

OFFICER DECISION
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAY AND REGULATORY SERVICES
5 AUGUST 2026
CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE PROPOSAL TO
INTRODUCE TWO-WAY CYCLING IN THE SECTION OF CATHCART ROAD
BETWEEN REDCLIFFE GARDENS AND HOLLYWOOD ROAD

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 In June and July 2026, the Council consulted on a proposal to introduce two-way cycling in the section of Cathcart Road between Redcliffe Gardens and Hollywood Road. This report considers the responses received and makes a recommendation on how to proceed.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 After considering the responses received to the consultation, officers recommend that the Director for Highway and Regulatory Services proceed with introducing two-way cycling in the section of Cathcart Road between Redcliffe Gardens and Hollywood Road, with one proposed amendment as set out in 5.3.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 From 1 June to 12 July 2026, the Council undertook consultation on introducing two-way cycling in the section of Cathcart Road between Redcliffe Gardens and Hollywood Road. The proposals can be viewed [here](#). Introducing two-way cycling here would mean that the entire length of Cathcart Road could be used in both directions for cyclists, providing cyclists a quieter east-west route between Ifield Road to the west and Hollywood Road to the east where they can then travel north or south on the existing two-way cycling scheme in Hollywood Road, avoiding heavily trafficked Fulham Road, Redcliffe Gardens and Finborough Road. A total of 1,645 households living near the proposal received letters sign-posting them to the consultation hosted on the Council's Consultation and Engagement hub. Twenty-five responses were received; 14 objections, 10 in support and one support in part. The responses received are set out in full in Appendix 1.

4. CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 4.1 Table 1 illustrates the objections and support in part comments raised by respondents and officer responses. All responses received (including comments supporting the proposals) are listed in full in Appendix 1. Officers have not responded to out-of-scope comments.

Table 1: Officers' responses to issues raised by respondents

Reason for objection	Officer response
Seven respondents made reference to cyclists having no consideration for other road users, footway riding or otherwise contravening traffic laws.	Whilst some people who cycle may exhibit abusive behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to provide facilities for cycling. Decisions on highway improvements, whether in support of cycling, walking or driving, are not based on value judgements.
Six respondents believed two-way cycling posed a safety risk to cyclists as well as other road users, with one stating there was too much traffic and some stating two-way cycling is already happening and posed a risk.	In 2009, the Council was the first borough to pilot two-way cycling in one-way streets. We began a trial allowing cyclists to travel against the flow in five one-way streets. Officers carefully monitored road safety statistics in the participating one-way streets and found that two-way cycling in one-way roads poses no more of a danger to motorists, pedestrians or cyclists than traditional contra flow schemes (with segregated cycle lanes for cyclists). There is therefore no evidence to support the idea that two-way cycling in one-way streets is inherently dangerous in principle. However, each two-way cycling scheme needs to be examined on its merits. If some cyclists are already opting to use this section of Cathcart Road in both directions, this suggests it is a route that cyclists find useful. Formalising the arrangement by way of signs and road markings will ensure that all road users are aware that two-way cycling is in place and to expect cyclists riding against the one-way restriction for motor traffic.
Three respondents said that the road is too narrow to accommodate two-way cycling. One of these respondents appeared to believe the proposals applied to a two-way section of Cathcart Road saying that the road was not wide enough to accommodate a cycle lane because some people who have large 4 x 4 vehicles cause other vehicles travelling in the opposite direction to have to stop.	The width of a street is not the sole consideration when proposing two-way cycling schemes. Sightlines, the availability of passing places, and volumes of traffic are all relevant factors. In this particular case however, this section of Cathcart Road has ample width to accommodate both a 3.5m traffic lane and 1.8m painted cycle lane – both over minimum recommended widths.

