Low Traffic Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission

Draft Report

September 2021

Commission Members:
Councillor Mary Atkins (Chair)
Councillor Paul Gadsby
Councillor Nicole Griffiths
Councillor Marianna Masters
Councillor Irfan Mohammed
Councillor Jane Pickard

Contents

Foreword by the Chair of the Commission

The Covid19 pandemic has changed many of the ways we do things. When the first lockdown eased the government offered Councils financial support to reduce the risk of infection on public transport and to avoid the possibility of gridlock on roads. One of the policies available to achieve the safer movement of people was Low Traffic Neigbourhoods (LTNs). However, the time frame given to implement this measure led to many mainly Conservative Councils wasting vast amounts of money implementing schemes and then removing them, often after the public or a section of the public protested. The government then gave a series of mixed messages that further put pressure on local councils. The lessons to learn from this approach are clearly outlined in Local Government Association *Stakeholder engagement in an emergency: lessons from low traffic neighbourhoods* *(May 2021)*

The rapid input of LTNs led to an often toxic debate on social media: Twitter, WhatsApp, YouTube. I like many of my fellow Councillors was concerned about the implications for democracy if such bitter debates either stopped people being involved in politics or were allowed to be "hijacked" by political groups for their agendas.

Campaigners often used excluded and/or interest groups to support their cause; the commission discussed equality issues in Para 3.8,4.3.4.8 4.10. with specific recommendations in Recs 10. We also read widely on the effect of LTNs on workers, people in social housing, disabled people and BAME groups; these are listed in the documents section.

The use of perceptions versus evidence to prove whether LTNs were effective or not was a theme that reoccurred frequently in discussion. Professor Aldred outlined research that fire crews perceived their journeys were taking longer in Low Traffic Neighborhoods while the evidence indicated there was no change in journey times. *The Impact of Introducing a Low Traffic Neighbourhood on Fire Service Emergency Response Times in Waltham Forest, London* (Dec 2020).

How to change our behaviour around car use and the many alternatives to car use, was an issue where evidence of what we intend to do when asked in a research situation and what we do when making personal choices, diverged. One of the top recommendations in the Government Climate change assembly (UK Climate Assembly *The Path to Net Zero* (2020)) was that road traffic should be reduced. This was reenforced in the consultation for Lambeth's Transport Strategy. Among the conclusions of that consultation was that "*four out of five people agreed with the principle that we should encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport rather than travel by car*". However, when actually asked to change our mode of transport many have, but many have protested. Bringing any kind of radical change needs clear and frequent communication, transparent processes for monitoring and the availability of mechanisms to support transition.

My thanks to my fellow Labour Councillors Paul Gadsby, Marianna Masters, Irfan Mohammed and Jane Pickard as well as Green Party Councillor Nicole Griffiths for all their hard work.

The Commission members discussed understanding of democracy and policy development, the role of perceptions against evidence, conflict management and behaviour change. All of my fellow councillors undertook their own research on the impacts of LTNs on business, disabled people, the role of WhatsApp groups in their localities, and presented examples of behaviour change.

In addition, my thanks to Gary O'Key from Democratic Services who so ably managed data, set deadlines and drafted the report.

Mary Atkins

Councillor, Tulse Hill ward and Commission Chair

List of Recommendations

DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Recommendation 1
A clear and convincing case should be made for future climate emergency interventions linked to related Council strategies (such as on health and business/economic development), the priorities of external bodies (e.g. Transport for London) where relevant, and published data/evidence from well-informed and trusted sources. This should include a broad, positive vision of what the interventions are attempting to achieve, referencing equality, health and wellbeing, and quality of life for all.

Recommendation 2
Co-design and co-production principles should be embedded in any scheme that is likely to impact a significant portion of the borough's population.

Recommendation 3
Clear criteria for implementation of hyper-local interventions should be linked to broader strategic objectives (in the case of LTNs, this includes how air quality is to be improved, the implementation of supporting measures such as electric vehicle charging points and bike storage, and movement plans for people and business, including goals for public transport).

Recommendation 4
It is vital that future schemes such as LTNs be implemented alongside other measures to mitigate potential problems, based on the specifics of the locality in question and with resident input (this could include, for example, more extensive use of benches in hilly areas, bicycle storage and car sharing options, or responding to personal safety concerns).

Recommendation 5
Travel interventions to support the climate emergency should have a greater focus on encouraging accessible and inclusive active travel – particularly walking – and be designed with surrounding areas (more broadly than just adjacent roads) in mind.

Recommendation 6
Clear and comprehensive signage at street level is required to eliminate any ambiguity as to what is and isn't permitted in relation to any future measures to tackle the climate emergency.

Recommendation 7
A more open approach to possible exemptions from schemes responding to the climate emergency is needed for those who may suffer serious detriment to their lives or livelihoods.

CONSULTATION, COMMUNICATION & DEMOCRACY

Recommendation 8
A major communications strategy is required regarding air pollution. This should focus on the causes of pollution; health implications; measurement/monitoring in the borough; and actions that can be taken by individuals and organisations to reduce and mitigate the impacts. Within this should be a recognition that people's experiences are going to be different according to their personal circumstances.

Recommendation 9
Consultation on future measures related to the climate emergency should be carried out via a range of methods including letter drops, local meetings/events and door to door

engagement where necessary – as well as online – in order to gather the widest possible range of views, thereby enabling potential issues to be considered and, where possible, mitigated prior to implementation. With regards to public meetings, skilled independent facilitators should be employed to mediate between different groups where strong conflicting opinions exist.

Recommendation 10
The impact of future climate emergency measures on groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act requires thorough consideration prior to implementation. Where a certain group is likely to be particularly affected, a representative of a relevant outside organisation should be co-opted onto the Equality Impact Assessment Panel. This is especially important when it comes to disabled people.

Recommendation 11
Climate change implications should be considered in all Council strategy and policy documents.

Recommendation 12
A greater focus on cross-departmental working is required to ensure appropriate expertise is brought in from all relevant areas. There should also be better use of existing communications channels (e.g. between Adult Social Care and carers' groups; Enterprise, Jobs & Skills and business forums; Community Safety and local policing teams; and Housing and residents' groups) when communicating on climate emergency issues.

Recommendation 13
The use of stakeholder groups, community leaders and elected representatives to communicate and engage with residents and businesses about the importance and urgency of measures to combat the climate emergency should be prioritised. This should encompass a wide demographic and include frequent messaging on timelines, refinement, monitoring and evaluation. Communications should be honest (acknowledging difficulties/drawbacks) and rebut myths by focusing on evidence vs perception. Messaging should be inclusive, focusing on wider community benefits and avoiding language which appears to penalise certain groups.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Recommendation 14
Monitoring criteria should be evidence-based and include wider benefits (such as, in the case of LTNs, impact on road traffic collisions and health).

Recommendation 15
Monitoring strategies should be clear about the time period over which certain benefits/outcomes are expected to be realised.

Recommendation 16
Monitoring of travel interventions should include the effects on borough wide traffic, not just on boundary roads but more broadly.

Recommendation 17
Monitoring needs to take into account interruptions to traffic movements in the wider area, such as significant road repairs or long-term utility works, which may have an impact on traffic flows.

Recommendation 18
There is an urgent need to improve the scope and accuracy of air quality monitoring across Lambeth. Consideration should be given to commissioning a trusted outside organisation to help achieve this.

Recommendation 19
The establishment of a specific body to oversee the Council's actions to tackle the climate emergency, including a broad range of representatives from within and outside the authority, should be considered.

