

School Street Consultation for Widcombe Infants and Junior Schools

Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)

Public Consultation Report

Bath & North East Somerset Council

April 2026

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
JW	NR	HH	HH

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	27/02/26	Report layout	NR	Neil Rogers	Associate Director
2	19/03/26	Draft report	NR	Neil Rogers	Associate Director
3	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	13
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	15
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 Widcombe Infants and Junior School. The School Street would restrict access for motor vehicles on the full length of Archway Street and Excelsior Street 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 schools.

From Thursday 5th February to Thursday 26th 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 the Widcombe Infants and Junior Schools 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 the full length of Archway Street and Excelsior Street during the times set out below. Essential access is maintained for those who need it, including for residents living on these streets.

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

- Mornings: 8:20am to 9am
- Afternoons: 2:50pm to 3:30pm

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/widcombeschoolstreet>

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/widcombeschoolstreet.

A drop-in event was also held at Widcombe Infants School on Tuesday 10th February 2026. 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 23 people.

The council informed 251 residents of the TRO public consultation by letter on 3 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 425 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 5th February to Thursday 26th 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 www.bathnes.gov.uk/widcombeschoolstreet. 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.

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 145 responses to the TRO public consultation. The majority of responses (n=144) were provided using the public consultation questionnaire, one paper survey was completed and subsequently input into the online survey to be included in the analysis.

2.4 Response profile

Table 1 shows an overview of the respondents who provided a response to the TRO public consultation. Most respondents (64%) were a parent or guardian (n=93), 17% were residents (n=24), 11% were school staff who worked or volunteered at one of the schools (n=16), 2% responded on behalf of a business or organisation (n=2), and 7% were answering in another capacity, not listed in the survey (n=10).

Table 1: Capacity each respondent is providing response

Type of respondent	Number	Percent
Base: All who responded to the public consultation survey	145	100
I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School. I live on Broadway, Ferry Lane, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Close, Spring Crescent or Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays	3	2
I am a parent//guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School I live on Excelsior Street or Archway Street i.e. on the proposed School Street	1	1
I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School and I live elsewhere	89	61
I work or volunteer at Widcombe Infants or Junior School	16	11
I am a resident living on Broadway, Ferry Lane, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Close, Spring Crescent or Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays	5	3
I am a resident living on Excelsior Street or Archway Street i.e. the school street	8	6
I live elsewhere/on neighbouring roads	11	8
I am responding on behalf of a local business	1	1
I am responding on behalf of a local stakeholder group	1	1
Something else	10	7

There was an option to answer equality monitoring questions in the survey, 64% of respondents (n=93) 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=74 and n=69 respectively). Specifically:

- Among parents or guardians, slightly more supported than objected to the proposal (n=49 and n=43 respectively).
- Slightly fewer respondents who work or volunteer at either Widcombe Infants or June school supported than objected (n=6 and n=10 respectively).
- Among all residents, the number who supported and objected were almost the same (n=11 and n=12 respectively).
- Of those who lived on either the School Street, Broadway, Ferry Lane, Miles Street, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Crescent, Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays Place, irrespective of whether they were a parent / guardian or resident, the number who supported and objected was almost the same (n=8 and n=8 respectively).

This is shown in Table 2. All findings should be considered indicative due to the low number of responses for each type of respondent.

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

Level of support	Total	Parent / Guardian living on local roads*	Parent / Guardian living elsewhere	Resident living on local roads*	Resident living elsewhere	Work or volunteer at Widcombe schools**	Business / Organisation	Something else
Base:								
All respondents	145	4	89	13	11	16	2	10
I wholly support this proposal	42	1	34	3	2	0	0	2
I partially support this proposal	32	1	13	3	3	6	1	5
I neither support nor object to this proposal	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
I partially object to this proposal	25	0	16	5	0	3	1	0
I wholly object to this proposal	44	2	25	2	5	7	0	3
Total: Wholly or partially support	74	2	47	6	5	6	1	7
Total: Wholly or partially object	69	2	41	7	5	10	1	3

*Parents/Guardian or Residents who live on the School Street, Broadway, Ferry Lane, Miles Street, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Crescent, Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays Place).

**Work or volunteer at Widcombe Infants of Junior School.

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, 139 out of 145 respondents provided a comment to the TRO public consultation.