	The proposals do not apply to sections of Cathcart Road which already enable two-way traffic for all vehicles.
Two respondents said the scheme was a waste of money when funding is scarce.	The scheme would be funded by Transport for London funding. These funds are ring-fenced for projects considered key to help promote cycling and secure associated improvements to health, congestion and air quality. The Council considers that two-way cycling schemes provide significant benefits at relatively little cost, allowing cyclists to take direct routes and avoid long detours or busy roads.
Two respondents said the scheme was unnecessary as transiting between Hollywood Road and Redcliffe [Gardens] is already possible using several side streets including Cathcart Road, Tregunter Road and Fawcett Street. One of these respondents said that most cyclists prefer to use faster main roads.	The aim of two-way cycling schemes is to make cycling trips more convenient, providing direct routes where it is possible to do so, so that cyclists do not need to deviate via side streets or busier roads. Cyclists who prefer to use main roads can continue to do so. Those that prefer quieter routes would be able to travel east fully along Cathcart Road.
One respondent said the scheme would add extra congestion to the area.	It is unclear how the proposals would contribute to congestion. This section of Cathcart Road has ample width to accommodate both a 3.5m traffic lane and 1.8m painted cycle lane – both over minimum recommended widths.
One respondent said that the scheme would involve loss of parking.	No changes to parking or loading provision are proposed.
One respondent said designated cycle lanes are ignored by cyclists.	Cyclists are not obliged under law to use cycle lanes where present. However, in this case, where the cycle lane enables two-way cycling rather than running in the same direction as general traffic, it is expected that the proposed cycle lane will be well-used.
One respondent said the proposed cycle lane would lead to a dangerous junction when cyclists turn right, straight into oncoming traffic from Hollywood Road.	As in the proposed design, the contra-flow cycle lane would be clearly marked with a give-way line where Cathcart Road meets Hollywood Road.

One respondent stated that no reason or evidence is given to explain how the scheme will advance the Council's objective of encouraging pedal cycle use.	The consultation text reads “enabling more cycling is one of the Council's borough transport objectives. Making cycle trips safer and more convenient is one way to encourage cycling and thereby improve our air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and work towards our goal for the borough to be carbon neutral by 2040.” Provision of two-way cycling can open up more direct routes for cyclists and sometimes provide a quieter alternative to busier roads. Introducing two-way cycling here would mean that the entire length of Cathcart Road could be used in both directions for cyclists, providing cyclists a quieter east-west route between Ifield Road to the west and Hollywood Road to the east where they can then travel north or south on the existing two-way cycling scheme in Hollywood Road, avoiding heavily trafficked Fulham Road, Redcliffe Gardens and Finborough Road.
---	---

5. COMMENTS FROM THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE (MPS)

- 5.1 The MPS objects to the mandatory cycle lane aspect of the scheme which would require vehicles to contravene the solid white line in order to utilise the parking provision. The MPS state this has significant potential for conflict and collisions between vehicles and cyclists and also constitutes an offence under Sect 36 of the Road Traffic Act.
- 5.2 The MPS asked that splitter islands be considered at both ends of this road to protect cyclists from vehicles entering and emerging at its junctions with Redcliffe Gardens and Hollywood Road.
- 5.3 Officers agree that the proposals should be amended to incorporate an advisory rather than mandatory cycle lane.
- 5.4 The Road Safety Audit Stage 1 also suggested splitter islands could be considered. Officers do not believe splitter islands are required at either end of the proposals. The width of the road is deemed insufficient to facilitate islands and LTN 1/20 states that islands should be provided where volumes exceed 1000 vehicles per day which data suggests is not the case here. Further, as cyclists have right of way turning in from the Redcliffe Gardens junction and do not need to wait to give way as they might at other junctions, officers believe a splitter island is not necessary. At the Hollywood Road end, as motor traffic can

only travel northbound (i.e. cannot turn right into Cathcart Road) officers judge that a splitter island has no real benefit that would justify the cost required to implement it.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The scheme is expected to cost £55k to implement. These funds have been secured from Transport for London as part of the Council's Local Implementation Plan allocation.