Recommendation 20
The Council should consider partnering with relevant local institutions (e.g. universities) to conduct independent research into longer term monitoring of climate emergency measures and publicise results.

Introduction

1.1 The Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (hereafter 'LTN') Scrutiny Commission was established in late 2020 following the submission of a proposal by Councillor Mary Atkins, who chaired the commission. This was approved by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 9 December, whereupon five more Members – Councillors Paul Gadsby, Nicole Griffiths, Marianna Masters, Irfan Mohammed and Jane Pickard – were appointed.

1.2 The commission's key aims were to examine the implementation and evaluation of the emergency LTNs introduced in Spring 2020 and identify lessons that could be used in future implementation of policies related to the climate emergency.

1.3 The commission scope, which outlines the core questions Members were seeking to answer and the resultant terms of reference, is attached at Annex B.

1.4 The commission held eight meetings over a six-month period. This began with a discussion on the terms of reference to ensure a common understanding of the scope of the commission and agree an outline work plan, followed by an initial consideration of key documents from Lambeth and elsewhere. Members next held a question and answer session with the then Deputy Leader of the Council (Sustainable Transport, Environment & Clean Air) and officers to fully understand the circumstances leading to the emergency LTN rollout and the monitoring mechanisms in place. The commission went on to consider a variety of research papers, articles and reports on LTNs more widely; explore common themes in objections to LTN schemes; and hear from witnesses including a prominent air quality campaigner and two university professors (with specialisms in active travel, and attitudes and behaviour change in relation to climate change initiatives). Finally, the commission met to draw together the evidence received and consider its findings.

1.5 Throughout the process Members aimed to provide scrutiny and challenge while also influencing the direction of policy development by working collaboratively with officers. The commission wishes to put on record its gratitude to the officers involved, as well as the Cabinet Member, whose time, expertise and constructive engagement were crucial to the outputs described below.

1.6 In response to the evidence gathered, the commission has formulated a set of recommendations. These are included in the appropriate sections of the main body of the report below and are also compiled above, for ease of reference.

Background

<u>The Climate Emergency and Transport in Lambeth</u>

2.1 Lambeth Council became one of the first local authorities in the country to declare a climate emergency in January 2019, recognising the urgent need for action to tackle carbon emissions via individual and collective action to "*make low carbon living easier and the new norm*". The motion recognised that the consequences of failing to tackle

the climate emergency would include health problems – particularly for children, disabled people and older people – and increased inequality.

2.2 In November the same year, Cabinet approved the Lambeth Transport Strategy, at the heart of which lay a commitment to ensure the transport system in the borough was safe and accessible to all while enabling people to lead healthier lives. The strategy set out a vision to urgently tackle climate change by introducing measures to reduce carbon emissions, including increasing the amount of trips made by 'active travel' methods (such as walking and cycling), alongside the use of public transport, and reduce reliance on private car use. The strategy was developed following two rounds of public consultation over an 18-month period, both conducted in parallel with the review of the Local Plan, which resulted in hundreds of representations. Among the conclusions of this consultation was that "*four out of five people agreed with the principle that we should encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport rather than travel by car*".

2.3 Alongside the Transport Strategy sat an Implementation Plan (TSIP), the aim of which was to provide more detail on the projects and initiatives the Council would prioritise to meet the aims of the strategy. The Transport Strategy was underpinned by five guiding principles: Sustainable Growth, Efficient & Connected, Inclusive & Accessible, Active & Safe, and Carbon Neutral & Clean Air. The TSIP outlined the criteria by which neighbourhood traffic reduction interventions would be prioritised: where there is evidence of 'rat running', where school pupils are affected, air quality is poor, collisions high and where a 'healthy route' is proposed (a 'healthy route' is defined in the TSIP as a convenient, attractive, safe and accessible route linking people with places they need to get to, which enable more people to walk and cycle).

2.4 Among the interventions proposed by the TSIP was a programme of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs). These are groups of residential streets, bordered by main roads, where through traffic is discouraged or removed via 'modal filters' – barriers through which certain vehicles are not permitted to pass. Such changes are designed to significantly reduce motor traffic levels and make walking and cycling the natural choice for shorter journeys.

2.5 While engagement with the community on the development of the Transport Strategy was a starting point, Section 10 of the TSIP explained how the proposed interventions contained within it were envisaged to include significant further engagement with, and input from, local communities and stakeholder groups as they proceeded through the various phases of design and implementation.

Covid-19 and the Emergency Response

2.6 When the novel coronavirus Covid-19 reached the UK at the end of January 2020, few could have foreseen the impact it would come to have on all aspects of life. Declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation in early March, the virus has devastated countless lives and led to societal changes which would previously have been unthinkable, including weeks of strict lockdown measures and a continuing policy of 'social distancing'.

2.7   The effect of Covid-19 on the Local Authority is hard to overstate. For several weeks the Council operated under emergency arrangements in order to be able to respond urgently to the emerging situation and provide critical support to residents and businesses in the borough, including life-and-death services such as food hubs. This meant some Council officers were redeployed to frontline services, while at the same time others attempted to juggle caring and childcare commitments with increasingly diverse and pressurised workloads. "Normal service" had gone out of the window.

2.8   Against this backdrop, the Council moved incredibly quickly to bring in its Emergency Transport Strategy in April 2020. This sought to tackle the immediate transport implications of the public health challenges posed by the virus, including the huge reduction in public transport capacity and the need to re-engineer the public realm to enable greater social distancing, by taking certain appropriate measures in the 2019 Transport Strategy and Implementation Plan, and accelerating these significantly. The Government's Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF), introduced in May 2020, provided support for local authorities to implement active travel schemes to respond to the challenges of the pandemic by facilitating a rapid increase in walking and cycling while discouraging car use.

2.9   As a result of central and regional Government guidance, including the statutory guidance with a direct bearing on local authority obligations in respect of the Network Management Duty (Traffic Management Act 2004) issued in May 2020, plans were brought forward to introduce selected Low Traffic Neighbourhoods using temporary traffic orders as mandated by the Secretary of State. Lambeth was not alone in this approach, particularly in London; LTNs were introduced in many areas. A distributional analysis produced by Prof Rachel Aldred, Professor of Transport at Westminster University and Director of its Active Travel Academy, and Dr Ersilia Verlinghieri, Senior Research Fellow, in November 2020, focusing on emergency schemes implemented between March and September 2020, showed that 4% of London residents were covered by LTNs. This rose to 15% in Lambeth specifically. The research also showed that, although there was significant variation between boroughs, LTNs were more likely to be in more deprived areas.

2.10   The events described above gave rise to a certain amount of confusion over why the LTNs were being introduced. Was it purely because of the pandemic? Was it to respond to the climate emergency and tackle air pollution? Was it just a convenient way of realising a longstanding policy ambition? And what of the tangible effects? While some people positively embraced LTNs as a chance to breathe cleaner air, increase exercise levels and reconnect with their locality and neighbours, others saw them as presenting only obstacles: local businesses had concerns regarding deliveries and passing trade, for example, while those who relied on car travel such as carers and taxi drivers saw their journeys become longer and more complicated.

2.11   Despite good intentions, LTNs became a polarising issue in many local communities, and it is this context that gave rise to the proposal of establishing a scrutiny commission, the idea being to bring together a group of cross-party backbench councillors representing different areas of the borough and with a diverse range of interests and specialisms to examine the circumstances surrounding the implementation of the

emergency LTNs, treating this as a case study to identify lessons for future such measures related to the climate emergency.

