

**OFFICER DELEGATED DECISION: 21 JANUARY 2021**

**Report title:** Quietway 5 upgrade schemes – Experimental Traffic Order conversion to permanent Traffic Management Order

**Wards:** Clapham Common, Clapham Town, Larkhall, Stockwell, Oval

**Portfolio:** Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport, Environment and Clean Air (job-share):  
Councillor Danial Adilypour and Councillor Dr. Mahamed Hashi

**Report Authorised by:** Neil Fenton – Assistant Director Parking, Street Management and Commercial

**Contact for enquiries:** Josh Learner, Transport Strategy Programme Lead, Sustainable Growth and Opportunity - [jlearner@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:jlearner@lambeth.gov.uk)

**REPORT SUMMARY**

This report authorises the making of traffic orders, subject to statutory consultation, to give the experimental traffic schemes that form the Cycleway 5 route permanent effect. The report considers responses, including objections, to the relevant traffic orders comprising the experimental schemes, general feedback received from the community and stakeholders, measured impacts of the scheme and proposed complementary improvements to the local area.

**FINANCE SUMMARY**

The recommendations in this report relate to the change in legal status of schemes already delivered on the ground. The costs associated with this work is £11,015.

The scheme will be funded by the approved Sustainable Transport and Public Realm capital allocation for Healthy Routes, this funding to be supplemented by grant funding should this become available.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Agree that the Experimental Traffic Orders used to deliver experimental schemes as part of Cycleway 5 on Windmill Drive, Sail Street, Larkhall Rise Junction with Union Road, Bromells' Road, Thorne Road junction – be converted to permanent Traffic Management Orders. For details on these projects go to section 5.
2. To consider the Council's statutory duties under the Traffic Management Act, including the Network Management Duty.
3. To consider the Council's statutory duties under the Equality Act including the discharge of the Public Sector Equalities Duty and any impact on Human Rights.

## 1. CONTEXT

- 1.1 The Transport Strategy Implementation Plan (TSIP) sets out the mechanisms for delivery of the Lambeth Council Transport Strategy objectives to make borough transport networks safe, efficient, inclusive, sustainable and healthy. The introduction of Healthy Routes is recommended within the TSIP as an effective delivery intervention that helps to achieve these objectives.
- 1.2 The TSIP Healthy Routes Plan sets out the rationale and approach for Healthy Routes in Lambeth. Healthy Routes are part of a network approach that ensures links between key areas across the borough are linked via accessible and attractive routes for walking, scooting, wheeling and cycling. Such measures are expected to encourage a mode shift from motor vehicle travel to sustainable modes and reduce the negative impacts associated with this form of travel, such as road danger, air pollution, carbon emissions and congestion.
- 1.3 In January 2019 Lambeth became the first council in London to declare a Climate Emergency and the Corporate Carbon Reduction Plan reasserts the council's commitment to taking all actions necessary in response to the climate crisis. Transport accounts for a significant proportion of the borough's CO2 emissions and traffic reduction, together with the switch to zero emissions vehicles will be required to deliver the necessary change in this area. Urgent action is required to meet this challenge and an innovative and flexible approach will be necessary.
- 1.4 The Covid-19 pandemic underlined the need to implement improvements to the transport network and on 27 April 2020 the Council published its Covid Transport Strategy Response, followed on 15 May 2020 by the Covid-19 Transport Strategy Programme.
- 1.5 The Strategy Response highlighted the need for traffic restraint in order to maintain a safe and healthy environment during the initial stages of the pandemic and to prevent a surge in motor traffic as restrictions on travel were expected to be eased. A key objective of the Strategy was to ensure that those who needed to drive could do so by introducing measures protecting against a significant increase in car trips and resulting congestion on the road network. The subsequent Programme provided more detail on the schemes to be brought forward based on a number of delivery scenarios.
- 1.6 The Covid-19 Transport Strategy Programme identified a broad range of interventions, including Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN) and Healthy Route schemes and committed funding for these. The Quietway 5 route upgrade was included in the Programme's 'Baseline Scenario' for priority delivery as the route runs parallel to the Northern Line – which was forced to run at lower capacity to enable social distancing. The route also links local centres between Clapham and Central London, including serving key workers based at St Thomas's Hospital.
- 1.7 On 6 May 2020, the Mayor of London announced the London Streetspace Plan (LSP). This aimed to make it easy and safe for Londoners to choose to walk or cycle as an alternative to public transport use which was restricted at the time. The LSP was developed to help respond to the immediate public health imperatives around:
  - enabling social distancing on-street;
  - encouraging Londoners to avoid unnecessary use of public transport; and
  - focusing on strategic movement to prioritise walking and cycling.

