

OFFICER DECISION

DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES

CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE STATUTORY TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION TO REVOKE TWO-WAY CYCLING IN GILSTON ROAD BETWEEN ITS JUNCTIONS WITH PRIORY WALK AND FULHAM ROAD

This report seeks the Interim Director of Transport and Regulatory Services' approval not to reverse the Council's 2022 decision to introduce two-way cycling in the southern part of Gilston Road

FOR DECISION

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Department for Transport's national guidance on cycle infrastructure design advises that there should be a general presumption in favour of cycling in both directions in one-way streets, unless there are safety, operational or cost reasons why it is not feasible. This report considers responses to a statutory consultation on a proposal to reverse the Council's 2022 decision to introduce two-way cycling on the southern part of Gilston Road.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Interim Director of Transport and Regulatory Services is recommended:
- i) **NOT** revoke that part of the Order, known as "Kensington and Chelsea (Prescribed Routes) (No.15) Traffic Order 2022" made in October 2022, allowing contraflow cycling on Gilston Road from Priory Walk to Fulham Road, and
 - ii) implement that Order by the erection of signs and relevant road markings.

3. REASON FOR DECISION

- 3.1 In early 2023, the Council conducted a statutory consultation on a proposal to revoke a 2022 traffic order allowing contraflow cycling on Gilston Road from Priory Walk to Fulham Road. The decision as to whether to proceed with, modify or abandon that proposal is delegated to the Director for Transport and Regulator Services.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Gilston Road operates one-way northbound for general traffic, but with contraflow cycling allowed from the Little Boltons to Priory Walk. In October 2022, following statutory consultation, the Council made a traffic order that would allow contraflow cycling on the remainder of Gilston Road, from Priory Walk to Fulham

Road. Whilst that order has been made, it has not yet been implemented on street.

- 4.2 After that decision, the Lead Member for Planning, Place and the Environment received representations from The Boltons Residents' Association about that order. As a result, the Lead Member asked officers to carry out the necessary process to revoke the new contraflow cycling order. Accordingly, in January and February 2023, the Council conducted a statutory consultation on a proposal to revoke that part of the 2022 traffic order that allows contraflow cycling on Gilston Road from Priory Walk to Fulham Road..

5. CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES

- 5.1 The Council received 51 representations objecting to the revocation and 38 in support, with a further response making comments without objecting or supporting. These are reproduced in full in Appendix 1 and are summarised thematically below with officer commentary.

Objection theme 1 - Rejection of the residents' association safety concerns

- 5.2 Several objectors to the revocation proposal noted that the specific details of the residents' association's safety concerns about two-way cycling in Gilston Road had not been made public, which made it impossible for them to consider those concerns. The objections to the original proposal to allow contraflow cycling were reported here: [consultationreport-june2022two-waycycling.pdf \(rbkc.gov.uk\)](https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/consultationreport-june2022two-waycycling.pdf)
- 5.3 Some objectors stated that the general principle of two-way cycling was safe, and some of them cited studies in support of this. Several objectors argued that allowing contraflow cycling on Gilston Road would be safer than preventing it, since this would allow people to avoid cycling on busier roads such as Drayton Gardens and Fulham Road
- 5.4 It is therefore appropriate to consider carefully the safety arguments against two-way cycling in Gilston Road that were made by supporters of the revocation order. Many stated simply that the proposal was dangerous without specifying reasons. However, others did explain their safety concerns and these are considered in paras 4.15 to 4.29.

Objection theme 2 – Two-way cycling is necessary.

- 5.5 Many of the objections to the revocation order were based on the view that allowing contraflow cycling all along Gilston Road would have great utility.
- 5.6 It is noted that several of the objectors to the revocation order appeared to think that the order would remove the long-standing contraflow lane between Tregunter Road and Priory Walk, as well as the contraflow facility from Priory Walk to Fulham Road that had been approved but not physically implemented in 2022.

Officers have taken this misunderstanding into account in analysing objectors' comments.

- 5.7 Several objectors commented that extending the existing contraflow section from Priory Walk to Fulham Road would fill a gap in a longer north-south route on quieter roads, from Kensington High Street to Chelsea, via The Boltons, with a connection straight across Fulham Road to Park Walk. Some objectors preferred this route to either the Drayton Gardens/Beaufort Street corridor to the east or Hollywood Road to the west, (noting that at the bottom of Hollywood Road cyclists must ride along part of the busy Fulham Road before they can continue south).
- 5.8 More generally, some objectors argued there was value in making the road network as permeable as possible for cycling, and that since many cycle trips are short, even small detours from the desire line of route were a disincentive to cycle.
- 5.9 Officers accept that Gilston Road provides a less-trafficked north-south route than Drayton Gardens and better onward connection to roads south of Fulham Road than Hollywood Road (which would require cyclists to ride approximately 200m on Fulham Road to reach Park Walk, and then make a difficult right turn). Officers have taken account of the fact that cyclists would be able to use an advisory eastbound cycle which is shortly to be installed for the majority of this 200m section. From the bottom of Gilston Road, Park Walk is a very short dog-leg, with cyclists turning right from the side road and immediately left from the main road – an easier manoeuvre.
- 5.10 Officers also accept that there is a general value in increasing the permeability of the network that is available to cycle on, in order to increase route choices and avoid detours as far as possible. As noted by one of the objectors, allowing cyclists a contraflow option does not compel them to take that option (albeit it would be reasonable for cyclists to conclude that the Council has assessed this option to be safe).