Stakeholder Involvement and the Commission Evidence Base

2.12 As can be seen from the scope agreed at the outset of the commission (attached at Annex B), Members initially planned to hold a dedicated stakeholder engagement session as part of their evidence gathering to solicit the views of a wide range of people with differing views and experiences of LTNs to feed into the commission's findings, in a similar fashion to the Events Scrutiny Commission which reported to Cabinet in 2019. However, once the commission got underway it soon became clear that there were a number of issues with this approach. First, the number of stakeholder groups was many and varied, and it would therefore be a significant and resource-intensive piece of work which would be likely to set the commission's initial estimated timelines back quite considerably. The level of polarisation around the arguments also led Members to conclude that such an exercise may be better undertaken by skilled independent facilitators. At the same time, the lack of public meetings due to Covid-19 restrictions meant that the vast majority of the debate was taking place online and in electronic forums such as WhatsApp groups which Members were already a part of, and this made it relatively straightforward to tap into debates and identify the main issues of a range of individuals and groups, which could be reflected back in commission meetings without the need for a specific consultation event.

2.13 As a result of this, the primary focus of the commission's evidence gathering was to sift through the multitude of reports, articles, opinion pieces, research papers and other information posted online to capture the key issues, being sure to take on board the full spectrum of viewpoints, while enabling the commission to work to tighter timelines than usual and report its findings without any unnecessary delay – thereby exerting its influence in a more timely manner. The comprehensive list of background documents set out at Annex C goes some way towards demonstrating the sheer volume of evidence considered, and it should further be noted that each commission member carried out additional research in their locality and field of expertise. This included gathering the views of businesses, disabled people and various local resident and special interest groups.

2.14 In addition to this, and the Q&A session with the portfolio holder and officers described above, the commission chose to invite three expert witnesses to give (virtual) in-person evidence at its meetings. These were: Rosamund Kissi-Debrah, a prominent air quality campaigner based in South London; Prof Rachel Aldred, Professor of Transport at Westminster University and Director of its Active Travel Academy; and Prof Lorraine Whitmarsh, an environmental psychologist specialising in perceptions and behaviour in relation to climate change, energy and transport, who was an expert advisor to the UK Climate Assembly.

2.15 The commission's findings are split into three sections which reflect the main themes identified: Design & Implementation; Consultation, Communication & Democracy; and Monitoring & Evaluation. The evidence received from the various sources identified is

reflected at relevant points in the main body of the commission report to support the conclusions reached.

Section 1: Design and Implementation

3.1 The first theme highlighted in our report is that of design and implementation. On this, we make several recommendations in an attempt to ensure future interventions are clearly defined, based on demonstrable evidence and involve input from relevant stakeholders at an early stage, thereby anticipating potential problems while also tailoring solutions to local communities.

3.2 As alluded to in the introductory section above, the basis for the introduction of the emergency LTNs was the subject of a certain amount of confusion. This is entirely understandable given the emergency context and the severely truncated timelines to which the Council was working. However, we consider that, although the evidence base for the LTNs was rooted in policy – from the 2019 Transport Strategy (and accompanying Implementation Plan) through to the Emergency Strategy approved in April 2020 – the case could have been made in a more convincing fashion. We believe there could have been a stronger link between the LTNs and other Council strategies which could have better demonstrated the reasons for these interventions, framed around arguments of health, well-being, equality and social justice, and that this may have helped quell some of the fears around, and opposition to, the schemes.

3.3 The Rapid Evidence Assessment on Liveable and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods produced in March 2021 by the Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change recognises the importance of such an approach. This report, which aimed to gather and assess the quality and quantity of evidence on Liveable Neighbourhoods and LTNs, recommends that "*communities be shown compelling evidence on the benefits to health and safety as a result of [a] better walking and cycling environment*" to help clarify misconceptions and that, above all, it is necessary to "*set out the narrative: we need to make positive changes: we cannot continue as now for the health and well-being of our communities and beyond*". The Air Quality report produced by Southwark Council's Environment Scrutiny Commission also makes similar points. It is vital that, in doing this, the legitimate fears of various stakeholders are neither dismissed nor belittled, but rather acknowledged and mitigations explored. It is also acknowledged that behaviour change is a complex and difficult process. Prof Whitmarsh informed us that support for active travel measures continued to grow despite the pandemic, and the experience from the UK Climate Assembly was that closing roads was among the more popular policies to tackle climate change, yet support often dropped at the hyper-local level once schemes went in. However, had there been a more clearly articulated positive vision of what LTNs were attempting to achieve, focusing on the wider community benefits, we believe more sections of the community may have been supportive from an early stage and this would have helped avoid some of the polarisation of views we have observed.

3.4 Similarly, we believe the criteria for implementation of schemes must be linked more strongly to the authority's objectives. It is noted that the TSIP explicitly sets out the criteria by which the Council will prioritise neighbourhood traffic reduction interventions: "*where there is evidence of 'rat running', where school pupils are affected, air quality is poor, collisions high and where a 'healthy route' is proposed*". We consider that, legitimate though it is as a local concern, to place 'rat running' at the forefront of this list is unhelpful and that a focus on broader strategic objectives – such as on air quality,

road safety and movement plans for individuals and businesses – would be more beneficial. The approach of the 2018 Equality Streets Scrutiny Commission – cited as part of the Transport Strategy evidence base – articulates such a vision.

3.5   As already stated, we accept that officers were under extreme pressure when implementing the emergency LTNs and that the prevailing circumstances at the time were both confusing and challenging. However, in seeking to identify lessons and best practice for the future, we feel it is necessary to highlight how vital it is to embed codesign and coproduction principles in any comparable future rapid response schemes.

3.6   One of the most striking recurring sentiments in the evidence we saw and heard is that "people do not like being told what to do". While this is hardly surprising, what was perhaps underestimated was the extent to which involving people in decision-making correlates with acceptance. As Prof Lorraine Whitmarsh, Director of the UK Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations (CAST), told us, lack of consultation was often the top reason for objecting to schemes like LTNs, while a sense of fairness – firmly linked to early consultation – was one of the strongest predictors of policy support – stronger even that the effectiveness of policies, according to her research carried out with Joseph Sweetman of the University of Exeter in 2015. These issues were also borne out in the Transport for All report *Pave the Way*, in which 75% of respondents criticised communications on LTNs. Furthermore, the genuine involvement of local councillors, communities and stakeholders in the design process would also help to identify potential problems at an early-stage and ensure these could be addressed in the most appropriate way – whether through design alterations, other mitigations or simply a formal acknowledgement of the issue. While we did observe examples of LTNs being tweaked during the experimental phase to take account of feedback received, such as the moving of a modal filter in the Tulse Hill scheme in response to problems being experienced by a local business, we consider that much more needs to be done by way of codesign and coproduction in relation to future schemes.

3.7   A key element of design must be to tailor schemes to the specific area in which they are introduced – a 'one size fits all' approach which fails to recognise local circumstances is unlikely to be successful. We heard concerns, for example, relayed back from the community by one commission member, about the suitability of hillier areas such as West Norwood for LTN-style traffic reduction interventions. In such areas, where many people may feel cycling is less of an option and also public transport coverage is less comprehensive than, say, Brixton or the north of the borough, it is particularly important that the sort of complementary measures mentioned in the Equality Streets report are integrated into the scheme. When we asked Prof Aldred, who has studied LTNs across the capital and beyond in great depth, about such issues, she concurred that schemes in areas such as these did require more thought. The installation of more benches was a suggestion we particularly support, while access to e-bikes, e-scooters and cargo bikes would also be beneficial.