1.8 On 23 May 2020, the Secretary of State for Transport issued statutory guidance in relation to the effect of Covid-19 on highway network management. The guidance stated that, to encourage active travel and to enable social distancing, local authorities should take measures to re-allocate road space to people walking and cycling. It emphasised these measures should be taken as swiftly as possible. The guidance is specific in its recommendations, for example supporting creating 'modal filters' whereby planters or large barriers are used to close roads to motor traffic, creating neighbourhoods that are low-traffic or traffic free.

1.9 The need for the specific measures introduced on the Quietway 5 route were informed route assessment work completed prior to the COVID pandemic as part of the development of the Healthy Routes Plan, which forms part of the adopted Lambeth Transport Strategy 2019.

1.10 In October 2020 the Council issued scheme approval for the implementation of the Quietway 5 route upgrades under experimental traffic orders. These include the following:

Larkhall Rise junction with Union Road – light segregation of existing cycle track

- Lightweight plastic bollards (known as wands) have been added to existing mandatory cycle lanes on the Larkhall Rise and Larkhall Lane approaches to Union Road. The wands ensure that the cycle lanes are kept clear and that cyclists have a form of physical protection from motor vehicles as they navigate across the junction.

Bromell's Road – Contra Flow Cycle Lane

- Two way cycling was introduced on this one way street to allow full permeability for cyclists using one of the borough's flagship cycle routes between Waterloo and Clapham Common.

Thorne Road junction with South Lambeth Road – light segregation of existing cycle track

- Lightweight plastic bollards (known as wands) have been added to existing mandatory cycle lanes on the Thorne Road approach to South Lambeth Road. The wands ensure that the cycle lanes are kept clear and that cyclists have a form of physical protection from motor vehicles as they navigate across the junction.

Sail Street junction with Lambeth Road - light segregation of existing cycle track

- A new mandatory, two-way cycle track has been added to Lightweight plastic bollards (known as wands) to ensure that the cycle lanes are kept clear and that cyclists have a form of physical protection from motor vehicles as they navigate across the junction. Additionally, cycle markings have been added on Lambeth Road to add a visual cue that cyclists continue along the junction with the intention of reducing the risk of vehicles turning across the path of cyclists. The Experimental Traffic Order included the removal of 5 parking bays on the east side of Sail Street which are now the location of the protected, two-way cycle track.

Windmill Drive

- A new modal filter on Windmill Drive, within Clapham Common, to reduce the amount of motor vehicles cutting between the A205 and the A24 to enable safer conditions for walking and cycling. Emergency services and refuse vehicles received exemptions for the modal filter. The ETO included the removal/suspension of existing parking places (which are used free of charge for limited periods) situated on the north side of Windmill Drive opposite the community garden known as Bandstand Beds, and immediately to the west of the western side of the community garden, and replace those parking places with double yellow lines.

1.11 It is now proposed to move the current experimental schemes to permanent schemes. No changes to the scheme are permitted or proposed in moving the experimental orders to permanent orders.