Objection theme 3 - The consultation and decision-making process

- 5.11 Some objectors raised concerns about the manner in which the proposal to revoke the order came about, after the Director of Transport and Regulatory Services had considered the responses to the original traffic order consultation and concluded that the contraflow order should be made. Specifically, it was argued that in proposing to revoke the order, the Council had placed greater weight on the opinions of the local residents' association than on its own technical expertise, or on the views of those who might use the contraflow facility.
- 5.12 Another objector felt that the Council should not consult people on traffic schemes, since they tended to draw comments only from those with strong views for or against them, which would not be representative of local opinion as a whole.
- 5.13 It is always open to people to ask the Council to amend or reverse a traffic management order that it has made. It is unusual but not unprecedented for the Council to be asked to revoke a made traffic order before it has been implemented. In the past, this has typically been by way of someone aggrieved

by the decision securing an injunction, but in this case, aligned to its commitment to listen to its residents, the Council has chosen to trial a less combative process.

- 5.14 It is accepted that traffic order consultations by their nature tend to elicit responses only from those with strong views. However, council officers must have regard to the Council's own commitment to listen to its residents and at the time of the consultation they had to have regard to Government guidance (notably "Traffic Management Act 2004: network management to support active travel", since withdrawn on 2 October 2023) to give people affected by its proposals the opportunity to comment on them. For minor local schemes such as the Gilston Road contraflow scheme, it is not realistic or cost-effective to conduct a representative survey of opinion.

Support Theme 1 – Safety

- 5.15 The main theme in expressions of support for revoking the two-way order was safety. This covered a variety of specific issues.

1a) Road is too narrow for vehicles to pass oncoming cyclists

- 5.16 The most relevant and recent technical guidance on road widths for two-way cycling schemes is contained in Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20. This guidance states that there should be a presumption of two-way cycling in one-way streets unless there are safety, operational or cost reasons that make this unfeasible.
- 5.17 Section 7.3.5 of LTN 1/20 recommends that on roads where there is parking on both sides, as there is on part of Gilston Road, the minimum width from kerb to kerb should be 6.6 metres. Given that most parking bays are up to 2m wide, this is consistent with its recommendation that roads with no parking should be at least 2.6 metres wide and roads with parking on one side of the road should be at least 4.6 metres wide. Gilston Road is 6.6m wide at its narrowest point so it meets this recommended minimum width.
- 5.18 This does not mean that officers would expect cyclists and vehicles to pass each other in the narrowest sections of Gilston Road. See 1b below.
- 5.19 It should be noted that the Council recently consulted on the removal of 15m of resident parking outside 5 Gilston Road, at the request of a local resident who was concerned about the difficulties that large vehicles have passing between parked cars. This proposal was not contested and has since been implemented. Whilst it was not proposed in connection with the cycling contraflow, it would increase the width of the road at its narrowest point, between Fulham Road and Milborne Grove.

1b) Drivers who may wait for vehicles to pass may not wait for cyclists

- 5.20 There are many two-way roads in London in which a motor vehicle cannot pass an oncoming cycle, thereby requiring one to give-way to the other. Some supporters of the revocation order believed that introducing this potential in

Gilston Road was an unacceptable risk. Under the Highway Code (Rule 155), if there is not enough space for two vehicles to pass through a given section of road simultaneously, drivers should pull into a passing place on the left or wait opposite a passing place on the right. While there are long continuous stretches of parking on the east side of the road (to the drivers' right), there are frequent gaps on the west side, large enough for drivers to pull into. Officers' visits to the road confirm that drivers and cyclists would have good forward visibility of each other on this straight road. The longest section of road with permitted parking on both sides is around 50m, from the Priory Walk junction to No.29 Gilston Road. Accordingly, officers advise that the inability for a driver to pass an oncoming cycle at parts of Gilston Road is not justification to revoke the two-way cycling traffic order.

1c) The road has a lot of fast traffic and heavy vehicles

- 5.21 Traffic surveys carried out in January 2020 in the section where two-way cycling is not allowed do not support this assertion. The 85th percentile speed on Gilston Road was 20mph, and there were just over 1200 vehicles between 7am and 7pm, (with 1550 over 24 hours). In the busiest hour (4pm to 5pm) the average number of vehicles was 136, or just over two per minute.
- 5.22 Unlike the section of Gilson Road in which cyclists can currently travel southbound using a contra-flow cycle lane, the 2022 scheme proposed simply allowing two-way cycling in a one-way road and did not include such a cycle lane. This point has been revisited during officers' consideration of the revocation proposal. To accommodate a marked cycle lane would require removing parking bays that, on weekday afternoons, when parking pressure was greatest, are 80% occupied. Officers consider that this is unnecessary given the traffic speeds and volumes on this road.
- 5.23 Several supporters of revocation believe that Gilston Road has a high volume of construction traffic and that this should preclude people cycling in both directions. While a collision with an HGV is more likely to result in a severe or fatal injury than a collision with a car, the risk of such a collision occurring is no greater. The nature of the road means that HGVs are likely to be travelling even more slowly than the low 85th percentile speed. Drivers of HGVs will have especially good onward visibility of cyclists.

1d) Danger to pedestrians including children and older people

- 5.24 While most of the safety-based comments in favour of revocation objections related to the safety of cyclists, some were of the opinion that allowing two-way cycling would compromise pedestrian safety, especially for children and older people. This concern was not always explained, although one supporter of revocation believed that cyclists ride faster than cars drive on this road and that this itself posed a risk. Officers advise that there is no published evidence to support this opinion.
- 5.25 In previous consultations about two-way cycling schemes, some people have explained that pedestrians would not expect to find cyclists travelling in the opposite direction to the one-way street. This would be an argument against the

principle of contraflow cycling, and is not accepted by the Council, which has installed many similar schemes, or the Government which has a presumption in favour of two-way cycling on one-way streets, as noted in 1.1 above. Appropriate signing and road markings should make it clear to road users that cyclists may travel in both directions, just as signing and road markings make it clear that the road is a one-way street. The argument that drivers might miss signs warning of oncoming cyclists is rejected, provided the signs comply with national guidance.