3.8   We mention above that the introduction of the emergency LTNs caused division and polarisation in certain communities and one example of this which we were particularly struck by relates to the perception of cycling. Increasing cycling is a stated aim in all LTN-style schemes and there is no doubt that cycling is hugely beneficial to physical

and mental health. However, we heard many concerns from people who believed cycling was 'not for them' as it was seen as the preserve of the mainly white, male, middle class demographic among which it is most popular. While we believe cycling can and should be made more accessible, we also think that placing a greater emphasis on walking would help to demonstrate that LTNs really are there to benefit all sections of society. We heard from Prof Aldred that results from Waltham Forest – an early adopter of LTN-style measures – and emerging findings from the emergency schemes introduced across the capital throughout 2020 showed that most of the increase in active travel was walking rather than cycling. The article produced by pedestrian charity London Living Streets cited in our background documents also makes this argument. A greater emphasis on encouraging more people to make shorter journeys on foot, therefore, is, we feel, an important mechanism in emphasising the inclusivity of LTNs. This should also be reflected in the imagery used in communications on active travel measures from the outset.

3.9   The last two issues we deal with in this section are the street level signage and exemptions. We picked up on a number of comments regarding the signage marking the borders of the LTN areas, which seemed to lead to confusion for some people. If there is ambiguity regarding what is permitted within the area and fines are issued to unsuspecting motorists acting in good faith, this will impact public confidence in the schemes. We recommend that any future measures of this kind be accompanied by unambiguous street level signage clearly showing what is and is not allowed. Exemptions also arose as a contentious issue in the course of our evidence gathering. We have already highlighted the fact that the material impacts of schemes such as LTNs are different for different sections of society, and some people will experience certain adverse effects – the most obvious being the inconvenience of taking a longer route to avoid the restrictions. This is of course part of the point – making shorter trips easier to take on foot or by bike will, it is hoped, discourage people from using their cars for such journeys. Indeed, we heard from both Prof Aldred and Prof Whitmarsh that reducing capacity for motor traffic has been shown consistently to result in a reduction in car use, albeit that this tends to happen over the medium to long term. We do however acknowledge that the impacts for some people are so great that exemptions are appropriate. This is particularly an issue for some disabled people and their carers. The *Pave the Way* report articulates eloquently and forcefully the profound difficulties that can arise for disabled people when journey times are lengthened considerably, including exhaustion, exacerbating or worsening impairments, and costing more money. While officers confirmed to us that there are mechanisms in place to grant certain exemptions to the LTN restrictions – organisational blue badge holders can apply for dispensation, for example – we believe a more comprehensive and open approach is needed in future which better identifies those people for whom dispensations would be appropriate, proactively and at an earlier stage.

Recommendation 1
A clear and convincing case should be made for future climate emergency interventions linked to related Council strategies (such as on health and business/economic development), the priorities of external bodies (e.g. Transport for London) where relevant, and published data/evidence from well-informed and trusted sources. This should include a broad, positive vision of what the interventions are attempting to achieve, referencing equality, health and wellbeing, and quality of life for all.

Recommendation 2
Co-design and co-production principles should be embedded in any scheme that is likely to impact a significant portion of the borough's population.

Recommendation 3
Clear criteria for implementation of hyper-local interventions should be linked to broader strategic objectives (in the case of LTNs, this includes how air quality is to be improved, the implementation of supporting measures such as electric vehicle charging points and bike storage, and movement plans for people and business, including goals for public transport).

Recommendation 4
It is vital that future schemes such as LTNs be implemented alongside other measures to mitigate potential problems, based on the specifics of the locality in question and with resident input (this could include, for example, more extensive use of benches in hilly areas, bicycle storage and car sharing options, or responding to personal safety concerns).

Recommendation 5
Travel interventions to support the climate emergency should have a greater focus on encouraging accessible and inclusive active travel – particularly walking – and be designed with surrounding areas (more broadly than just adjacent roads) in mind.

Recommendation 6
Clear and comprehensive signage at street level is required to eliminate any ambiguity as to what is and isn't permitted in relation to any future measures to tackle the climate emergency.

Recommendation 7
A more open approach to possible exemptions from schemes responding to the climate emergency is needed for those who may suffer serious detriment to their lives or livelihoods.

Section 2: Consultation, Communication & Democracy

4.1   We have already mentioned how crucial early consultation is to winning trust and what an important part that plays in predicting success for schemes such as LTNs, as well as noting the considerable barriers to this presented by the emergency situation in this case. Issues surrounding consultation, communication and democracy comprise perhaps the biggest single theme running through almost all the evidence we saw; we have therefore chosen to devote a section of our report purely to these issues and the lessons we believe can be learned from the LTN experience.

4.2   One of the main areas of debate we have picked up in the arguments made around LTNs concerns air pollution. Air pollution is recognised by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as one of the biggest threats to health we are facing today, and there is widespread agreement that it is absolutely vital to reduce levels of pollution with the utmost urgency for the good of public health as well as the climate. However, where measures such as LTNs fit into this has been the subject of some conjecture. While levels of traffic are, as expected, significantly reduced within the LTN areas, resulting in cleaner air, a common immediate side effect is that traffic levels outside these zones (particularly on boundary roads) can increase while people get used to the new measures. Although the academic evidence indicates that this effect tends to subside, as referenced in Section 1, this does take time and potentially leaves residents on the periphery of LTN areas facing increased levels of traffic for an indeterminate period. What this means for air pollution, however, is not entirely straightforward since, as WHO advocate for health and air quality Rosamund Kissi-Debrah told us, the number of cars does not necessarily directly correlate to levels of pollution – other factors, such as the speed of traffic, are also important determinants (with gridlocked traffic being the most polluting).

4.3   There are also potential significant equalities issues here, with older people, young children, those with pre-existing health conditions and disabled people being more adversely affected by poor air quality, for example. Distributional analysis of LTNs in London, referred to in paragraph 2.9 above, showed that overall 15% of Lambeth's population live in LTN areas, and this rose slightly in more deprived areas. The questions concerning the impact on boundary roads, which may have demographic differences to areas within LTNs, leave us uncertain as to the true equalities impact (see also Section 3 and Recommendation 16).

4.4   One particular issue in Lambeth is that there is a perception that the Council's approach to monitoring air pollution is lacking in robustness. We deal with this in more detail in Section 3 below. However, notwithstanding this, we feel that a major communications strategy around air pollution is urgently required to ensure communities are well-informed as to the causes, health implications and possible mitigations. This is in line with the coroner's report into the death from a rare form of asthma of Rosamund Kissi-Debrah's nine-year-old daughter Ella – the first person in the UK to have air pollution listed as a cause of death – which called upon local authorities to raise awareness about pollution levels and expand capacity for air quality monitoring. It would also help contextualise the argument for interventions such as LTNs around broader strategic objectives, as we suggest in Section 1. Such a communications strategy needs to

recognise the different experiences of different communities (businesses, taxi drivers, cyclists and disabled people, for example, would all have different needs) but would help enable individuals and organisations to become better informed about the issues and respond in the way best suited to them.

4.5 More generally on consultation and communication, there are many learning points to be identified. These are very well captured in the LGA publication *Stakeholder Communication in an Emergency: Lessons from Low Traffic Neighbourhoods* (see Annex C – Background Documents), which we would urge readers of this report to digest in full, but the most pertinent is probably that "*it pays to invest in doing engagement well*". As discussed, consultation on LTNs was severely limited due to the emergency situation (including the stipulations of the Government funding), as well as the national restrictions put in place to protect public health under the Coronavirus Act (rendering in-person meetings all but impossible), making the situation very difficult for the Council.