Appendix 1 – Responses received to the Cathcart Road Two-way Cycling Proposal

Objection

1	There is already too many problems with cyclist, cycling in the wrong direction against traffic in an unsafe manner. Introducing these changes will make things less safe for both drivers and cyclist. Please do not introduce this residents do not want this
2	1 - Well the road is already narrow enough. 2 - cyclist do obey traffic rules 3 - There are a lot of older people in this area that walk and cross the streets 4 - There is bad enough having a cycle port at the end of Redcliffe Place 5 - Cyclists just leave the bikes where ever they feel like it 6 - Surely they are other more worthwhile project that K&C can spend council tax money on 7 - Car parking spaces are getting harder to find in the small roads.
3	Cyclists are everywhere. They do not respect and code of conduct. They think they are above the law. Until there are proper registration plates on bikes, I will oppose every improvement from them. They put everyone at risk, themselves included
4	I wholeheartedly oppose this proposal as this will add extra congestion to the area. There is already enough cycle routes in play within this area and the added additional one will provide no benefit to cyclists or carbon neutral intentions. Cathcart road is naturally a small road and it would be more beneficial to implement this cycle route on Finborough or Ifeld road instead. We witness cyclists daily using the pavement as a way to get down the one way section in the opposite direction whilst brushing pedestrians and oncoming traffic. Cathcart road is a quiet road and from personal observation, it is extremely rare to see any kind of footfall /cyclists or vehicles using it. I would kindly suggest this needs to be reviewed .
5	I strongly believe this is not a good idea. Cyclists need to travel in the same direction as the cars. Having cyclists go against traffic is simply accident-prone and will put everyone at risk. Keeping them aligned to traffic flow is the only safe option
6	Two way cycle traffic is already occurring on Cathcart Road despite current one way system. I find it dangerous when cyclists ride against the car traffic direction. To me, it's a collision accident likely to happen with cyclists in more vulnerable position.
7	1) Your proposed cycle lane will lead to a dangerous junction when e-bikes turn right, straight into oncoming traffic from Hollywood rd. Hollywood rd is a busy one way rd with a contra flow cycle lane. Having a further separate cycle lane turn right from Oakfield directly into head on traffic is a recipe for disaster. This is especially so when it is dark and cyclists are wearing dark clothes and possibly do not stop at the giveaway sign. 2. Hollywood rd has been ruined by the huge number of e-bikes strewn all over the pavements and roads. These abandoned bikes are a daily obstacle for pedestrians and drivers. This issue should be addressed and resolved before you contribute further to the problem by adding further unnecessary cycle lanes.
8	You have given no reasons and supported it with no evidence to explain how the scheme will advance the Council's objective of encouraging pedal cycle use in this area. So we are left to guess. I live in the next street and am a cyclist and I cannot see how it would improve cycling in the area. Specifically, transiting between Hollywood Rd and Redcliffe Road is already possible using several side streets including Cathcart Rd and Fawcett St which already enable cyclists to get off the main road if they wish to. Most cyclist prefer to use the faster main roads in any event. The cost benefit analysis is not made out.

