

Appendix 2 – Overview of support from survey results

Perivale Scheme

Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: Residents/Business

Support	Level of Support	Perivale scheme	
			88 responses 760 addresses (11.5% response rate)
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it	50%	28 residents 16 businesses
	No Opinion	3%	3
	I support it	47%	38 residents 3 businesses



Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: Parents/Carers

Support	Level of Support	Perivale Primary		St John Fisher	
			1 response		34 responses
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it			42%	14
	No Opinion	100%	1	4%	1
	I support it			54%	18



Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: Staff

Support	Level of Support	Perivale Primary		St John Fisher	
			24 responses 40 staff (60% resp)		15 responses 41 staff (37% resp)
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it	25%	6	53%	8
	No Opinion	25%	6	15%	2
	I support it	50%	12	32%	5



LSP Schemes

Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: **Residents/Business** (see page 4 for reasons for not supporting)

Support	Level of Support	Berrymede Infants & Junior	Derwentwater	Gifford Primary	Holy Family	Mayfield	N Ealing	Oaklands	St Johns	St Marks	Vicars Green	Willow Tree
Response rate		5/316 1.5%	11/160 7%	14/191 7%	84/639 13%	15/174 9%	34/177 19%	98/730 13%	9/197 5%	46/617 7%	23/265 9%	35/420 8%
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it	20%	45%	57%	55%	27%	26%	42%	56%	33%	48%	20%
	No Opinion	20%	36%	21%	11%	27%	38%	17%	22%	15%	30%	31%
	I support it	60%	18%	21%	35%	47%	35%	41%	22%	52%	22%	49%

Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: **Parents/Carers**

Support	Level of Support	Berrymede Infants	Berrymede Junior	Derwentwater	Gifford Primary	Holy Family	Mayfield	N Ealing	Oaklands	St Johns	St Marks	Vicars Green	Willow Tree
Responses		5	12	33	13	85	78	56	78	3	101	14	76
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it	0%	0%	6%	8%	42%	6%	5%	14%	0%	5%	64%	20%
	No Opinion	20%	50%	24%	31%	16%	35%	18%	22%	33%	12%	14%	14%
	I support it	80%	50%	70%	62%	41%	59%	77%	64%	67%	83%	21%	66%

Percentage of Respondents who support the Schools Street Scheme: **Staff**

Support	Level of Support	Berrymede Infants	Berrymede Junior	Gifford Primary	Holy Family	Mayfield	N Ealing	Oaklands	St Johns	St Marks	Vicars Green	Willow Tree
Responses		8	13	16	29	12	19	27	3	9	19	38
Overall Support for the Scheme	I don't support it	13%	0%	0%	24%	0%	11%	22%	0%	26%	0%	13%
	No Opinion	25%	31%	50%	21%	17%	16%	33%	33%	26%	8%	25%
	I support it	63%	69%	50%	55%	83%	74%	44%	67%	47%	92%	63%

Reasons for not supporting

Derwentwater

No. resident/business responses: 11 / approx. 160 properties

5 don't support

Reasons:

No specific reasons provided. 1 comment about stopping high rise flats, 1 comment about requirement for law enforcement

18% agree it improves road safety and 9% agree it has improved congestion, suggested limited acceptance in the wider community. 36% agreed there were previous parking and congestion issues related to the school.

Gifford

No. resident/business responses: 14 / approx. 190 properties

8 don't support

Reasons:

Displaced parking and congestion. Residents want other restrictions, eg. Parking permit scheme, restriction on non-residents for whole estate (wider school street)

Safety concerns (parked vehicles) on Casey Avenue and Rectory Park Avenue were raised, as well as lack of consideration for residents:

- *I don't want this scheme, the residents who live on (and pay rent & council tax for this street) should be supported. This scheme needs to be scrapped. And instead there should be a restriction on non residents parking in the area during school pick times (this should be enforced) that would ease the congestion and problems*

Despite this, some positive feedback was given;

- *The scheme is working and the school and community seem to be really happy with the scheme. Talking to neighbours this scheme has provided peace of mind and limits the amount of traffic and pollution in the air. Our street has been used as a race for cars to avoid traffic on the main road. No more.*

NOTE: The school have withdrawn their support for this scheme due to aggressive and abusive behaviour from drivers. We hope to be able to consider a wider scheme if camera enforcement and funding is available.

