

St Cecilia's School Street Consultation – Report

1. Overview

The consultation on the proposed School Street at St Cecilia's Secondary School was held between 2 March and 29 March 2026 and received a total of 491 responses.

Respondents were predominantly local residents, with the majority not being parents or carers of pupils at the school. A smaller proportion of responses were received from parents/carers and other stakeholders.

2. Level of Support

There was a clear majority of opposition to the proposal:

- Around **83% of respondents did not support the scheme**
- Approximately **16% expressed some level of support**

Support varied significantly by respondent type:

- **Parents and carers were more likely to support** the scheme
- **Local residents were overwhelmingly opposed**

Opposition was particularly concentrated on streets most directly affected by the proposal, where levels of opposition exceeded 90% in some locations.

3. Geographic Distribution of Responses

Responses were concentrated in the immediate area surrounding the proposed School Street, particularly within SW18 postcodes.

The dataset shows that:

- Around **29% of respondents live within the proposed School Street zone**
- Approximately **70% live outside the zone**, many on adjacent or nearby streets

This distinction is important, as concerns raised in open-text responses often correlate with respondents' location relative to the scheme.

4. Reasons for Objection (Structured Responses)

From the structured (multiple-choice) responses, the most common concerns were:

- Increased congestion and longer journeys
- Increased pollution on nearby roads
- Reduced parking availability
- Restricted access for residents, deliveries, and visitors

While these options provide a useful overview, the open-text responses give significantly greater detail and depth.

5. Key Themes from Open-Text Responses

Analysis of open-text comments identified several consistent and recurring concerns. These themes are summarised below, alongside indicative frequencies taken from keyword analysis.

5.1 Safety Concerns (particularly on surrounding roads)

(approx. 189 references)

This was the most frequently raised issue.

Many respondents expressed concern that the scheme would increase safety risks on nearby streets rather than reduce overall risk.

Typical comments included:

- “Combemartin Road has a bend... this will be even more dangerous.”
- “Increased traffic will create new safety risks where none currently exist.”
- “Cars will get jammed, creating a safety hazard for pedestrians.”
- “More cars on neighbouring roads will make it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists.”

These responses indicate that while improving safety outside the school is supported in principle, many respondents believe the proposal would transfer risk elsewhere.

During the consultation, officers emphasised the existing concerns regarding road safety outside the school gate, which affect hundreds of pupils at present, including parking on School Keep Clear markings, obstructed sightlines, and unsafe manoeuvres. A School Street intervention was therefore designed specifically to address these hazards by reducing vehicle presence during peak times and creating a safer, more

predictable environment. Officers advised that any safety risks on the surrounding roads could be identified prior to implementation and, where necessary, appropriate mitigations introduced.

5.2 Suitability for a Secondary School

(approx. 135 references)

A significant number of respondents questioned whether a School Street is appropriate for a secondary school setting.

Common views included:

- “This is a secondary school, not a primary school.”
- “Children of this age should be making their way independently.”
- “Pupils are old enough to cross roads safely.”
- “School Streets are designed for primary schools.”

Many respondents noted that pupils already use public transport, walk, or cycle, and therefore questioned whether the proposal is proportionate or necessary.

During the consultation, officers stated that while School Streets are often associated with primary schools, secondary schools can also experience significant issues with pupil safety, traffic congestion and unsafe driver behaviour at the school gates.

Wandsworth Council, like many other councils across London, is seeking to make streets safer outside the school gate regardless of the age of the students. The Council implemented a first School Street scheme serving a secondary school last year outside Bolingbroke Academy, which is operating successfully.

5.3 Traffic Displacement onto Neighbouring Streets

(approx. 126 references)

A key concern raised throughout the consultation was that the proposal would displace, rather than reduce, traffic.

Examples include:

- “It will move traffic to neighbouring streets.”
- “You won’t be reducing the traffic, just placing the burden on other streets.”
- “All traffic will be routed through narrower residential roads.”