## 2 PROPOSALS AND REASONS

- 2.1 The schemes set out at 1.1 have now been operational for over 12 months. Following a review of these schemes, and feedback received, it is proposed to convert the experimental traffic orders used to deliver these schemes to permanent traffic orders.
- 2.2 Statutory consultation was carried out prior to the original Officer Delegated Decision published on the 10 July 2020 It comprised of emails containing the designs for the interventions and the reasons for implementation sent to the emergency services, no comments were made on any of the Cycleway 5 Covid-19 Response Schemes.
- 2.3 For Windmill Drive the borough are conducting ongoing assessments/engagement in order to design and develop permanent designs and features. The agreement of which will be subject to a further decision report.
- 2.4 There are no changes proposed to any of the infrastructure that was installed as part of the ETOs highlighted in this report as the current infrastructure is deemed suitable. However, officers will be conducting regular reviews of this infrastructure to identify any potential upgrade opportunities.

*Table 1 – Statutory Consultation Responses*

Consultee	Date Consulted	Comment and date received	Officer Response
Chief Officer Police	10/7/2020	No Comment	NA
London Ambulance Service/NHS Trust	10/7/2020	No Comment	NA
London Fire Brigade	10/7/2020	No Comment	NA

## 3 FINANCE

- 3.1 The recommendations in this report relate solely to the change in legal status of schemes already in place on the ground. However, £11,015 is expected to be incurred from the traffic order process and maintenance.

## 4. LEGAL AND DEMOCRACY

- 4.1 In response to the Covid-19 pandemic, on 23 May 2020 the Department for Transport issued revised [statutory guidance on councils' highway network management duty](#). It recommends that local authorities in areas with high levels of public transport use should take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling as swiftly as possible. This report's recommendations are strongly aligned to this guidance.
- 4.2 The Council has, pursuant to Section 62 of the Highways Act 1980, a general power to improve any highway in its area. Section 75 of the Act extends a power to vary the relative widths of the carriageway and of any footway.
- 4.3 Restricting traffic from using part of the public highway requires the making of a traffic management order (TMO). The Council's powers to implement this are principally set out in the

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA). For the reasons set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 and 5.2 of this report, the making of Experimental TMOs pursuant to Section 9 of the RTRA, is recommended.

- 4.4 The provisions of sections 9, 10, 124, Schedule 1 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the RTRA provide the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make TMOs for the purpose of:
- a) designating on-street parking places and to charge for the use of such places;
  - b) imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes, at all times or otherwise;
  - c) to prohibit, restrict and otherwise regulate the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by all classes of traffic, or by any class or classes of traffic, and
  - d) to vary or revoke an existing TMO for these purposes.
- 4.5 Paragraphs (a) to (g) of section 1(1) of the RTRA provides that the Council may make a TMO for any of the following purposes
- a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
  - b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
  - c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
  - d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
  - e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
  - f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs
  - g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).
- 4.6 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its functions under the RTRA so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
  - b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
  - c) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy)
  - d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
  - e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

The Council must have proper regard to the matters set out in s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.

- 4.7 Section 90A of the HA1980 empowers a local highway authority to construct (and remove) road humps (including raised crossings or speed tables) on roads with a speed limit of 30 mph or less. The procedure for this including specific design, publication and consultation requirements are set out at Section 90C of the HA80 and detailed in the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999. Those requirements include a duty to consult with:
- the chief police officer;

- the fire and rescue authority
- the chief officer of any body providing ambulance services; and
- organisations appearing to represent persons who use the highway to which the proposal relates, or to represent persons who are otherwise likely to be affected by the road hump.

Section 90C of the HA1980 requires that the council publish in one or more local papers a notice detailing the nature, dimensions and location of the proposed road hump, raised crossing or speed table, the address to which any objections to the proposals may be sent and the period during which such objections may be sent, that period being no less than 21 days beginning with the date on which the notice is published. The same provision also specifies that the council post at appropriate points on the highway, a notice containing the aforementioned information for the same period.

Section 90C of HA80, prescribes, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed before a decision is made to construct a road hump.