1e) Safety at junctions

- 5.26 It was argued that drivers turning right into Gilston Road from Milborne Grove would not be expecting or looking for vehicles approaching from their right. This issue should be addressed through clear signs advising drivers that cycles are exempt from the one-way restriction. The design for the contraflow proposal had an “except cycles” plate beneath the existing one-way arrow opposite the Milborne Grove junction. Such signs are commonplace and it is not accepted that this would complicate matters.
- 5.27 The same supporter of revocation was concerned that for drivers exiting Milborne Grove who did look to their right, their sightlines would not be good. There may be a case to convert the stretch of single yellow line on Gilston Road immediately north of the junction to double yellow lines, to ensure that there is never a vehicle parked in that location. But the current junction design is typical of streets in the borough, including two-way streets. Drivers leaving the side road should proceed cautiously in any case. It is likely that the majority of drivers in Milborne Grove will be locals or professional drivers (eg deliveries, taxis), as there is no obvious reason to use Milborne Grove as a through route.
- 5.28 Similar concerns were raised by some supporters of the revocation in respect of the Priory Walk junction. But while some objectors mistakenly believed the revocation order applied to the long-established contraflow cycle lane between Priory Walk and the Little Boltons, this was not the case. The collision record at Gilston Road/Priory Walk does not support the view that the existing cycle lane is dangerous.

1f) Sightlines from parked vehicles

- 5.29 It is the case that drivers of cars parked on the eastern side of Gilston Road, which would naturally be facing north, have poor visibility of oncoming vehicles. However, this hazard is also present in any two-way street where a vehicle is parked facing against the direction of traffic closest to it so is not a justification to prohibit people cycling in both directions.

Support theme 2 - Cyclist behaviour

- 5.30 A few comments in support of revoking the order complained about dangerous or inconsiderate riding behaviour by cyclists, or cycling uninsured, with one suggesting there should be no new cycling schemes until there is proper enforcement of traffic laws. There was a belief that allowing contraflow cycling effectively authorises anti-social behaviour. Contraflow cycling effectively

authorises one illegal act, namely contravening a no entry or one way restriction (on the basis that there is no need for these restrictions to apply to cycling trips) but it does not authorise anti-social behaviour by cyclists, such as riding on the pavement or ignoring red traffic signals. It is unlikely that people who are happy to commit these traffic offences are deterred from riding against the flow of a one-way street. For the same reason it is improbable that, as one objector felt, inviting people to cycle two-way in Gilston Road would increase traffic from criminals operating in the area.

Support theme 3 - Impact on drivers

5.31 A few supporters of revocation felt that allowing two-way cycling in one-way streets is confusing for drivers, creating more “hassle” for them. Some of this concern is linked to the need for additional signs, which are used to alert all road users to the possibility of cyclists riding against the one-way flow. These are well-established signs, authorised by Government for many years, and there is no reason to think that well-designed signing should confuse any drivers.

Support theme 4 - Two-way cycling scheme is unnecessary

5.32 A further reason advanced against the extension of the two-way cycling scheme in Gilston Road was that it would be unnecessary. This point was made in several of the submissions in support of revoking the two-way order, with respondents noting that people wishing to cycle south towards Gilston Road could use either Drayton Gardens or Hollywood Road.

5.33 The utility of the two-way cycling scheme is addressed in paragraphs 4.9 to 4.10.

Support theme 5 - Comparisons with Hollywood Road contraflow cycling scheme

5.34 A supporter of revocation asked why the Council considered the existing Hollywood Road contraflow cycling scheme to be safe, if it felt that the proposed contraflow cycling scheme on Gilston Road was unsafe. As was noted above, the Council has not stated that the Gilston Road scheme is unsafe. But in any case, it is still reasonable for the Council to conclude that two-way cycling could be safe on one street without being safe on every one-way street. The longstanding Hollywood Road contraflow has not been proposed for removal and this point has been included simply for completeness: it does not form part of officer judgements about the case for revoking the Gilston Road contraflow.

6. LEGAL COMMENTS

6.1 When making decisions the Council must have regard to its Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 as well as its obligations under the European Convention of Human Rights as it has effect under the Human Rights Act 1988. In particular, consideration has been given to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) which is a qualified right.

6.2 The Council has also had regard to its Network Management Duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 as well as to its duty to secure

the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic when exercising its functions contained in section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

- 6.3 As the original order which was made in October 2022 still remains in force, the Council will also need to ensure that Regulation 18 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 is adhered to by placing appropriate traffic signs on or near the road (in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016).
- 6.4 Any legal challenge to the Council's decision not to revoke the original order will need to be by way of judicial review proceedings (unlike a decision to revoke the order which would be by way of a statutory challenge).

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 Officers accept the arguments made by objectors to the revocation order, that road safety is not a compelling reason to justify revoking the contraflow order.
- 7.2 Officers agree that the contraflow facility would have value, so the argument that it is unnecessary is not a reasonable ground for revoking it.
- 7.3 The comments about the decision-making process are not relevant to the decision on whether to revoke the contraflow order.
- 7.4 On balance, having considered the arguments presented for and against contraflow cycling in Gilston Road, I conclude that there is NOT a sound case for revoking the order.

Contact officer:

Mark Chetwynd, Head of Transportation and Highways

Tel: 07773 767337 E-mail: mark.chetwynd@rbkc.gov.uk

DECLARATION

I have considered the above report and its appendix and agree to the recommendations.