4.6 Officers explained to us that letters had been delivered to residents within the proposed LTN areas, though acknowledged that there had been some issues with distribution in the first instance which were later resolved by changing supplier. We also heard how relevant email lists were used to communicate with stakeholders, people were directed to a specific website to leave comments, and the then-portfolio holder met with dozens of individuals and groups either virtually or in person. Many businesses were also sent letters and some visits took place, though the feedback we received via the Council's Business Champion was that these were not always successful and that many affected businesses felt they had not been adequately consulted about the plans for the schemes and how they would operate. It was noted that, prior to the pandemic, a very detailed engagement strategy was being delivered regarding the Brixton Liveable Neighbourhoods project, including the production of films, liaison with schools and Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and various other means of communication. It was accepted that such long periods of engagement were necessary for people to feel really informed; however, owing to the necessity to bring in the emergency LTNs very quickly, officers did their best in the time available, taking into account existing traffic data and information gleaned from pre-Covid consultations. We also heard how the capacity of the Council's Communications Team was limited after several years of budget cuts and that their immediate focus was, quite understandably, on messaging around emergency food supplies and public health.

4.7 The experience of LTNs and the resultant response and polarisation of views shows us that, wherever possible, even in emergency situations, time and care must be taken to engage properly with all stakeholders, for reasons already highlighted. This means using a range of methods according to the intended audience, and allowing feedback to shape the design of schemes (as per our recommendation 2 in Section 1 above) so that people feel listened to. We also feel that the use of highly skilled independent facilitators would be beneficial in future where proposals may be particularly controversial. We heard from Prof Whitmarsh, for example, regarding the excellent work that organisations such as Sustrans had carried out on diversity of methods to engage people; such an approach would cater for a wide cross-section of people with different preferences and capabilities and would therefore help gain an insight into the worries and concerns of different groups.

4.8   Another issue we identified is the consideration of the impacts of LTNs on groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act. Of particular concern was the approach with regards to disabled people, many of whom, as we have already explored, were considered to be significantly affected by the schemes. The Transport for All report *Pave the Way*, referred to earlier, represents an excellent exploration of the issues – this includes the need for more meaningful engagement with disabled people and organisations to fully explore implications and potential mitigations in advance of putting the schemes in; more accessible implementation (including considerations around benches and the location of planters); and more dispensations for those adversely affected. The input from Disability Advice Service Lambeth (DASL), who spoke to one of our commission members, mirrored these issues – a reflection, no doubt, of the fact that 60% of those interviewed for *Pave the Way* came from Lambeth. It is noted that Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) were completed for the emergency LTN schemes and that these were considered by the Council's internal Corporate EIA Panel as per usual practice, and no significant negative impacts were identified for protected groups. However, we are of the view that there were clearly deficiencies in this approach and we suggest that, wherever possible, for future such situations where a given characteristic is likely to experience a particularly profound impact, appropriate input is sought from relevant individuals or organisations outside the Council to bring external expertise and added rigour to the EIA process. This might include, for example, input from DASL – who told us they were not consulted on the LTN EIAs – on disabilities issues.

4.9   We next turn to the Council's internal processes and how these may be better used to communicate more effectively. We heard from officers how existing email lists were one of the methods used to communicate with relevant stakeholders regarding the LTNs, and this is of course entirely pragmatic and appropriate, particularly in circumstances where in-person meetings could not be held. However, it seems to us that, while the email lists in question no doubt included many relevant stakeholders, there was little if any use of existing communications channels outside the Sustainable Transport, Environment & Clean Air brief. This meant that certain sections of the borough's population who may be affected by the LTNs were not engaged in the way that they could have been. For example, more effective contact could have been made with businesses by asking officers within Enterprise, Jobs & Skills to send out communications to their existing contact lists; ditto Adult Social Care and carers' groups, Housing and Residents' Associations; and Community Safety and local neighbourhood policing teams. It is also more important than ever that climate change implications are properly considered in all Council strategy and policy documents; this can only help increase coordination between Council departments, with the communications benefits that brings.

4.10 We also feel that more could have been done to utilise key individuals to help get the message across to their communities. This includes ward councillors but also other community leaders such as Tenants & Residents' Association chairs, faith leaders or Business Improvement District managers. We heard from our academic witnesses how important such "messengers" are in helping to engage their communities and this could in turn reduce the sort of polarisation of views we have seen and help make issues less

contentious. As hinted at previously, it is important that communications are honest in recognising the potential drawbacks of schemes and focus on facts rather than perceptions – couched, again, in inclusive language which uses wider community benefits as their basis.

Recommendation 8
A major communications strategy is required regarding air pollution. This should focus on the causes of pollution; health implications; measurement/monitoring in the borough; and actions that can be taken by individuals and organisations to reduce and mitigate the impacts. Within this should be a recognition that people's experiences are going to be different according to their personal circumstances.

Recommendation 9
Consultation on future measures related to the climate emergency should be carried out via a range of methods including letter drops, local meetings/events and door to door engagement where necessary – as well as online – in order to gather the widest possible range of views, thereby enabling potential issues to be considered and, where possible, mitigated prior to implementation. With regards to public meetings, skilled independent facilitators should be employed to mediate between different groups where strong conflicting opinions exist.

Recommendation 10
The impact of future climate emergency measures on groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act requires thorough consideration prior to implementation. Where a certain group is likely to be particularly affected, a representative of a relevant outside organisation should be co-opted onto the Equality Impact Assessment Panel. This is especially important when it comes to disabled people.

Recommendation 11
Climate change implications should be considered in all Council strategy and policy documents.

Recommendation 12
A greater focus on cross-departmental working is required to ensure appropriate expertise is brought in from all relevant areas. There should also be better use of existing communications channels (e.g. between Adult Social Care and carers' groups; Enterprise, Jobs & Skills and business forums; Community Safety and local policing teams; and Housing and residents' groups) when communicating on climate emergency issues.

Recommendation 13
The use of stakeholder groups, community leaders and elected representatives to communicate and engage with residents and businesses about the importance and urgency of measures to combat the climate emergency should be prioritised. This should encompass a wide demographic and include frequent messaging on timelines, refinement, monitoring and evaluation. Communications should be honest (acknowledging difficulties/drawbacks) and rebut myths by focusing on evidence vs perception. Messaging should be inclusive, focusing on wider community benefits and avoiding language which appears to penalise certain groups.

Section 3: Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 The final section of our report concerns the monitoring and evaluation of LTNs and the lessons we believe can be highlighted for future application. This reflects another of the principal themes which came to light during our investigations – for interventions such as LTNs to be deemed a success or failure, there needs to be clarity around success criteria: what will be measured, how will it be measured, and over what time period.

5.2 Given the relatively recent implementation of LTN schemes and the length of time it takes to properly monitor effects and draw conclusions, the evidence for LTNs is still emerging. However, there are some studies we can draw on when seeking to assess how effective they may be. This includes the research conducted by Aldred and Goodman in 2020 which reports on analysis of impacts of active travel interventions in Outer London between 2016 and 2019, which concludes that LTNs lead to decreased car ownership and use, and increased active travel. Data from Waltham Forest, where LTN-style measures were first announced in 2014, shows that car ownership fell by around 7% within three years of the schemes being implemented, while a study by King's College London focusing on the same borough – the first of its kind to attempt to quantify the effect of increased active travel on health outcomes – reports that increased walking and cycling arising from active travel interventions would amount to an additional 7 to 9 months of life expectancy for a child born in 2006. Further, the Rapid Evidence Assessment produced by the Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change cites a "*substantial body of evidence showing that reallocating road space from cars to active modes tends to reduce car use in the long term*"; while London Living Streets, in a 2019 article, refer to similar evidence to support the conclusion that "*low-traffic neighbourhoods do not simply shift traffic from one place to another, but lead to an overall reduction in the numbers of motor vehicles on road*". Nevertheless, experiences can vary in different locations and each requires robust monitoring in its own right.