The Council is required to consider any objections sent to it in accordance with a notice referred to above and may, if it thinks fit, cause a local inquiry to be held.

- 4.8 Section 23 of the RTRA provides powers to establish; alter and remove crossings for pedestrians and requires that such crossings be indicated in the manner prescribed by Regulations made under Section 25 of the Act. The relevant regulations for this purpose are The Zebra, Pelican and Puffin Pedestrian Crossings Regulations and General Directions 1997 and the requisite sign or signs for these purposes specified in the TSRGD.
- 4.9 Section 23(2) of the RTRA provides that before establishing a crossing the local traffic authority shall:  
Consult with the chief officer of police about their proposal; and Give public notice of that proposal to do so
- 4.10 Section 144 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 requires the Council when exercising any of its functions to have regard to the Mayor of London's transport strategy (MTS) and any written guidance given to it. The current strategy emphasizes the importance of reducing emissions, improving air quality and encouraging active, inclusive and safe travel. The MTS includes the following commentary:
- “Policy 1  
The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will reduce Londoners' dependency on cars in favour of active, efficient and sustainable modes of travel, with the central aim for 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport by 2041.”
- 4.11 Further at page 50, under the heading, “FOCUS ON: BOROUGH TRAFFIC REDUCTION STRATEGIES” is the following commentary:

“Road space reallocation and enabling car-free lifestyles

Using street space more efficiently to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport should be considered. This could include creating vehicle-free zones, introducing ‘filtered permeability’ (using physical restrictions to prevent motorised vehicles from using certain streets) or creating space for cycle parking, greening or seating. This is not about being anti-car, but about supporting Londoners in moving around the city without having to rely solely on cars. By doing so, road space can be freed up for cycling and walking and for more necessary road usage....”

4.12 The making of experimental traffic orders is governed by the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996. Regulation 6 of these Regulations specifies that in addition to the Chief Officer of the Police, the Council is required to consult with the following before making an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO). The outcome of this consultation is set out in the table in paragraph 5.5 below.

Case	Consultee
Where the order relates to, or appears to the order making authority to be likely to affect traffic on, a road for which another authority is the highway authority or the traffic authority	The other authority
Where the order relates to, or appears to the order making authority to be likely to affect traffic on a road included in the route of a London bus service	London Buses
Where it appears to the authority that the order is likely to affect the passage of an ambulance	the chief officer of the appropriate NHS trust
Where it appears to the authority that the order is likely to affect the passage on any road of a fire-fighting vehicle	the chief officer of the fire brigade of the fire authority
All cases	The Freight Transport Association The Road Haulage Association
Such other organisations (if any) representing persons likely to be affected by any provision in the order as the order making authority thinks it appropriate to consult.	
Any such organisations that have been consulted in respect of one or more schemes subject to this report's recommendations are detailed in section 2 of this report	

Whilst there is no statutory requirement to consult other groups, 'Statutory Guidance under the Traffic Management Act 2004: network management in response to COVID-19' states that whilst measures should be taken as swiftly as possible, it should not be at the expense of consulting local communities including disability groups as set out in paragraph 5.4 below.

4.13 Regulation 9(1) of the 1996 Regulations provides that the authority must cause a public inquiry to be held in certain circumstances, which are not applicable here. In all other cases it has a discretion, and "may" cause such an inquiry to be held.

4.14 Regulation 22 of the 1996 Regulations provides that prior to the making of an *experimental* order there is no requirement to publish proposals for public consultation or to consider any objections arising therein. However, whilst no decision on whether or not the provisions of the ETO or any of them will be made permanent in due course, if the scheme is to deliver the long-term objectives detailed in paragraph 1.2, the experimental traffic order will need to be replaced within 18 months by a permanent traffic order. To enable this to happen efficiently, Regulation 23(3) of the 1996 Regulations makes provision for no further public consultation being necessary at that time if:

(a) the notice of making for the Experimental Traffic Order contains the statements specified in Schedule 5 of the Regulations, namely;

1. That the order making authority will be considering in due course whether the provisions of the experimental order should be continued in force indefinitely.
--

2. That within a period of six months—
  - (a) beginning with the day on which the experimental order came into force, or
  - (b) if that order is varied by another order or modified pursuant to section 10(2) of the 1984 Act, beginning with the day on which the variation or modification or the latest variation or modification came into force, any person may object to the making of an order for the purpose of such indefinite continuation.
3. That any such objection must—
  - (a) be in writing;
  - (b) state the grounds on which it is made; and
  - (c) be sent to an address specified for the purpose in the notice of making.