9	You suggest cycles on one way road is “successful”. Totally disagree. We have enough delivery cyclists travelling at speed on pavements and down roads. It’s very dangerous and scary when cyclists travelling down one way roads the other way. I have nearly been run over by cyclists or have almost hit a cyclist as I didn’t expect them to appear silently at speed from nowhere when I am driving in my local area. Cyclists should not be allowed to cycle the OTHER WAY to traffic. It’s unnecessary. It’s dangerous. I live on Cathcart Rd and am totally opposed to this.
10	If heading east cyclists can easily cycle down Fawcett Street which is partially one way they can also cycle down Tregunter Road. So this seems a complete waste of money considering the junction of Redcliffe Gardens and Cathcart Road we recently. We have more problems with drivers driving down the street the wrong way from Redcliffe Gardens and turning right at Oakfield street as drivers fail to read signs. Better the money spend on a camera fining drivers for careless driving.
11	it's a small street feeding into a major artery road on top which could cause a lot of accidents as cyclists come down the road for the restaurants and pubs on Hollywood rd. prone to accidents.
12	Having experienced this arrangement in Hollywood Road, I am strongly against the extreme danger posed by two way cycling schemes. I have had numerous near misses, as have the other residents, emerging from Hollywood Mews by car when suddenly a cyclist appears from behind the Hollywood Arms crowds outside and Brinkleys pavement tables - there are 9 houses in The Mews and this is an accident waiting to happen. Another issue in this vicinity is with the section of Cathcart Road at the point where it joins Redcliffe Road leading down to the Fulham Road. It is currently two way traffic with cars parked on either side and therefore there is only single vehicle space in centre of road, so reversing from either person coming from Fulham Road or from top end in order to find a gap to pass is a nightmare. It should be one way from top end to Fulham road especially as parallel Hollywood Rd is one way from Fulham Rd. I think it is wishful thinking to believe that these two-way cycling schemes will encourage more people to use bicycles - they are incredibly dangerous and any resident in the location you are considering I am sure is likely to share this opinion .
13	Cathcart Road is not wide enough for this scheme - not least because those people who have very large 4 x 4 vehicles steam down the middle of the road and those of us travelling in the opposite direction have to stop otherwise we might be hit - if the road is narrowed for the benefit of cyclists there is bound to be trouble. Some designated cycle lanes are totally ignored by pedal cyclists - who on the whole ignore the highway code - so why should they be given special treatment? E-bike riders are also a total menace and as I have said before - all those other than the Santander bikes should be disallowed. There are three controlled pedestrian crossings near me when all the lights turn to red so that all traffic stops BUT NOT THE CYCLISTS - they weave in and out of people crossing the road. They ignore no right or no left hand turns. One of these is at the junction where Bousfield school is - even parents with the bikes that have the box carrying children in front ignore the lights.
14	There is too much traffic for there to safely be two-way cycling lanes on any part of Cathcart Road. Rental bikes in general have been an utter nuisance since their inception and still block pavements even with new council measures in place. At my end of Cathcart Road adding cycling lanes is a total impossibility as traffic filters from what is basically a single lane road at Redcliffe Road - this should be made one-way flowing from Fulham Road. This is more concerning than adding unnecessary bicycle lanes at the other end of Cathcart Road. Cars are

	constantly driving head-on towards each other on the narrow Redcliffe Road, causing jams, air pollution and excess noise. There are already huge amounts vehicles speeding (above 20 mph) along Cathcart Road between Redcliffe Road and Hollywood Road.
--	--

Support

1	Excellent idea.
2	I think cycling should be introduced to more areas of London, especially in our neighbourhood as the car traffic is already extremely congested. I am all for this cycling lane being introduced as the road is already not made for 2 way traffic and cars get stuck here anyways. Thank you.
3	As long as entrance is through redcliffe gardens and exit is through finborough road. Thank you.
4	any improvment for cycling in London helps to improve the general traffic consitions
5	[No comment supplied]
6	This is the right thing to do and really not controversial so should just be implemented. Slightly surprising a consultation is conducted for such scheme when significantly heavier and/or more impactful scheme re: car traffic are not subject to consultations.
7	[No comment supplied]
8	Improved permeability of cycling on side streets helpful to enable more cycle journeys Consideration should be given to crossing Redcliffe Gardens and need for a crossing to help prioritise east west cycle crossing where traffic can be busy and congested Yellow box on junction area
9	Does this cycle lane extend to from Hollywood Road to Ifield road? Are you or have you provide(d) a bike crossing next to the pedestrian crossing? I know there is such a crossing on redcliffe gardens already but maybe it is one road further to the south? It would be good to have a seamless connection that goes horizontally across as driving on redcliffe gardens is perilous
10	[No comment supplied]

Support in part

1	The contraflow lane should remain perpendicular to Hollywood Road rather than deviate North as this makes to harder to position to turn right from it. If possible the pavement should be built out (to match the width of the car parking).
---	--