Andrew Burton MEng CEng MICE
Interim Director of Transport & Regulatory Services

11th October 2023

Appendix 1: Responses received to proposal to revoke the two-way cycling scheme at Gilston Road

Objection One

I am emailing to object to the proposed revocation of the traffic order which would allow two-way cycling in Gilston Road.

I am objecting on the following grounds;

- The Council undertook the necessary work and consultation in line with its statutory requirements and made a decision to proceed with the recommendations of the council officers. To revoke a decision in response to further approaches by a residents association on the grounds of safety without any new relevant information and outside of this process would seem very unusual and contradicts established process for decision making.
- The council states it is responding to "representations from a residents' association about the safety of the proposal" however the proposal to allow two way cycling on this stretch of road was taken forward after the council's own professional team had carefully considered the merits of the proposal and findings of expert consultants. The council's report stated;

Prior to consultation, potential new two-way cycling schemes are investigated by consultants, including carrying out on-site investigations, traffic counts and video surveys to determine for each street the:

- *Traffic flow volumes (and types including lorries);*
- *Speed of vehicles;*
- *Number of cyclists using the street in each direction;*
- *Geometric layout, and;*
- *Collision data.*

Consideration of these data inform our assessment of whether two-way cycling is appropriate in each street, and if so, the level of supporting intervention required. Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 1's are also undertaken, with designs amended where any issues raised at the RSA1 are deemed applicable prior to consultation. The Council only takes forward schemes to consultation that it considers safe in a real-world setting. However, a RSA Stage 2 is also undertaken at detailed design stage (following consultation) to further pick up any concerns, and a RSA Stage 3 is undertaken once a scheme is implemented on-street to again identify any post-implementation issues.

Based on this, the opinion of a residents association whose views were presumably expressed in the original consultation and are documented can not overrule the professional view of expert traffic engineers. To do so would suggest the residents association has more expertise than consultants whose job it is to evaluate such schemes and have been brought in because they provide such expertise to inform council decision making.

- The current documentation does not state whether a RSA Stage 2 has been undertaken, it would seem inappropriate to propose revoking a planned traffic scheme based on non expert opinion.
- It would appear from council documentation and from the objectors themselves that two way cycling is already a common occurrence suggesting this route is a desired route for many people choosing to travel sustainably, therefore acknowledging the proposal is in line with other two way schemes in the borough and expert consultants deemed it safe "in real world setting" it is imperative for the council to improve safety of vulnerable road users reflecting the road user hierarchy of the revised highway code by formalising this and having appropriate signage to make drivers aware
- The council has stated in numerous policy documents that it wants to encourage more trips by cycling and is one of the borough's six transport objectives. Opening up new routes to assist cyclists such as introducing two-way cycling are one of the ways in which the council can increase the number of people cycling by improving connectivity and convenience. The council has stated that if more convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel encouraged to travel by bike and reduce their use of the private car, this is a key priority for the council and reflects wider London and national priorities. Gilston Road is evidently a popular route and would provide a convenient safer connectivity between an existing two way cycle section on Gilston Road and the Fulham Road and links well with Palk Walk which provides a continuous southbound route on a comparatively quiet road than Beaufort Street
- Maintaining the existing arrangement with the existing two way cycle route ending at the junction of Priory walk and routing cycle traffic Westbound forces cyclists to encounter more junctions which by their nature present increased risk to cyclists and routes cyclists onto busier roads to either join Fulham Road or continue Southbound.
- The council's original consultation canvassed a wide range of residents and there was a majority in favour of the proposed schemes with a significant number of responses in support applying to all planned schemes. After considering the responses received to the consultations, council officers recommended proceeding with introducing two-way cycling schemes in Gilston Road, Holland Street, Powis Terrace, Queens Gate Gardens and Victoria Grove and this recommendation was adopted by the council.

Objection Two

This is a useful route which I often need to use, and forcing people on bikes to make detours along the Fulham Road in that area which has a well documented appalling safety record is irresponsible madness.

Rather than pander to the fact-free prejudices of an entitled few, the lead member should do his job properly and enable people to travel by bike in this area rather than nonsense about making them detour along the currently highly hostile Fulham Road.

Objection Three

I am emailing to object to the proposed revocation of the traffic order which would allow two-way cycling in Gilston Road.

I am objecting on the following grounds;

This is the only safe option to go north south at that level. Alternatives are Earl's Court Road and Beaufort Street which are far too busy. Revoking it will only cause additional accidents.

Objection Four

I object to the proposed revocation of the order which introduced an exception for pedal cycles to part of the one-way system in Gilston Road (known as contraflow cycling).

I note the representations made by the unnamed residents' association on the safety of the proposal, but it is without merit or basis in fact.

Contraflow cycling in one-way streets is a long-tested international approach to cycling permeability, has been a feature of UK streets for over 40 years and is a common approach across London more specifically.

The practice was investigated by Ryley and Davies of the Transport Research Laboratory in Report 358 published in 1998:

<https://trl.co.uk/uploads/trl/documents/TRL358.pdf>

The executive summary reads;

"Contra-flow cycle schemes have been operating satisfactorily in the UK for many years. Most of these involve a mandatory contra-flow cycle lane and segregation at the entrance and exit. However, the number of contra-flow schemes installed has been quite limited, particularly when compared with certain other European countries. This appears to be due to the difficulties of implementing conventional contra-flow schemes, and a largely unfounded belief that contra-flow cycling is dangerous."