3.2.1 Themes from comments about parking

Table 3 shows the main themes from comments provided by 68 respondents about parking. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**. Comments about parking referred to 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
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking	68
Issues around parking on double yellow lines/ parking illegally / parking enforcement	32
Alternative parking is required	22
Staff parking should still be allowed after 8:20/ staff should be exempt	12
Will cause parking to issues/ reduce the number of places to park	11

Some respondents (n=32) commented that improving poor driver behaviour, specifically where cars are parked in the area, would make the area safer for children. Some felt it could negate the need for a School Street.

"I fully agree that the streets are currently not safe for children entering and leaving the school around these hours, however I also note that this is due to people parking illegally on the double yellow lines outside of school"

Other parking comments mentioned the need for parking for those who have to drive their children to school. Respondents commented that there are no suitable car parks nearby.

"Already the parking situation around the school, particularly at collection time, is incredibly strained and challenging to find a space unless arriving 30 minutes before the gates open which, as full-time working parents, is unrealistic. If this proposal were to proceed it would result in the displacement of approximately 30 - 35 cars no longer able to park in Archway or Excelsior Streets meaning the pressure would increase for the already limited capacity in Broadway, Miles Street and other surrounding roads"

There were 12 comments, including 10 from staff or volunteers from the school, mentioning the need for staff to access the staff car park during the School Street times.

“As a staff member at the junior school I need to access the staff car park after 8.20 (I start work at 8.30) and I leave at 3.15. The current plan has the staff car park within the School Street zone. Is there a way the staff could be exempt to the restrictions?”

3.2.2 Themes from comments about traffic

Table 4 shows the main themes from comments provided by 56 respondents about traffic. All themes mentioned are shown in Table 8. The primary themes around traffic were the impact on the nearby roads and that of potential increases in congestion on those roads.

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about traffic	56
Will displace traffic / increase traffic elsewhere	32
Will cause congestion / Will not reduce congestion	22
One way system should be put in place	6
Public transport needs to be improved / needs to be encouraged	5
Will reduce congestion	3
Will not discourage parents from driving to school	2

There was a view among some respondents that parents would park on roads such as Broadway, Pulteney Road or side roads from these. It was anticipated that having parked, parents would then walk to the school with the child or children and walk back which would lead to additional congestion along narrow roads.

“By making Excelsior and Archway street ‘safer streets’, it is going to mean more people squeezing into Broadway, Spring Crescent and Ferry Lane which will become gridlocked”

3.2.3 Themes from comments about safety

Table 5 shows the main themes from comments provided by 78 respondents about safety. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**. The respondents' comments were split between those who thought the School Street would improve or reduce safety.

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about safety	78
Will cause accidents / reduce safety	28
Will improve safety	28
Will make the area safer for children	20
Will make the area less safe for children	17

Having vehicle free streets outside the school, leading to improved safety for children, was the safety benefit commented on most often.

An expected increase in traffic on neighbouring roads was the reason other respondents commented that the area would be less safe. There was a view that more children would be walking along and crossing roads before they reached the School Street as they would no longer be dropped off by car.

“Restricting vehicular access to the school during drop-off and pick-up times will result in more vehicle drop-offs and pick-ups being attempted on the infinitely busier adjacent main trunk road (Pulteney Road) which will be much more dangerous for children.”

3.2.4 Themes from comments about disturbance

Table 6 shows the main themes from comments provided by 70 respondents about disturbance. All themes mentioned are shown in **Appendix C**.

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about disturbance	70
Unfair on those who cannot switch from car to cycling or walking	50
Affects parents work/ work hours	26
Will cause increased stress/pressure for residents/parents	16
Will have a negative impact on residents in adjacent/surrounding neighbourhoods	12
Will cause students/staff/parents to be late	11

The theme most mentioned (n=50) was about those who cannot switch from car use. Reasons for this included distance from the school and a perceived lack of public transport options, or ability to use public transport.

“Being able to walk to school is a luxury for those who live near enough to do so. This is not a luxury that everybody enjoys, particularly in a city as expensive as Bath. This proposal therefore discriminates against those who do not live in walking distance, or who are unable to take public transport.”

Respondents commented that the introduction of a School Street would disrupt their routine. Examples of this were the increased time to drop-off and collect children due to the need to park further from the school, or having to drop children off earlier to be able to get to their onward destination on time (such as their place of work). Some parents suggested they would have to change their work hours if the School Street was implemented.

“Many working parents operate within strict time constraints due to fixed work start and finish times. Removing parking access assumes a level of flexibility that many families simply do not have”

3.2.5 Themes from comments about the environment

Table 7 shows the main themes from comments provided by 20 respondents about the environment. All themes mentioned are shown in Table 7.