5.3 Lambeth Council published its LTN Monitoring Strategy in December 2020. The Monitoring Strategy explains the main objectives of the schemes – to achieve "*a reduction in through motor traffic within LTN areas; and an overall reduction of motor vehicle movements across the area, when considering boundary roads and the inner area together*". It also explains how, once traffic patterns settle down, a wide range of other indicators would be monitored, including traffic speeds and the level of collisions, air quality, and active travel levels. Three stages are envisaged: an initial adjustment phase in which people become aware of the LTNs but have not yet changed their travel habits; a settling down period during which it is anticipated people begin to adapt and some of the aims of the schemes may start to be met; and finally, a third stage in which the LTN would be in "regular use" and firmer conclusions could be drawn as to the success or otherwise of the measures. Finally, it sets out the data that will be used – most notably traffic counts, traffic speeds and air quality modelling (more on this below), but also compliance levels, feedback from stakeholders and business engagement.

5.4   At our witness session with the then-Deputy Leader and officers we asked several
        questions about the Monitoring Strategy, reflecting some of the concerns we had
        heard from the community. When asking about specific thresholds for intervention – for
        example, whether a particular percentage increase in traffic levels on boundary roads
        would trigger certain action – we were told it was not possible to do this as the
        schemes would be judged on a case-by-case basis, and the response would be
        different depending on what type of road it was. We also queried the situation
        regarding traffic counts and officers explained these were not being conducted at that
        time (March 2021) due to abnormal traffic conditions owing to the lockdown measures
        in place at the time. The first major rounds of traffic counts had been carried out in
        Autumn 2020, when levels were close to normal, but would not resume until the
        lockdown was relaxed. In response to a specific question regarding what consideration
        there had been of the potential for displacement of traffic from LTN areas leading to
        increased traffic on arterial roads, we were told that the necessity to accelerate the
        planned LTN schemes due to Government guidance had meant implementing them on
        a trial basis and monitoring impacts in real time (rather than the more considered
        approach initially planned under the 2019 Transport Strategy, which envisaged far
        more detailed planning and assessment prior to implementation).

5.5   What is clear is that, given the strong views on either side of the argument, monitoring
        of schemes like these needs to be based on the strongest possible evidence in order
        that the conclusions command respect and cannot be easily rebutted or undermined.
        While this clearly means traffic volumes and air quality data, we believe more
        prominence should be given to the anticipated wider benefits to population health and
        safety, such as the impact on traffic collisions and health outcomes (while recognising
        these take some time to assess, as with the King's report). Equally, these criteria
        should better reflect the broader strategic aims of the authority, as referenced in
        Sections 1 and 2.

5.6   We had some concerns regarding the time periods connected to the expected
        outcomes in relation to LTNs. It is accepted that data collection and comparison during
        the pandemic was a significant challenge due to the abnormal conditions associated
        with successive lockdowns, and that the circumstances of each traffic intervention are
        unique to the area in question. We have also already noted how some positive effects
        from interventions such as these can take a long time – up to three years – to be
        realised. However, communities are understandably concerned at how long any
        possible negative effects should be tolerated as schemes bed in. For example,
        Rosamund Kissi-Debrah explained to us that around 8-12 children a year died from
        asthma, and these numbers had remained fairly constant for some time, yet during the
        first Covid-19 lockdown in 2020, no child in the UK died from asthma. The first casualty
        then happened just after the lockdown was lifted. In light of these very real effects on
        people's health, we do feel that it is vital monitoring strategies are clear, not just on
        how decisions will be made, but when.

5.7   The scope of monitoring was another issue we explored. There is much debate as to
        what constitutes "the wider area" over which an overall reduction in traffic is expected,
        and we noted concerns from various residents' groups that the way the traffic system
        behaves due to road closures such as those in LTN areas can have a much wider

impact than just a few surrounding streets. Officers showed us a map of traffic count locations but, while many in number, we found that certain locations where residents had perceived substantial increases in traffic, ostensibly connected to LTN interventions, were not in fact monitored. This makes it very difficult to paint an accurate overall picture of the effects of the measures. We therefore believe a more holistic approach is needed in future as focusing on boundary roads, while important, is not sufficient to determine the overall impact. Also necessary to take account of is the effect of other works such as road repairs or planned utility works which may significantly affect routes and traffic flows for a considerable period of time. If not properly considered, these present inherent difficulties in thoroughly and objectively assessing the impact of measures such as LTNs.

5.8   Our biggest concern around monitoring, though, is on air quality. We heard from officers how there are currently only three permanent air quality monitoring stations in Lambeth and, while additional smaller monitors were being trialled, there were issues with the reliability of the data. This means that the approach to monitoring the air quality impacts of the LTNs relies heavily on a modelling approach using data on traffic volumes and speeds, weather, and other inputs such as urban topography to simulate air pollution levels in a given area. Whilst we accept there is a certain rigour to this approach, with the software used being a market leader widely used in the industry and the data being independently validated twice, we believe there is no substitute for robust and accurate monitoring of actual air pollution levels, using proper specialist equipment dedicated to the purpose to obtain real-world data. Indeed, we feel that these deficiencies in Lambeth's air quality monitoring regime, as well as reporting, make it particularly difficult to set out a definitive picture as to how schemes like LTNs are performing, and that this only adds to the amount of conjecture, mistrust and speculation which swirl around the various arguments on either side. We therefore recommend that urgent action is needed to improve both the scope and accuracy of air quality monitoring across the borough, and suggest that appointing an appropriate independent organisation with specialism in this field may be a good way of winning back trust on this issue (for example, we note that Southwark commissioned Friends of the Earth to carry out an air quality data audit in 2017).

5.9   Finally, we make two broader recommendations aimed at ensuring Lambeth reflects best practice in its future work to respond to the climate emergency declaration passed back in 2019, with which we began this report. Firstly, we have referred on a number of occasions to the Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change. This is an independent, technical committee whose members have wide-ranging expertise on climate change issues, and provides technical advice to Bristol's One City Boards. We note that this innovative approach is endorsed by the Chair of the national Committee on Climate Change, Lord Deben, and believe this represents a particularly good governance model which Lambeth should aim to replicate. Secondly, we believe that the Council would benefit from bringing in more external expertise when it comes to independent research connected to monitoring of climate emergency measures, and suggest partnering with local institutions such as universities to achieve this.

Recommendation 14
Monitoring criteria should be evidence-based and include wider benefits (such as, in the case of LTNs, impact on road traffic collisions and health).

Recommendation 15
Monitoring strategies should be clear about the time period over which certain benefits/outcomes are expected to be realised.

Recommendation 16
Monitoring of travel interventions should include the effects on borough wide traffic, not just on boundary roads but more broadly.

Recommendation 17
Monitoring needs to take into account interruptions to traffic movements in the wider area, such as significant road repairs or long-term utility works, which may have an impact on traffic flows.

Recommendation 18
There is an urgent need to improve the scope and accuracy of air quality monitoring across Lambeth. Consideration should be given to commissioning a trusted outside organisation to help achieve this.

Recommendation 19
The establishment of a specific body to oversee the Council's actions to tackle the climate emergency, including a broad range of representatives from within and outside the authority, should be considered.

Recommendation 20
The Council should consider partnering with relevant local institutions (e.g. universities) to conduct independent research into longer term monitoring of climate emergency measures and publicise results.