The findings were distilled into Traffic Advisory Leaflet 6/98 Contraflow Cycling:

<https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/sites/cycling-embassy.org.uk/files/documents/Contraflow%20Cycling%20TAL%206-98.pdf>

More recently, the advice has been updated and is contained within Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design, see paragraph 4.2.8 for two-way cycling as part of the core design principles and Section 6.4 more specifically.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120>

Research into the safety of contraflow cycling was published earlier this month by Tait et al in "Contraflows and cycling safety: Evidence from 22 years of data involving 508 one-way streets"

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000145752200330X>

The highlights of the findings are:

- Contraflow cycling does not increase cyclist crash or casualty rates.
- Crash rates are identical whether the cyclist is travelling with flow or contraflow.
- All UK one-way streets should be evaluated to allow contraflow cycling.
- Legislation mandating two-way cycling would improve cycling networks and routes.

There is no safety case for the order to be revoked and doing so against the weight of policy, design guidance and evidence would be perverse.

Objection Five

As a resident of the borough and a cyclist, I do not support the revocation of two-way cycling on Gilston Road. Two-way cycling is likely to happen here anyway, particularly now that cyclists are habituated to it, and it is likely to be considerably safer if the onus is on vehicle drivers to watch out for cyclists legally cycling in both directions.

Objection Six

I'm writing to object to the revocation order and strongly suggest a safe cycle lane in contra-flow to the traffic on Gilston Road. Cycling on this road is not made unsafe by allowing two-way cycling, but by not keeping cyclists travelling in the opposite direction to traffic separate from the that traffic, using a cycle lane that runs the full length of the road. Ideally the cycle lane would be physically separated but even a painted line on the road would do. This may require removing or moving some parking, which would not only reduce road clutter, it would also encourage more people to cycle and walk instead of driving, with all of the associated safety and environmental benefits for the local area.

Objection Seven

I am extremely concerned and disappointed that the council are thinking of revoking their plans to make Gilston road bidirectional for cyclists. RBKC already has significantly worse cycling infrastructure than other boroughs so making roads 2-way for cyclists is an essential step in the right direction for RBKC to make the borough safer for cycling. 2-way roads are much safer for cyclists as it allows them to avoid more dangerous busy main roads. Residents associations do not represent the majority of the borough and the council should not be caving in to their pressures. They should be putting the safety of cyclists first. I can say as a cyclist I find 2-way roads much safer for cycling.

Objection Eight

Wow. What a disaster of a borough this is for people cycling and sustainable transport.

Disappointing but completely expected.

Is there anything happening for safe segregated cycling on High Street Kensington or are you still happy with this polluted and dangerous street for people like me who choose to cycle it and worry each day that I'll get home safely. And of course, there will be many people who are put off even starting active travel because of your decisions.

Objection Nine

I am against the proposal to revoke the current two way scheme on the above road.

RBKC is currently decades behind on safe cycling provision and needs to improve the permeability of its infrastructure to bicycles, including development of safe spaces to cycle which are guarded from motorised vehicles. As such, any revocation should not be done unless the many deficiencies and hazards in the council's existing road network are rectified for cyclists.

Objection Ten

I hereby believe that the two way cycling exception is a positive move, and therefore should not be revoked.

It is important to have safe street where one can cycle and this would be one.

Objection Eleven

I'm writing to record my opposition to the Gilston Road revocation of cycling exemption.

It is well established that contraflow cycling is a safe and critical tool to encourage cycling in neighborhoods, to the great benefit of all residents. Revoking this exemption will force cyclists on longer, possibly more dangerous streets, and discourage cycling.

RBKC has London's worst cycling infrastructure, which discourages residents of all ages and abilities from cycling, and encourages many to drive instead. This comes at great cost to the RBKC community -- a space-inefficient, noisy, polluting (even for EVs) form of transportation that causes congestion and presents meaningful danger to RBKC residents, especially children and the elderly.

RBKC needs to adopt more forward-facing policies towards cycling, and it starts by not taking steps backwards on streets like Gilston.

I would further encourage RBKC to refrain from using these consultations that are largely unfit for purpose. A select minority, like myself, and likely including others who share opposing views, will battle at the margins to express points of view that are well established. The results are unlikely to be representative of the wish of the people. At best, you may get suggestions for slight amendments, which is really the only thing the Council should look for in these consultations.

The council should develop a holistic policy, implement it, and have it's residents vote for it on the basis of the results it delivers. Consultations are a horribly unrepresentative and illogical way to try and make decisions, and generally show a lack of leadership, in my opinion, when used as quasi-referenda.

Objection Twelve

Please do not revoke this very helpful measure for bicycles. It helps cyclists to stay off the much busier Drayton Gardens and is a real boon.

Objection Thirteen

I strongly strong object to the removal of the plan for increased cycling infrastructure by Gilston Road. This borough has continuously let itself and its consistent down by blocks plans for more public transport, less congestion and less inner city emissions. We are soon to be the laughing stock of London as others may it easy and safe to cycle with is good for health, emissions, is cheaper and is a more fun way to get around. The extent of this borough dependence on cars (and SUVs) in 2023 is disgraceful and I urge you to reconsider.

Objection Fourteen

As a visitor and former resident of the borough I would like to object to the revocation of this traffic order (Gilston Road) on the grounds it is irrational and ignores current best practice for the development of cycling.

Decades of research have shown contraflow cycling to be safe and effective. It is also likely to push cycling onto the more dangerous Fulham Road to get to the same destination.

Objection Fifteen

I am writing to object to the revocation of your previous order enabling contraflow cycling on Gilston Road.

You have not provided details of the nature of the objections made by residents on safety grounds, but I consider them unlikely to have any foundation in fact.