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about the environment	20
Will reduce air pollution	12
Will cause air pollution / Will not reduce air pollution	8

Respondents commented that the air quality around the school would benefit due to fewer vehicles being in the area during pick-up and drop-off times.

“Currently lots of slow moving drop off and pick up traffic runs past the school and fumes from the cars are at high and very noticeable, at levels that will be damaging to the children’s lung health”

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

“In terms of air quality, I am concerned that blocking the adjacent roads will have an impact on Pulteney road, making pollution worse or the same at best”

3.2.6 Themes from comments about access

Table 8 shows the themes mentioned by three respondents about access. Two comments raised the concern about emergency vehicle access and another for business. All themes mentioned are shown in Table 8.

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about access	3
Negative impact on emergency service vehicles/provision	2
Limits access to city / businesses	1

3.2.7 Themes from comments about finance

Table 9 shows the theme mentioned by three respondents about how the money to implement the scheme could be used elsewhere. All themes mentioned are shown in Table 9.

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

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

3.2.8 General comments and other themes

There were 93 comments provided which were general or did not fit into any of the categories listed in the official TRO public consultation questionnaire. The main

themes for these general comments is 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
Total number of respondents who provided at least one other theme or general comment	93
Support the School Street trial without providing further detail about their reasons	20
Scheme is unnecessary / not needed	18
Oppose the School Street, it will have a negative impact without providing further detail about their reasons	11
The scheme relies on volunteers and these may not be forthcoming	11
More information required	11
Unfair on elderly and disabled residents	10
Teachers shouldn't have to do traffic duty	8

A number of respondents (n=18) 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 and that the area is only busy for a short amount of time.

“While there may be a perceived safety issue, is it real around the Widcombe schools? Certainly in the years my children attended the schools I was not aware of any injuries to children, and certainly no deaths”

Some concerns were raised about the need for volunteers to run the system and a fear these may not be forthcoming. There were also comments that teachers should not have this added to their workload as they are already caring for children during the operating times.

“The scheme relies on volunteers/staff to man. This would be 4 people a day/20 a week. This is too big an ask for parents who will have child caring responsibilities and potentially jobs to go to. Staff will not be able to fill these positions.[School staff] greet and settle children, deal with daily enquiries and complete essential set up or day end tasks.”

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
Total number of respondents who suggested changes to the School Street	15
More measures needed	7
Walking bus / walking schemes should be implemented	5
Excelsior street should not be closed / restricted area is too large	4
Scheme needs longer operating hours	3
The nearby playground should be used for access	3
Suggest staggered parking times	2

Suggestions for alternative solutions included a walking bus or a park and stride scheme and adding official drop-off areas. Others suggested changes to the size of the zone or timings. Below are some of the comments made regarding alterations to the scheme.

“I do not understand why the streets do not get blocked off from where Excelsior Street meets Archway Street as I think this would reduce traffic blockage and all the negative aspects which come with it”

“Part of the public playground (on the far side) could be used as an official school drop off zone or parking for use during drop off and collection. Access could be from the Travel Lodge Junction which has big wide splays and clear traffic lights. This could remove all the traffic from Archway Street etc during these busy times instantly creating a safe school area 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/widcombeschoolstreet>.

The council's School Streets team can be contacted by emailing school_streets@bathnes.gov.uk, or by calling **01225 394 025**

Appendix A Official TRO Public Consultation Questionnaire

Traffic Regulation Order 25-072

Public Consultation Survey: Widcombe Infants and Junior 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 entrances on Archway Street and Excelsior Street, by restricting access to most vehicles between 8:20 and 9:00 am and again between 2:50 and 3:30 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 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*

Please read all options before selecting one

- I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School and I live on Broadway, Ferry Lane, Miles Street, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Crescent, Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays
- I am a parent//guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School and I live on Excelsior Street or Archway Street i.e. on the proposed School Street
- I am a parent/guardian of a pupil who attends Widcombe Infants or Junior School and I live elsewhere
- I work or volunteer at Widcombe Infants or Junior School
- I am a resident living on Broadway, Ferry Lane, Miles Street, 10-16 Queen's Place, Spring Crescent, Spring Gardens Road, Summerlays Court or 8-13 Summerlays
- I am a resident living on Excelsior Street or Archway Street i.e. the school street
- 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 93 respondents did this. The outcomes to these questions are shown in the tables below.