- (b) deposited documents (including the documents referred to below in sub-paragraphs (c) and (e) were kept available for inspection in accordance with Schedule 2 throughout the whole of the period specified in regulation 22(4);
- (c) the deposited documents included a statement of the order making authority's reasons for making the experimental order;
- (d) no variation or modification of the experimental order was made more than 12 months after the order was made; and
- (e) where the experimental order has been modified in accordance with section 10(2) of the 1984 Act, a statement of the effect of each such modification has been included with the deposited documents.

4.15 The Council is also obliged to deposit at the same time various documents for inspection, including a statement setting out our reasons for making the experimental order. The Experimental TMO will take effect seven days after the day on which the said notice of making is published and may remain in force for up to a maximum of 18 months. Within this period, the Council will need to decide whether to make the scheme permanent. No consultation is required prior to the order coming into force.

4.16 Section 10 of the RTRA provides for an Experimental TMO to be suspended or modified while the order is in place. This power cannot be used to extend or make additions to the order. No variation to, nor modification of, the Experimental TMO can be made more than 12 months after it was made.

4.17 Once the experimental order is in place, the Council is required to make the necessary amendments to the road markings and traffic signs as soon as practicable to adequately provide information as to the Order that is in place. The requisite sign or signs for these purposes is specified in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

Paragraph 5 of the report details the Council's communication and consultation strategy with respect to this proposal.

4.18 As detailed in paragraph 4.12, the Regulations specify a statutory consultation procedure which must be followed if the Council wishes an experimental order to be replaced by a permanent traffic order. This procedure requires that before deciding whether to make the provisions of the ETO or any of them permanent, the Council must take account of any representations made within six months of it coming into force or, if it is modified, within 6 months of that modification coming into

force. All material objections received must be properly considered by the decision maker in light of administrative law principles, human rights law and the relevant statutory powers. The Council's constitution delegates to Directors and Assistant Directors (Residents Services) the authority to consider objections received from statutory consultation as part of the TMO making process, (subject to a formal report setting out the objections, with clear recommendations, being submitted for approval) and the power to make, amend or revoke traffic orders, following the consideration of such objections.

4.19 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 sets out the public sector equality duty in relation to race, sex and disability and extending the duty to all the protected characteristics i.e. race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership and gender reassignment. The public sector equality duty requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity and
- Foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Part of the duty to have "due regard" where there is disproportionate impact will be to take steps to mitigate the impact and the Council must demonstrate that this has been done, and/or justify the decision, on the basis that it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Accordingly, there is an expectation that a decision maker will explore other means which have less of a disproportionate impact.

4.20 The Equality Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken – that is, in the development of policy options, and in making a final decision. A public body cannot satisfy the Equality Duty by justifying a decision after it has been taken.

4.21 In addition to the above, Section 175A of the Highways Act 1980 extends a specific duty upon local authorities to have regard to the needs of disabled and blind in the execution of certain street works (namely the placing of lamp-posts, bollards, traffic signs, apparatus or other permanent obstructions) which may impede such persons. Consideration of this duty and the Councils' public sector equality duty are discussed in paragraph 7 below.