As a professional working in the City of London I was involved in consultations on extensive increases in the number of one-way streets in the city where contraflow cycling was to be permitted. There were objections “on safety grounds” there too, so the City highways department conducted a safety audit of all its existing cycle contraflows, which showed that the objections were unfounded - there was no statistically significant difference in accident rates on one way contraflows than on two way streets or cycling with-flow on one way streets. My understanding is that the additional 53 streets permitted for cycle contraflow after that consultation have also shown no significant augmentation of accidents involving cyclists compared with City streets in general.

Furthermore, the streets concerned were considerably narrower than Gilston Road.

Objection Sixteen

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the revocation of order allowing a contraflow cycle lane on Gilston Rd. I regularly cycle through that area of the borough during my commute. The contraflow cycle lanes allow cyclists to avoid cycling along Fulham Rd and Old Brompton Rd, both of which are very busy and very unpleasant for cycling.

Revocation of this order will inevitably force more cyclists to use these roads, which are completely lacking in any suitable cycle infrastructure – thereby putting more of them at risk.

Objection Seventeen

I understand from a notice that there is an intention to revoke the exception for cycles to use the first part of Gilston Road one-way-system .

I would strongly object to revoking this. I use this almost every day from my house in Tregunter Road through to Priory Walk and then through another exception for cycles route in Evelyn Gardens and then onto to the Fulham Road. I use this to take my 13 year old son to his school in Sloane Square via tandem. This avoids the congested and frankly dangerous for cyclists Fulham Road from the C&W hospital which is often blocked by delivery vans and lorries.

He will start to take his bicycle to school soon and this current cycle route is invaluable. As a resident and an avid bicycle user I am surprised that the Borough which has been criticised in the past for not providing more cycle routes and being generally cycle un-friendly borough is contemplating

closing this one rather than opening others (for instance going the other way on Tregunter Road towards Chelsea Harbour requires crossing the dangerous Redcliffe Gardens and then again the equally dangerous A3220).

I would have thought that in this climate of worries about pollution etc , the Borough would encouraging more bike use rather than less and I am curious to know your reasons.

Objection Eighteen

I am writing to object to the removal of two way cycling on Gilson Road.

When cycling from Kensington High Street area South, I quite often cycle round the Bolton's - it seems a natural route from one of the few crossing points for the A4. The Bolton's are also beautiful and it is a very attractive quiet route to cycle down the Bolton's, Gilston Road to Park Walk, which has an existing cycle lane on it.

Hollywood road is not quite as useful as it does not line up with my favourite crossings of the A4 at Marlow's road- A4 - Knaresborough Place and the crossing Grenville Place - Ashburn Places.

I prefer the Bolton's - Gilston Road – Park Walk because it has less traffic and fewer busses than Beaufort St.

However, your cycle lanes should be right next to the pavement, with the parked cars, if there is room for them, between the cycle lane and the traffic. This would be so much safer than the cycles being in the same section of road going south with one way vehicles going north.

Objection Nineteen

My Husband has told me of an intention to revoke the exception for cycles to use the first part of Gilston Road one-way-system .

He uses this path daily from our house in Tregunter Road through to Priory Walk and then through another exception for cycles route in Evelyn Gardens and then onto to the Fulham Road to avoid the congested Fulham Road from the which seems often blocked by delivery vans and lorries.

Mon son will also start use this route to bicycle to school in Sloane Sq. I would strongly object to this proposal and would have thought that the borough would be opening more cycle lanes to encourage cycling rather than closing them.

Objection Twenty

With respect to the above subject, I am in favour of retaining the traffic order which would allow two-way cycling in Gilston Road.

The decision to implement the proposed two-way cycling scheme in the section of Gilston Road between Priory Walk and Fulham Road was reached after a full consultation and presumably, at that time, passed all the hurdles required in terms of safety concerns. I fail to understand why the local residents' association has waited until now to raise objections, particularly any relating to safety. Without access to their reasoning, it is difficult to refute any suggestions of a lack of safety of such a scheme but I am certain that proper safety engineering would make the scheme as safe as is practicable. One

wonders whether it is the potential "inconvenience factor" of the extremely wealthy residents of the street that is the real reason for their objection. Clearly not many of them appear to be cyclists. Please retain the traffic order.

Objection Twenty-One

I live on Drayton Gardens and am a regular cyclist. The two-way flow on Gilston is a very useful way to get to the Fulham Road so I do not support the revocation. As a general point I believe more access for cyclists, provided it is safe, is a good thing.

Objection Twenty-Two

Contra-flow cycling is ubiquitous in the Netherlands, and research indicates no increase in accidents.

In the last 5 years, there have been zero pedestrian and cycle accidents in Gilston Road - there is therefore no evidence on which to base any change. Encouraging cycling by making easy routes available is vital in achieving increases in active travel use, and this objection comes from a residents' association dominated by car users, who seek to exclude other users from the streets. Please retain the current contraflow arrangement

Objection Twenty-Three

Can you confirm that the council will follow the views of residents re the road safety of a scheme over the recommendations of safety auditors, road safety experts and transport professionals? Will this be for all council schemes, both transport and other?

When taking the views of residents groups do you have and criteria you follow? i.e. how many residents responded to their stated view, whether any evidence is provided for these views (i.e. independent vote telling) or whether the stated opinion is just that on an individual person.

Will you be publishing the concerns of the residents association and any expert critic of the submission?

Is there any reason why you haven't done this to be included with this 'consultation'?

Objection Twenty-Four

I'm very much in support of allowing two-way cycling on Gliston Road. Two-way cycling works very well on other streets in the borough and encourages low-emissions, non-polluting and active travel with should be encouraged not discouraged.

Objection Twenty-Five

I refer to the letter you sent today about a consultation on revocation of the proposed two-way cycling scheme in Gilston Road.