Holy Family

No. resident/business responses: 84 / approx. 645 properties

46 don't support

Reasons:

Negative comments; (13) congestion, (9) traffic displacement, (9) inconsiderate parking, (7) increased journey times, (6) the scheme should be backed by law enforcement or council. Boileau Road was also raised as an area of concern (mentioned on 14 occasions). Only 9 positive comments were received.

- *Massive traffic issues of cars being diverted to already busy or narrow streets (eg Boileau Road). This is leading to stress and tension and aggressive attitude to people who use the school as well as the kids.*
- *There are no parking space left on our street and cars are constantly illegally parking on pavement and on both sides of the road.*
- *You have now moved the traffic issues to an area of the street where it is more densely residential than along Vale Lane between the roundabout and the bollards.*

Total No. parent/carer responses; 85 / 474 pupils on role

42% don't support (total number: 36 don't support) 41% do support

Reasons:

Traffic displacement (9 comments) with several references to Boileau Road. 11 mentioned concerns the scheme was difficult to enforce with volunteers, and 17 stated they wanted to see the scheme backed by law enforcement or the council:

- *Closing Hanger Vale Lane simply pushes the problem of parked cars and traffic to other areas. As Hanger Vale Lane is one of two routes from the Hanger Hill Estate to Queens Drive all the diverted traffic now goes via Boileau Road.*
- *it cannot rely on parent volunteers to enforce the rules as parents are not traffic enforcers and we have no authority.*
- *This is a primary school and kids should not be walking or cycling in the rain .it is causing more stress*
- *This is not helping anyone. People need to have the freedom to choose whether they want to walk or take the car.*

NOTE: The school wanted to withdraw their support for this scheme due to aggressive and abusive behaviour from drivers but we have been able to offer limited CEO support and they have agreed to continue this term.

Oaklands

No. resident/business responses: 98 / approx. 730 properties

42% don't support (total number: 41 don't support) 41% do support

Reasons:

19 related to access, also inconvenience and unnecessarily authoritarian nature of the scheme. Others highlighted concerns about its implementation regarding children's road safety:

- *I don't mind the one way and the road being closed to school drop offs but residents should be allowed to book or give a pass to their visitors.*
- *Deliveries/taxis for residents should be allowed to operate as usual.*
- *The implementation of this scheme has offered no benefits whatsoever to myself, visitors or delivery drivers; quite the reverse.*
- *Nothing was broken before. Why is the council meddling? I was much happier before my street is residential and there was little noise from children walking to school as most would be dropped off by cars. Now there is noise and I cannot use my car at certain times of the day. Complete nightmare.*

St Johns

Total No. resident/business responses: 9 / approx. 190 properties

5 don't support

Reasons:

No specific reasons

- *A zebra crossing would be great. Also the signs around the school are not clear.*
- *I do not think it is possible to see the full impact of the scheme on surrounding roads until the pandemic restrictions are fully lifted and the pre pandemic traffic flow resumes.*

Vicars Green

No. resident/business responses: 23 / approx. 265 properties

11 don't support

Reasons:

A number of residents gave detailed information about the scheme negatively affecting their access, and parking issues;

- *Road safety in May Gardens, Lilly Gardens has worsened. Parents park wherever they can; across driveways, on double yellow lines, on corners, on the pavement, sometimes in people's drive ways.*
- *....Blocking residents driveways even parking in residents gardens and get very aggressive when asked to move. Family will not visit as it is very stressful. Deliverys are missed as there is no access*
- *Extend the school street till the main roads to avoid residents becoming disturbed by inconsiderate parents/carers.*
- *The school was given permission for the parents to park their 4x4's in Goals car park. As the children live locally they should be able to walk or cycle to school.*

No. parent/carer responses: 14 / 450 pupils on role

8 don't support

Reasons:

Difficulties parking outside of school street, increased congestion in local area.

- *This scheme will only make dropping off and picking up kids more stressful for parents who can not walk to school because of so many reasons.*
- *Before when school ends at different times all parents had a chance to actually park cars and go in and out without putting kids into risk. Main road is now closed and the other one is both ways which makes drivers to turn around in dangerous ways. There is always traffic on this street and huge stress for walking people and for drivers. Around this area there is not enough parking spaces which makes it almost impossible to get on time for work or to come and pick kids up after work. People are screaming at each other and there is a lots more incidents.*

NOTE: The school wanted to withdraw their support for this scheme because they would like a wider scheme and advised they were no longer able to provide staff to manage barrier. They have agreed to wait for the outcome of the Cabinet decision on the future of the schemes.