause would be to move the barriers to the end of Richmond Lane (past the allotments) or to the entrance to Richmond Hill from Lansdown Road. This would ensure there was no vehicle access to the area for the allotted time which would create a safe environment for the children.”*

## 4. Information about the proposals

Feedback received from this formal public consultation will be summarised in a report to the deciding officer (the Director of Place Management). If plans are supported, the council will:

- make any necessary amendments before finalising the design
- invite applications for permit exemptions
- train stewards and work with the school to encourage more active travel and promote safe driving behaviours
- launch the School Street in May 2026

Should the scheme be installed, the council would monitor traffic and travel behaviour to assess the School Street's effectiveness, drawing on baseline counts gathered before launch. Adjustments would be made to the scheme, as required.

More information about School Streets TRO consultation can be found at [https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/st\\_stephensschoolstreet](https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/st_stephensschoolstreet).

The council's School Streets team can be contacted by emailing [school\\_streets@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:school_streets@bathnes.gov.uk), or by calling **01225 394 025**

## Appendix A Official TRO Public Consultation Questionnaire

### Traffic Regulation Order 25-073

### Public Consultation Survey: St Stephen's Primary School Street

#### Proposal for a School Street

Thank you for sharing your views on a proposal for a School Street.

These proposals are designed to create a safer, healthier and calmer environment in the outside the school entrance on Beacon Road, by restricting access to most vehicles between 8:15 and 9:00 am and again between 3:00 and 3:45 pm on weekdays during term-time. Vehicle exemptions will apply during the timed restrictions for essential access (e.g. emergency services, utilities).

#### Before you begin

- **Questions marked with \* are mandatory**

Your responses will remain confidential and will be used solely for the purposes of this consultation. We will ask you for your address to help us analyse the survey, and for your email address so that we can contact you about your feedback if required.

The survey also includes a set of optional equality monitoring questions. Each of these questions includes a “prefer not to say” option should you choose not to disclose that information.

Completing the survey should take no more than a few minutes depending on whether you choose to add extra comments at the end or fill out the equalities monitoring section.

This consultation is open from **Thursday 5 February until Thursday 26 February 2026 at 5pm.**

Paper forms can be left at the event or returned by post before the above deadline to:

#### **School Streets**

#### **Bath and North East Somerset Council**

#### **Lewis House**

#### **Manvers Street**

#### **BA1 1JG**

If you have any questions or need assistance or an alternative format, please contact us at **[school\\_streets@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:school_streets@bathnes.gov.uk) or 01225 39 40 25.**

**Full name\***

**Contact email address (if available)**

**Your address, including postcode\***

About your support

**Please tell us your level of support\***

*Please select one*

- I wholly support this proposal
- I partially support this proposal
- I neither support nor object to this proposal
- I partially object this proposal
- I wholly object to this proposal

## About the category of your response

### **Please tell us which category your response falls under\***

*Please select all that apply*

- Parking
- Traffic
- Safety
- Access
- Disturbance
- Financial
- Environmental
- Something else

## About the capacity you are responding in

### **Please tell us in what capacity you are responding to this consultation\***

- I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends St Stephen's Primary School and I live on Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road
- I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends St Stephen's Primary School and I live elsewhere
- I work or volunteer at St Stephen's Primary School
- I am a resident living on Beacon Road (south of the junction with Richmond Lane), Mount Beacon, Richmond Hill, Richmond Lane, Richmond Place or Summerfield Road
- I live elsewhere/on neighbouring roads
- I am responding on behalf of a local business
- I am responding on behalf of a local stakeholder group
- Something else

## About your response

**If you would like to explain the grounds for your objection or your support for the scheme, please use the space below to write this:**

## Declaration

**You must read the privacy notice and agree to this statement to take part in this online consultation. You must read the privacy notice and agree to this statement to take part in this online consultation. If you do not agree to the terms in the Privacy Notice we will be unable to submit your response to this consultation.**

I have read the Privacy Notice

I confirm that I agree

## Appendix B Equality monitoring response

All respondents were invited to complete the equality monitoring questions at the end of the official TRO public consultation questionnaire and 47 respondents did this. The outcomes to these questions are shown in the tables below.