- “This will simply move the problem elsewhere.”
- “Parents will still drive, just stop outside the zone.”

This theme was particularly prominent among residents living on adjacent roads such as Combemartin Road, Skeena Hill and Girdwood Road.

During the consultation, officers confirmed that while there can be some initial displacement of vehicles when a School Street is first introduced, evidence from London and from our own borough indicates that this effect is typically temporary. Within a few months, traffic patterns tend to stabilise, and the wider area often benefits from a calmer environment overall, with reduced levels of through-traffic using local residential streets.

5.4 Impacts on Access (Residents, Visitors, Deliveries)

(approx. 121 references)

Many respondents highlighted concerns about the impact of the scheme on day-to-day access.

Typical issues raised included:

- “It is impossible to organise our lives around the proposed restrictions.”
- “How are deliveries, tradespeople and visitors supposed to access properties?”
- “This will make normal daily activities very difficult.”
- “Residents should not need permission to access their own homes.”

These concerns were particularly strong among residents within the proposed zone and immediately adjacent streets.

During the consultation, officers emphasised that deliveries are a topic frequently raised in similar schemes but have not presented operational issues for the hundreds of thousands of residents already living within School Street areas. Delivery drivers and couriers (e.g. Amazon, DPD) operate across more than 800 School Street zones in London and are generally familiar with complying with traffic restrictions in the same way as they would with “No Entry” signs or other standard road controls. Officers also highlighted that supermarket deliveries can typically be pre-booked for specific time slots, and residents are encouraged, where possible, to arrange deliveries outside the School Street operational hours.

5.5 Increased Congestion

(approx. 111 references)

Respondents frequently expressed concern that congestion would worsen overall.

Comments included:

- “The whole area will become gridlocked.”
- “Traffic already struggles – this will make it worse.”
- “Cars will be forced onto streets that cannot cope.”
- “This will create congestion on roads that already suffer from tailbacks.”

This concern was closely linked to the theme of traffic displacement.

During the consultation, officers confirmed that while there can be some initial increase in traffic volume on the streets around the restricted zone, data from similar schemes show this effect is usually temporary and within a few months, traffic patterns tend to stabilise, and the wider area often enjoys slightly reduced levels of through-traffic.

5.6 Perception that the Scheme is Unnecessary

(approx. 65 references)

A number of respondents felt that the proposal was not justified.

Examples include:

- “It is unnecessary and won’t change anything.”
- “There is no existing problem to fix.”
- “This is a solution in search of a problem.”
- “Traffic outside the school is not a problem currently.”
- “The current situation has been fine for many years.”

These responses often cited limited evidence of safety issues or significant congestion directly outside the school.

During the consultation, officers explained that while collision data shows eight incidents on streets around the school in the past three years, this excludes near misses and unreported incidents, meaning the actual level of risk is likely higher. The school has also reported two recent near misses, but as these are not formally recorded, the Council does not hold detailed information on them. Crucially, School Streets are not introduced solely in response to recorded collisions; where credible

concerns about children's safety are raised, officers have a duty to investigate and take preventative action to reduce risk before accidents occur.

6. Observations

Several clear patterns emerge from the consultation:

- Opposition is strongly geographically linked, with residents on surrounding streets expressing the greatest concern about impacts
- Traffic displacement is the dominant concern, underlying multiple themes
- Many respondents support the principle of improving safety, but do not believe the current proposal would achieve that aim
- Concerns about proportionality and suitability for a secondary school are widespread

7. Summary

The consultation indicates:

- A clear majority of respondents do not support the proposal, particularly among local residents
- Open-text responses reinforce that objections are primarily driven by:
 - Expected traffic displacement
 - Concerns about safety on neighbouring streets
 - Impacts on residents' daily lives
 - Questions about the necessity and appropriateness of the scheme

Overall, feedback suggests that many respondents view the proposal as likely to relocate issues rather than resolve them, and that further consideration may be required in relation to scheme design, scope, and supporting evidence.