Table A1: Age group

Age group	Number*	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	81	100
Under 25	0	0
25 to 34	2	2
35 to 44	25	31
45 to 54	35	43
55 or over	19	23
Prefer not to say	0	0

*12 respondents did not answer this question

Table A2: Sex / Gender

Sex	Number	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	93	100
Female	62	67
Male	28	30
Prefer not to say	3	3

Table A3: Ethnic background

Ethnic group	Number	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	93	100
White	75	81
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	6	6
Asian or Asian British	4	4
Black, African, Caribbean or Black British	0	0
Other ethnic group	4	4
Prefer not to say	4	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
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	92	100
Yes	15	16
No	73	79
Prefer not to say	4	4

*1 respondent did not answer this question

Table A5: Marital or civil partnership status

Marital or civil partnership	Number*	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	92	100
Never married and never registered in a civil partnership	8	9
Married	70	76
In a registered civil partnership	0	0
Separated, but still legally married	1	1
Separated, but still legally in a civil partnership	0	0
Formerly in a civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	0	0
Widowed	2	2
Surviving partner from a registered civil partnership	0	0
Divorced	5	5
Prefer not to say	6	7

*1 respondent did not answer this question

Table A6: Religious affiliation

Religious affiliation	Number*	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	92	100
No religion	48	52
Christian	33	36
Buddhist	0	0
Hindu	1	1
Jewish	0	0
Muslim	1	1
Sikh	0	0
Any other religion	2	2
Prefer not to say	7	8

*1 respondent did not answer this question

Table A7: Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation	Number*	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	92	100
Heterosexual or straight	88	96
Gay or lesbian	0	0
Bisexual	0	0
Prefer not to say	3	3
Other	1	1

*1 respondent did not answer this question

Table A8: Care experienced

Care experienced	Number	Percent
Base: All who responded to the equality monitoring questions	93	100
Yes	2	2
No	91	98
Prefer not to say	0	0

Appendix C Full coding tables

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking	68
Issues around parking on double yellow lines/ parking illegally / parking enforcement	32
Alternative parking is required	22
Staff parking should still be allowed after 8:20/ staff should be exempt	12
Will cause parking to issues/ reduce the number of places to park	11
Will lead to more cars parked in certain areas	8
Will improve parking in the area	2
Parking currently is a problem for residents	1

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about traffic	57
Will displace traffic / increase traffic elsewhere	32
Will cause congestion / Will not reduce congestion	22
One way system should be put in place	6
Public transport needs to be improved / needs to be encouraged	5
Will reduce congestion	3
Will not discourage parents from driving to school	2

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about safety	78
Will cause accidents / reduce safety	28
Will improve safety	28
Will make the area safer for children	20
Will make the area less safe for children	17
Will not improve safety	4
Safety of volunteers	4
Will improve safety with cycling	4
Pavements/roads are too narrow	4
Will improve safety with walking	3
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with walking	3
Safety is important (not supportive and or unsupportive about the scheme)	3
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with cycling	2
Will reduce safety / there are safety concerns with driving a vehicle	1

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about disturbance	70
Unfair on those who cannot switch from car to cycling or walking	50
Affects parents work/ work hours	26
Will cause increased stress/pressure for residents/parents	16
Will have a negative impact on residents in adjacent/surrounding neighbourhoods	12
Will cause students/staff/parents to be late	11
Will reduce noise pollution	1

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about the environment	20
Will reduce air pollution	12
Will cause air pollution / Will not reduce air pollution	8

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about access	3
Negative impact on emergency service vehicles/provision	2
Limits access to city / businesses	1

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about finance	3
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
Total number of respondents who provided at least one other theme or general comment	93
Support the School Street trial without providing further detail about their reasons	20
Scheme is unnecessary / not needed	18
Oppose the School Street, it will have a negative impact without providing further detail about their reasons	11
The scheme relies on volunteers and these may not be forthcoming	11
More information required	11
Unfair on elderly and disabled residents	10
Teachers shouldn't have to do traffic duty	8
Concern about the Impact on residents with lower incomes / financially challenged	8
Another group of people should be exempt	7
There should be an exemption for other nearby residents	6
Will have a positive impact on walking / cycling (active travel)	4
Supportive of promoting active travel	4
Will have a positive impact on the area	2
Will have a positive impact on Residents	1
Will not have a positive impact on walking / cycling (active travel)	1
Majority of parents do not support the scheme / are against it	1

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

Theme	Count
Total number of respondents who suggested changes to the School Street	14
More measures needed	7
Walking bus / walking schemes should be implemented	5
Excelsior street should not be closed / restricted area is too large	4
Scheme needs longer operating hours	3
The nearby playground should be used for access	3
Suggest staggered parking times	2