**Table A1: Age group**

Age group	Number*	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Under 25	1	2
25 to 34	1	2
35 to 44	13	30
45 to 54	12	27
55 or over	17	39
Prefer not to say	0	0

\*3 respondents did not answer this question

**Table A2: Sex / Gender**

Sex	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
Female	25	53
Male	20	43
Prefer not to say	2	4

**Table A3: Ethnic background**

Ethnic group	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
White	42	89
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	2	4
Asian or Asian British	1	2
Black, African, Caribbean or Black British	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	0
Prefer not to say	2	4

**Table A4: Physical, mental health conditions or illness lasting, or expected to last, 12 months or more**

Physical, mental or illness lasting 12 months or more	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	44	94
No	3	6
Prefer not to say	0	0

**Table A5: Marital or civil partnership status**

Marital or civil partnership	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
Never married and never registered in a civil partnership	4	9
Married	37	79
In a registered civil partnership	1	2
Separated, but still legally married	1	2
Divorced	2	4
Prefer not to say	2	4

**Table A6: Religious affiliation**

Religious affiliation	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
No religion	26	55
Christian	15	32
Hindu	1	2
Jewish	1	2
Prefer not to say	4	9

**Table A7: Sexual orientation**

Sexual orientation	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
Heterosexual or straight	42	90
Gay or lesbian	1	2
Bisexual	1	2
Prefer not to say	3	6

**Table A8: Care experienced**

Care experienced	Number	Percent
<b>Base:</b> All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	0	0
No	47	100
Prefer not to say	0	0

## Appendix C Full coding tables

**Table C1: Number of comments provided per theme about parking (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking</b>	<b>33</b>
Issues around parking on double yellow lines/ parking illegally / parking enforcement	28
Parking currently is a problem for residents	4
Will cause parking to issues/ reduce the number of places to park	3
Will lead to more cars parked in other areas	3
Concern people will arrive early to avoid restriction	3
Will improve parking in the area	1
Alternative parking is required	1

**Table C2: Number of comments provided per theme about traffic (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about traffic</b>	<b>41</b>
Will displace traffic / increase traffic elsewhere	25
Will cause congestion / Will not reduce congestion	22
Will not discourage parents from driving to school	8
One way system should be put in place	7
Will require camera enforcement / ANPR should be used	4
Public transport is not good enough/ needs to be improved / needs to be encouraged	1
Changes have made journey inconvenient	1
Will reduce congestion	1

**Table C3: Number of comments provided per theme about safety (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about safety</b>	<b>53</b>
Pavements/roads are too narrow	21
Will make the area less safe for children	14
Will make the area safer for children	13
Safety is important	8
Will cause accidents / reduce safety (general comment)	7
Will improve safety (general comment)	7
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with walking	6
Will not improve safety	2
Concerned about safety for children	2
Will improve safety with walking	2
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with cycling	1
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with driving a vehicle	1
Safety of volunteers	1
Will improve safety with cycling	1

**Table C4: Number of comments provided per theme about disturbance (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about disturbance</b>	<b>19</b>
Will have a negative impact on residents in adjacent/surrounding neighbourhoods	15
Affects parents work/ work hours	4
Unfair on those who cannot switch from car to cycling or walking	1

**Table C5: Number of comments provided per theme about the environment (N)**

Theme	Count
<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about the environment</b>	<b>13</b>
Will cause air pollution / Will not reduce air pollution	7
Will reduce air pollution	6

**Table C6: Number of comments provided per theme about access (N)**

Theme	Count
-------	-------

<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about access</b>	<b>2</b>
--	----------

Negative impact on emergency service vehicles/provision	2
---	---

### Table C7: Number of comments provided per theme about finance (N)

Theme	Count
-------	-------

<b>Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about finance</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------

Scheme is a waste of money/ costs too much	3
--	---

### Table C8: Number of comments provided per theme which did not fit into any of the categories (N)

Theme	Count
-------	-------

<b>Total number of respondents who provided at least one other theme or general comment</b>	<b>45</b>
---	-----------

More information required	13
---------------------------	----

Support making the trial permanent	11
------------------------------------	----

Scheme is unnecessary / not needed	7
------------------------------------	---

Oppose making the trial permanent	6
-----------------------------------	---

There should be an exemption for residents	4
--	---

Criticism of consultation/ scheme planning	4
--	---

Will have a positive impact on walking / cycling (active travel)	3
--	---

Unfair on elderly and disabled residents	2
--	---

Supportive of promoting active travel	1
---------------------------------------	---

Will make area more pleasant	1
------------------------------	---

**Table C9: Number of comments provided suggesting changes to the School Street (N)**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Count</b>
<b>Total number of respondents who suggested changes to the School Street</b>	<b>15</b>
Expand the scheme area / include Richmond Place	11
Alternate suggestion/ more measures needed	7
Relies on volunteers / sustainability concern	3
Walking bus / walking schemes should be implemented	3
Concerns about the weather	1
Scheme needs longer operating hours	1