4.22 Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 imposes a duty on the Council to manage its road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to its other obligations, policies and objectives, to:

Securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and

Facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

4.23 Subject to the requirement set out in section 18 to have regard to statutory guidance on network management, under section 17 of the Traffic Management Act the Council 2004 as a network manager must have in place arrangements as it considers appropriate for carrying out its network management duty which must include provision for establishing processes for ensuring, so far as is reasonably practical, that the Council identifies occurrences, including future occurrences which are causing or may cause road congestion or disruption to the movement of traffic, and consider possible action that can be taken in response to those occurrences.

4.24 The Council, as a public body, is under a duty to consider whether the exercise of its powers interacts with rights protected by the European Convention, set out in the Human Rights Act 1998. The Convention rights applicable are:

Article 1, Part I - protects the right of everyone to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. No one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law. This does not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest etc.

Article 8 - protects the right of the individual to respect for their private and family life, their home and their correspondence. There should be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of amongst other matters, public safety, the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Any interference with a Convention right must be necessary and proportionate and in pursuing an ETO, the council has to consider carefully the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest.

4.25 Page 187 of the Council's Constitution 2020-21 delegates to Business Unit Managers authority to consider and approve, within their area of managerial responsibility, the detailed delivery of local traffic and highway schemes (including controlled parking zones) which have been included within the Council's overall programme. The measures proposed by this report meet this criteria by virtue of having been included in [Lambeth's Transport Strategy Implementation Plan](#) approved by Cabinet on 17 November 2019.

4.26 The Council's Constitution requires that issues of an important or sensitive nature will be published on the Council's website for five clear days prior to the decision being taken (Constitution, Part 2, Chapter F) by the Cabinet Member or officer concerned. It is suggested that this proposed decision is published online in the interests of transparency. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken.

## 5 CONSULTATION AND CO-PRODUCTION

5.1 As part of the traffic order process, consultation took place with statutory consultees, including emergency services, prior to the making of the experimental traffic orders underpinning the scheme.

5.2 Site notices were put up at the location of the interventions with the address to the Healthy Routes email inbox as well as providing a project page where the public could access further information

5.3 The borough received the following representations and one objection:

- Bromell's Road – contra flow cycle lane
  - 0 responses
  - 0 formal objections were received
- Larkhall Rise junction with Union Road – light segregation of existing cycle track
  - 5 unique responses were received – of which the general themes were the lack of consultation and the lack of justification
  - 0 formal objections were received

- Thorne Road junction with South Lambeth Road – light segregation of existing cycle track
  - 0 responses
  - 0 formal objections were received
  
- Sail Street junction with Lambeth Road - light segregation of existing cycle track
  - 1 response - relating to the removal of a parking meter unrelated to the scheme.
  - 0 objections received.
  
- Windmill Drive
  - 1 response relating to lack of consultation
  - 1 objection (Response in Appendix B)

5.4 There is no statutory requirement to consult the public on experimental traffic schemes, except to take into account responses submitted in the 6-month statutory period post-implementation.

## 6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The main risks associated with the proposals detailed in this report are summarised in table 6 below, along with the proposed mitigation.

*Table 2 - Risk severity calculation*

		Impact			
		Minor (1)	Significant (2)	Serious (4)	Major (8)
<b>Likelihood</b>	Very likely (4)	4	8	16	32
	Likely (3)	3	6	12	24
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	8	16
	Very Unlikely (1)	1	2	4	8

*Table 3 - Risk Assessment*

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Score	Mitigation
That introducing a healthy route intervention on a permanent basis will create public opposition	2	4	8	The trial schemes have been in place for over 12 months with minimal opposition received by the council. The Healthy Route email inbox will remain open for any future correspondence.
That a scheme being delivered on a permanent basis should be implementing more permanent features (as opposed to temporary materials)	2	4	8	Due to funding constraints and uncertain future grant funding opportunities, the borough is unable to commit to funding permanent features. However, Lambeth will look, where possible, to upgrade temporary materials where funding allows