Annex A: Acknowledgements

The Commission would like to thank all those who have contributed to its work, whether directly through submission of written or oral evidence, or indirectly through posting/publishing articles and opinions online which the Commission used as part of its evidence base. These are too numerous to mention in full but particular thanks goes to the following in-person witnesses:

- Councillor Claire Holland (Leader of the Council; formerly Deputy Leader [Sustainable Transport, Environment & Clean Air])
- Hannah Jameson (Assistant Director, Sustainable Development and Climate Change Response)
- Michael Munnelly (Assistant Director, Infrastructure, Environment, Public Realm & Climate Change Delivery)
- Simon Phillips (Head of Transport Strategy & Programme)
- Nick McCoy (Senior Policy & Communications Officer)
- Prof Rachel Aldred (Professor of Transport and Director of Active Travel Academy, University of Westminster)
- Prof Lorraine Whitmarsh (Professor of Psychology, University of Bath and Director, Centre for Climate Change & Social Transformations)
- Rosamund Kissi-Debrah (Co-Founder, Ella Roberta Family Foundation and World Health Organisation advocate for health and air quality)

Annex B: Commission Scope

<u>Scrutiny Commission Proposal and Scoping Template</u>

Scrutiny Principles agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) Chair and Vice-Chairs

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Commissions it sponsors should as far as possible:
- *Be independent from the administration and stakeholders;*
- *Be accessible and inclusive of everyone in the borough;*
- *Enable decisions to be challenged constructively;*
- *Strive for better services that produce the best outcomes;*
- *Base its decisions and recommendations on the best evidence available;*
- *Follow up its recommendations.*

Commission members: **Councillor Mary Atkins (Chair)**
Councillor Marianna Masters
Councillor Irfan Mohammed
Councillor Paul Gadsby
Councillor Jane Pickard
Councillor Nicole Griffiths

<u>Note</u>: Commission members' role is to represent the views of service users while also balancing the interests of the Council more widely. They are accountable for the project's success and delivery of its outcomes.

While the Chair has overall control it is expected that a collaborative, evidence-based approach is taken which commands the support of all commission members.

Councillor(s) submitting proposal	Mary Atkins
Working title	Low Traffic Neighbourhoods: Lessons for the Climate Change Emergency.
Reason for inquiry and desired outcome	*This constitutes the business case for the commission and must be completed in detail, addressing the below questions. This will be reviewed periodically to ensure continued business justification.* • *Does the issue relate to one or more Borough Plan priorities?* In January 2019 Lambeth became the first London borough to declare a climate change emergency. Work has progressed within the council on ensuring action on climate change is embedded in council policies and plans. In 2019 the Council's Transport Strategy followed by the Transport Strategy Implementation Plan were published following 2 years of full consultation. The policy highlighted the council's commitment to 5 guiding principles: • Sustainable Growth • Efficient and Connected

- Inclusive and accessible

- Active and Safe, and

- Carbon Neutral and Clean Air.

The TSIP sets out the criteria by which the council will prioritise neighbourhood traffic reduction interventions, where there is evidence of "rat running", where school pupils are affected, air quality is poor, and where a healthy route is proposed. The TSIP was intended to be a process and to provide monitoring mechanism.

This relates in particular to the following Borough Plan priorities/goals: *Making Lambeth a place where people want to live, work and invest* (manage Lambeth's neighbourhoods so that the feel safe and welcoming; maintain attractive neighbourhoods… that support and encourage healthier lifestyles; reduce our carbon emissions)

Promote care and independence (support people to live longer and healthier lives)

- *Does the issue have a potential impact for one or more section(s) of the population?*

Lambeth has a diverse population with poorer areas recognised to have worse health outcomes, less car ownership, fewer opportunities to cycle /exercise. The reasons for these are well documented in various health audits (including the [Annual Public Health Report 2020](#)) but have been exacerbated by Covid-19.

The debate about low traffic neighbourhoods has been characterised by the different needs of differing populations. Small businesses, low income v high income, families with children v those with none, cultural differences and perceptions of safety. The needs of the disabled. The right to car ownership. Car owners v cyclists.

- *Will a commission add value to the Council, and/or its partners', overall performance?*

This is the first introduction of a strategy related to climate change that affects significant areas of the population. Lessons learnt here will inform how other strategies can be brought in that will need the

consent of the population to implement, thereby allowing such measures to be enacted in the most effective manner.

- *Is the issue strategic and significant?*

Yes, the Climate Change Emergency is influencing all areas of the Council's work.

Will a commission contribute to the council's financial strategy?
Other Councils (for example, Wandsworth and Bromley) have wasted considerable amounts of money implementing and then cancelling LTNs. Bringing significant change in a short period of time is resource heavy. Any lessons learnt will reduce officer time and therefore support efficient budget use.

- *Is the commission likely to result in a high proportion of 'gold-medal recommendations' i.e. ones which are well evidenced and result in a shift in policy, lead to resource savings, improve services, make things fairer or solve problems?*

This commission will give residents a voice in solving local issues. This will improve outcomes and aid understanding between different groups. It will aid the local population's understanding of council processes make recommendations to the Council on how Climate change actions can "take citizens with them".

- *Is scrutiny activity timely?*

Yes, there is considerable debate in neighbourhoods where LTNs are being introduced as to whether they are the "right thing"; do they support local business, is it making "middle class" areas safer while displacing pollution on to main roads where less affluent people live? Are emergency vehicles being delayed? Is it adding too much time to key worker journeys etc.

How can communities be consulted under emergency conditions?
How are expected outcomes communicated and measured?
How can misinformation be counteracted and by whom?
How can council processes be "demystified"?

	Commencing this commission now will help address these issues and ensure that findings can feed into the Citizens' Assembly which will explore issues of behaviour change and citizen buy-in. • *Will scrutiny involvement be duplicating other work?* This work will complement policy that sustainable neighbourhood staff are developing to monitor impact and deliver change. Efforts will be made to ensure the relevant Cabinet Member and lead officers are sighted on the commission's progress in order that emerging findings can be taken on board as the work progresses. • *Is it an issue for concern to partners and stakeholders?* Yes, of significant concern to residents, climate change organisations, community groups and academics. • *Is it an issue of community concern?* Yes, as evidenced by the considerable amount of debate locally (the deputations received by Full Council in October 2020 both against and in favour of LTNs demonstrate the strength of feeling).
Links to Borough Plan Outcomes / Resident Priorities	See above (under Reason for Inquiry)
Time constraints	*If the commission needs to be considered within a specific time frame please state here and why.* The temporary traffic orders which authorise the LTN expire in 2021/2; however, it is expected officers will start evaluation in the next 6 months. It will therefore be useful for the scrutiny to be able to feed into the evaluation process as that happens.
Core Questions / Terms of Reference	*What are the core questions the commission is seeking to answer (no more than three)? These will form the Terms of Reference of the commission* What is the driver for implementing emergency LTNs? Health, Covid 19, increasing activity, improving the environment, financial? How will LTNs be evaluated, and after what period? What is the baseline of objective data that will be measured from? How will local people/stakeholders be involved? How will communities/stakeholders be involved in implementation of future policies that are hyper local and controversial?
What will not be included	*This will assist in setting the boundaries for the commission's work and prevent 'scope-creep'.*