As your letter outlines, the Council undertook and completed a public consultation, in which I participated. The Council then considered the feedback from this consultation from the public and made a decision to proceed with the proposal.

Your letter states that a residents' association subsequently made representations about the safety of the proposal. These representations—which seemingly were made outside the public consultation process—must have been so compelling that they caused the Council to reverse course because the Council is now consulting with the public on revoking its prior decision.

Because the Council appears to be placing such weight on the representations from this residents' association, the new public consultation process on revoking the Council's prior decision would only be effective if those representations were released publicly so that the public can consider and respond to these representations. Please point to where I can find these representations or, if these representations are not already public, please release them as promptly as possible. The public consultation should have sufficient time to consider these representations and respond to them. Without releasing these representations, the public consultation on revoking the Council's decision would be no different to the prior consultation for making the decision in the first place.

Your letter also refers to works on Hollywood Road as part of the reason for revoking the Council's prior decision. The public consultation would therefore also be enhanced if the public had the benefit of the details of these works as they also underpin the Council's change of course. Please point to where the public can find details of these works or, if they are not publicly available, release them promptly.

[Additional comments]

I object to the proposed revocation of the order introducing two-way cycling on Gilston Road.

My grounds for objection are:

1. **Revoking the order would sever a key quiet southward cycling route in the Borough.** Gilston Road is a critical link to create a north-south cycling route from Kensington Gardens to the River Thames and Battersea Bridge. The first part of this route is the Quietway from Kensington High Street to Harrington Gardens. Continuous southward cycling on quiet streets thereafter is possible on Bolton Gardens, The Boltons, Gilston Road, Park Walk and Milman's Street to the River Thames. Revoking the order destroys this direct route by removing Gilston Road with no viable alternative.

2. Drayton Gardens is not an alternative quiet southward cycling route. Drayton Gardens exits onto Beaufort Street and Fulham Road. Both are busy roads and bus routes (345 for Beaufort Street, 14, 211 and 414 for Fulham Road). Right turns are not permitted onto Fulham Road, so re-joining the quiet southward route would involve cycling on Beaufort Street for 220 metres, turning right at Chelsea Park Gardens and re-joining Park Walk. The diversion to Drayton Gardens to avoid Gilston Road adds 265 metres to southward journeys. The Boltons Association represented to the Council that first diversion on Priory Walk to Drayton Gardens would add 8 seconds to journeys. For a child cycling at 10 kilometres per hour, this additional 125 metres would add 45 seconds and a further 50 seconds on Chelsea Park Gardens to rejoin the quiet route. The Boltons Association representations misunderstand what the Priory Walk/Drayton Gardens scheme adds to the Borough's cycling network. Priory Walk-Drayton Gardens is a branch route to avoid Fulham Road if cycling southward to, say, the Picturehouse cinema, Sainsbury's or M&S. The existing Gilston Road-Priory Walk scheme is also part of a quiet west-east route avoiding Fulham Road and Old Brompton by linking Tregunter Road with Roland Gardens, Evelyn Gardens and other quiet routes. Revoking the order on the basis that Drayton Gardens is an alternative route to Gilston Road is misguided and defeats the Council's general policy objective.

3. Hollywood Road is also not an alternative quiet southward cycling route. A diversion along Tregunter Road adds 230 metres to a cyclist's journey. Hollywood Road terminates at Fulham Road with no direct route further southward. Fulham Road at this point is busy and has three bus routes (14, 211 and 414). The intersection of Hollywood Road and Fulham Road is particularly busy with traffic activity at the bus stop on the left and the pick-up zone for the hospital. The most likely further southward route is cycling east on Fulham Road to moderately quiet Limerston Street (120 metres) or quiet Park Walk (200 metres). The additional 430 metres for the diversion to Hollywood Road and re-joining at Park Walk to avoid Gilston Road would add at least 154 seconds to the journey of a child cycling at 10 kmh. All this would be solely to avoid Gilston Road. The claim that Hollywood Road is an alternative misunderstands how the Hollywood Road cycle lane fits into the Borough's network of cycling routes. Hollywood Road is a branch off north-south route for access to destinations such as the hospital, restaurants on Hollywood Road or Tesco. Revoking the order on the basis that Hollywood Road is an alternative route to Gilston Road is also misguided and defeats the Council's general policy objective.

4. Improvements to cycling on Hollywood Road cannot compensate for removing two-way cycling on Gilston Road. While I welcome any upgrade to improve cycling on Hollywood Road, Hollywood Road is not part of a continuous southward quiet route because it ends at Fulham Road. The irreplaceable value of the two-way scheme on Gilston Road is linking quiet routes coming feeding onto Tregunter Road and the Boltons to Park Walk.

5. Revoking the scheme would eliminate a direct quiet cycling route to destinations on Gilston Road. Gilston Road includes destinations in the community, such as the Budokwai or Bayley & Sage on the southern end of Gilston Road. Revoking the scheme would mean journeys to these destinations from the north would be less direct and less quiet for cyclists. Revoking the scheme would make cycling a less attractive transport option for present and future residents of Gilston Road itself.

6. Revoking the order would undermine School Travel Plans. Two-way cycling on Gilston Road is the safe travel route for children in the area to Bousfield Primary School. My son cycles to Bousfield Primary School on Gilston Road. He dislikes the diversion to Hollywood Road and navigating the

complex intersection with Fulham Road on his return journey. His natural inclination is to cycle all the way south on Gilston Road. The scheme creates a critical link for students who live north of Fulham Road to access Park Walk Primary School. The scheme also provides a direct route for children who live on Gilston Road itself.