That the proposals result in increased traffic levels in nearby roads	4	2	8	As far as possible, the healthy route has been designed to limit traffic displacement to classified roads. Lambeth's Transport. Post-scheme traffic surveys will inform whether this has been achieved.
That the measures will negatively impact emergency response times.	1	8	8	The scheme is compliant with London Fire Brigade regulations to allow for emergency service access – Low traffic means emergency response within neighbourhood will be faster. Traffic on main roads to be monitored, noting wider impact of other London schemes and works creating additional pressure on arterial network.
That the restrictions negatively impact operations for businesses within the scope area during transitional stage	2	4	8	Engagement with business in the locality.
That the scheme disproportionately disbenefits a group with protected characteristics.	3	4	12	Full scheme equalities impact assessment undertaken and reviewed by decision maker prior to scheme authorisation.

## 7. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed for this scheme and is attached under Appendix A.

## 8. COMMUNITY SAFETY

8.1 Not Applicable

## 9. ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Environmental:  
None arising from this report's recommendations

9.2 Health  
None arising from this report's recommendations

9.3 Corporate Parenting  
None arising from this report's recommendations

9.4 Staffing and accommodation:

None arising from this report's recommendations.

9.5 Responsible Procurement:

None arising from this report; all goods and services will be provided by the council's existing supply chains.

## 10. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

*Table 4 - Implementation timetable*

	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>
1	Publication of decision online	13 January 2022
2	Decision date	21 Jan 2022

<b>Name and Position/Title</b>	<b>Lambeth Directorate</b>	<b>Date Sent</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Cllr Dr. Mahamad Hashi	Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport, Environment and Clean Air	09.12.21	09.12.21
Neil Fenton, Assistant Director, Parking, Street Management and Commercial	Resident Services	21.12.21	05.01.22
Russell Trewartha, Head of Programmes (Capital Programme for Public Realm)	Resident Services	02.12.21	04.12.21
Jamila Barrett, Programme Manager (Public Realm)	Resident Services	02.12.21	04.12.21
Simon Phillips Transport and Public Realm Strategy Manager	Sustainable Growth and Opportunity	02.12.21	05.12.21
Matthew Gaynor Assistant Director Finance	Finance and Property	02.12.21	08.12.21
Gregory Carson Principal Lawyer	Legal and Governance	02.12.21	08.12.21
Maria Burton, Senior Democratic Services Officer	Legal and Governance	02.12.21	09.12.21

<b>Report History</b>	
<b>Original discussion with Cabinet Member</b>	Ongoing since April 2020
<b>Report deadline</b>	N/A
<b>Date final report sent</b>	N/A
<b>Part II Exempt from Disclosure/ confidential accompanying report?</b>	N/A
<b>Key decision report</b>	No
<b>Date first appeared on forward plan</b>	N/A
<b>Key decision reasons</b>	N/A
<b>Background information</b>	<p>Transport Strategy and TSIP <a href="#">Transport Strategy</a>  Transport Strategy Consultation Report <a href="#">Consultation Report</a>  TSIP Low Traffic Neighbourhood Plan <a href="#">LTN Plan</a>  TSIP Healthy Route Plan <a href="#">Healthy Routes</a>  Transport Covid Programme <a href="#">CMDR</a>  LTN Monitoring Strategy <a href="#">Monitoring Strategy</a>  Transport Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment: <a href="#">EqIA</a>  TMA Guidance  Experimental Scheme Decision Report <a href="#">London Streetscape Plan ODDR</a></p>
<b>Appendices</b>	<p>Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment  Appendix B – Objection response</p>

**APPROVAL BY CABINET MEMBER OR OFFICER IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

**I confirm I have consulted Finance, Legal and Democratic Services, and taken account of their advice and comments in completing the report for approval:**

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Post:** Josh Learner  
Transport Strategy Programme Lead

**I approve the above recommendations:**

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Post:** Neil Fenton  
Assistant Director Parking, Street Management & Commercial, Resident Services

**Any declarations of interest (or exemptions granted):** None

**Any conflicts of interest:** None

**Any dispensations:** None