	Policy decisions around the evaluation/future of the current LTNs (the commission will explore how this has been done but with a view to establishing best practice recommendations for future emergency measures) The climate change emergency declaration The Lambeth Transport Strategy and Implementation Plan
Risks (mitigation)	*What risks are there to the commission completing its work? This could include political, economic, social, technological, legal or environmental factors [PESTLE analysis]. Other pieces of work the commission may be dependent upon should also be included.* The main risks concern officer or witness availability (particularly in light of the new lockdown announced in January 2021), both of which could necessitate extensions to the planned timetable.
Equality & Diversity considerations	*Identify any Equalities and Diversity issues that may arise – this may include positive or negative impacts on those with protected characteristics (for Lambeth this includes socio-economic status, health, and English as a Second Language as well as the 9 outlined in law)* To be considered in depth as the commission progresses. Issues initially identified include accessibility of communications and possible adverse impacts of road closures on older people (e.g. limiting access for taxis).
Possible co-options	*Would the commission's work benefit from having a co-optee(s)?* Not required. Diverse points of view will be sought via witnesses.
Key stakeholders / Potential witnesses	*Who will the commission wish to hear from in order to meet its Terms of Reference, and how do you plan to engage them? Include opportunities to involve the public/service users/voluntary sector/other authorities//lobby groups/academics/private sector etc* Potential witnesses include: ➢ Cllr Holland and relevant officers from Transport, Communications and Climate Change Response ➢ Businesses (both via BIDs and small business owners in their own right) ➢ Disabled groups ➢ Patient groups (cf the Lambeth Hospital issue above) – both in relation to physical and mental health (on which Black Thrive may also have useful input) ➢ Different political perspectives (including from Cllr Briggs) ➢ Residents' groups from affected areas, including just outside the LTNs – to include estates as well as streets ➢ Community groups who provided their own research such as Liveable Wells

	➢ Cycling/active travel groups (e.g. Lambeth Cyclists, Living Streets, Mums for Lungs) ➢ Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams ➢ Safer Neighbourhood Panels ➢ Other boroughs, particularly Waltham Forest (who introduced their Mini-Holland scheme around five years ago and so would be able to speak with a certain degree of hindsight and perspective with regards to success measures and resident reaction) ➢ Academic experts (e.g. Rachel Aldred [Professor of Transport at the University of Westminster] and Anna Goodman [Assistant Professor, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine]) It will be important to liaise with decision makers to ensure those groups who have engaged in the process thus far have the opportunity to be involved in the scrutiny.
Portfolio holder(s)	Deputy Leader of the Council (Sustainable Transport, Environment & Clean Air): Councillor Claire Holland
Research/Evidence	*What information will the commission need to meet its Terms of Reference?* To be determined as the commission progresses but to include: - information from academic experts - documentation from the UK Climate Change Assembly - information on other boroughs' experiences of implementing, monitoring and amending LTN schemes - internal documentation on implementation/rational for schemes, monitoring strategies, how feedback is considered and responded to in the experimental phase
Potential site visits	*Would the commission's work benefit from any visits?* Potential site visits to LB Waltham Forest Mini Holland scheme (an early adopter of LTN-style measures) and observation of existing Lambeth schemes which have caused controversy, provided these can be done in a Covid-secure way.
Commission format and Outline Plan	*Commission format could include (but is not limited to):* *- One-off meeting akin to a single-issue OSC* *- One-day stakeholder summit at which a variety of views can be taken* *- Longer series of themed meetings* *Please set out below an outline plan including timelines (this should take into account the following phases: (i) agreement of scope; (ii) evidence gathering [research]; (iii): stakeholder engagement; (iv) determination of recommendations; (v) reporting):*

	Agreement of Scope: December , Research: December/January Synthesis published research January Identify gaps January Stakeholder summit February Recommendations: March Publish draft report: March / April

Annex C: Background Documents

LB Lambeth *Lambeth's Borough Plan Review* (July 2019)

LB Lambeth *Lambeth's Response to the Climate Emergency* (July 2019)

LB Lambeth *Full Council motion to declare a climate emergency* (Jan 2019)

LB Lambeth *Equality Streets Scrutiny Commission Report* (2016)

LB Lambeth *Events Scrutiny Commission* (2019)

LB Lambeth *Transport Strategy* and *Implementation Plan* (2019)

LB Lambeth *Covid-19 Response: Emergency Decision: Transport Strategy Covid-19 Emergency Response* and *Appendix* (April 2020)

LB Lambeth *Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22*

LB Lambeth *Air Quality Annual Status Report for 2019* (Aug 2020)

LB Lambeth *Climate Change and Health: Annual Public Health Report 2020 (*2020)

LB Lambeth *Covid-19 Transport Strategy Programme: LTN Monitoring Strategy* (2021)

LB Lambeth *Officer Delegated Decision Report Railton Low Traffic Neighbourhood Experimental Scheme* (Dec 2020)

LB Lambeth *Officer Delegated Decision Report Tulse Hill Low Traffic Neighbourhood Experimental Scheme* (Dec 2020)

LB Lambeth *Officer Delegated Decision Report Ferndale Low Traffic Neighbourhood Experimental Scheme* (March 2021)

LB Lambeth *Officer Delegated Decision Report Streatham Hill Low Traffic Neighbourhood Experimental Scheme* (April 2021)

LB Lewisham *Report to Overview & Scrutiny Business Panel: Update on temporary measures to support safer walking and cycling in response to the Covid-19 pandemic* (Nov 2020)

LB Southwark *Air Quality Annual Status Report 2019* (May 2020)

LB Southwark *Environment Scrutiny Commission Air Quality Report* (July 2020)

LB Waltham Forest *Report to Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee: Update on the Council's Air Quality Action Plan* (Sept 2020)

King's College London *Waltham Forest study of life expectancy benefits of increased physical activity from walking and cycling* (2018)

Local Government Association *Stakeholder engagement in an emergency: lessons from low traffic neighbourhoods* (May 2021)

Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change *Rapid Evidence Assessment: Liveable and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods* (March 2021)

Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations [CAST] – *Briefing 4: How Has Covid-19 Impacted Low Carbon Lifestyles and Attitudes Towards Climate Action?* (Aug 2020)

Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations [CAST] – *Briefing 5: Tracking the Effect of Covid-19 on Low Carbon Behaviours and Attitudes to Climate Change* (Dec 2020)

Howarth et al *Building a Social Mandate for Climate Action: Lessons from Covid-19* (July 2020)

Goodman et al *The Impact of Introducing a Low Traffic Neighbourhood on Fire Service Emergency Response Times in Waltham Forest, London* (Dec 2020)

Aldred & Goodman *Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, Car Use, and Active Travel: Evidence from the People and Places Survey of Outer London Active Travel Interventions* (2020)

Aldred & Verlinghieri *LTNs for All? Mapping the Extent of London's New Low Traffic Neighbourhoods* (Nov 2020)

Sweetman & Whitmarsh *Climate Justice: High-Status Ingroup Social Models Increase Pro-Environmental Action Through Making Actions Seem More Moral* (2015)

Laverty et al *Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and Population Health* (Feb 2021)

Courts and Tribunals Judiciary *Coroner's Report (Ella Kissi-Debrah)* (April 2021)

Greater London Assembly Environment Committee *Clearing the Air: Pollution in London* (Feb 2021)

Transport for All *Pave the Way: The Impact of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) on Disabled People, and the Future of Accessible Active Travel* (Jan 2021)

UK Climate Assembly *The Path to Net Zero* (2020)

The Guardian *London teenagers' road signs highlight effect of toxic air on people of colour* (March 2021)

The Guardian *Opponents of LTNS say they delay emergency services – but look at the facts* (April 2021)

London Living Streets *Evaporating traffic? Impact of low-traffic neighbourhoods on main roads* (July 2019)