7. The scheme is safe:

a. *The scheme itself is not inherently dangerous to cyclists.* Any risk to cyclists using the scheme is created by motorists driving their vehicles with insufficient care. Motorists have an inescapable duty to drive their vehicles safely so as not to endanger cyclists. This responsibility is reflected in Rule H1 of the Highway Code. Revoking the order on the basis that the scheme is unsafe legitimizes and gives priority to drivers creating unsafe conditions and infringing on the rights of cyclists to use the roads. The Council's stated policy is to create safe conditions for cycling, and revoking the scheme on safety grounds would be removing cyclists to make way for dangerous driving.

b. *The road width is sufficient.* A concern expressed by the Boltons Association is that the road is too narrow to accommodate both a cyclist and a large construction vehicle. This is not sufficient reason to revoke the scheme: many two-way driving streets are too narrow to accommodate vehicles in either direction, so there is a "negotiation" between them for one to pull so the other can pass. The same "negotiation" occurs between cyclists and on-coming vehicles. There are regular gaps on the western side of the Gilston Road for this, and on the eastern side south of Milborne Grove. An enhanced duty could be placed on drivers to slow or give way to on-coming cyclists by including priority signs in favour of southbound cyclists.

c. *I have tested the scheme and my experience is that it is safe.* Since the order was made, I have cycled southward on Gilston multiple times, at different times of the day and week. Most times I cycled from Priory Walk to Fulham Road without encountering any vehicles. Those times that I passed on-coming vehicles, I felt the vehicle was at a comfortable distance from me without either me or the vehicle having to pull in and the vehicle did not have to slow. There are ample passing points for larger vehicles. The narrowest part of Gilston Road is the southern end between Milbourne Grove and Fulham Road. On the eastern side (where cyclist heading south are more likely to be situated when passing vehicles) there are five parking spaces, then a gap, four parking spaces, then a gap, then the exit to Fulham Road. These nine parking spaces are visitor parking, so open parking spaces frequently provide more gaps. There are also two boxes of parking spaces for three cars at a time on the western side, with gaps in between. One of the parking boxes on the western side is currently under consideration for removal, which would create more space in this part of the street. Similar schemes have been implemented on narrow roads. There is ample room on Gilston Road for this scheme.

d. *The scheme is similar to many other contraflow or "except cycles" routes around the Borough that are considered safe.* The meeting transcript reveals the Boltons Association's representations identified no particular aspects of this scheme that were different from similar schemes across the Borough. Nor has the Council specified any particular features of the scheme that mean it would be less safe than similar schemes it has implemented.

e. *Greater weight should be placed on evidence-based conclusions of professionals that the scheme is safe.* The Council has engaged specialist consultants to analyse the safety of the scheme. This involved surveys and other information gathering. Greater weight should be given to the data-driven expertise of professionals in determining whether the scheme is safe than the anecdotal observations of residents.

8. Construction traffic for basement renovations is insufficient reason to revoke the scheme. The Boltons Association is concerned that the scheme will not be safe so long as there is heavy vehicles ingressing on Gilston Road for basement renovations.

a. *Rights of residents to use the roads should not be curtailed because other residents undertake basement renovations.* Our roads are a shared public space for all to enjoy. One resident's use of a road should not permanently deny another resident's use of the road. Revoking the order on the basis that the route is unsafe because of construction traffic means the Council is unfairly favouring residents who are already imposing on others by their construction project.

b. *Construction traffic has limited hours.* Construction traffic management plans limit the hours and days of the week that construction traffic is allowed for a project. Revoking the order would deny cyclists from use of the scheme at all hours on all days of the week. Even if it is accepted that construction traffic makes the scheme unsafe, revoking the scheme on the basis of construction traffic is not a proportionate response to the limited risks posed.

c. *Construction traffic is responsible for driving safely.* Repeating a point previously made, Rule H1 of the Highway Code places a heavy responsibility on these drivers:

“those in charge of vehicles that can cause the greatest harm in the event of a collision bear the greatest responsibility to take care and reduce the danger they pose to others. This principle applies most strongly to drivers of large goods and passenger vehicles ...”.

We should expect drivers of construction traffic to abide by the law. Cyclists should not have their rights to use Gilston Road revoked because drivers of construction vehicles might fail to fulfil their great responsibility to take care.

9. Allowing cyclists personal choice is a better approach to safety than revoking the scheme. Cyclists using the scheme exercise personal choice in doing so, and those cyclists who consider the scheme unsafe could choose not to use it. A cyclist's choice might vary based on conditions or his or her confidence levels. For example, some cyclists might feel uncomfortable using the scheme at 10 a.m. on a Tuesday if there is heavy construction traffic, yet feel comfortable using the scheme on a Sunday afternoon if there is comparatively lighter traffic. The scheme merely provides cyclists with an option of a route. Allowing cyclists' personal choice means those who would benefit from the scheme can do so at no cost to those who consider it unsafe. Revoking the scheme paternalistically denies all cyclists of the opportunity and benefits of the scheme at all times.

10. Greater weight should be placed on the views of residents who will be most affected by revocation of the scheme. The Boltons Association's claims of multiple residents supporting revocation of the order may simply reflect that such residents are unlikely to use the scheme anyway because cycling is not their primary mode of transport. The Boltons Association referred to the scheme in its representations to the Council as "totally unnecessary", "frankly bizarre", and "very arguably so unreasonable that no reasonable person could have come to that decision in the prevailing circumstances." No doubt, given the choice, many motorists would prefer not to have to deal with on-coming cyclists. (Equally likely, many cyclists would prefer not to have to deal with on-coming motorists.) Regular cyclists are a minority of road users, yet would be the largest beneficiaries of the scheme. While the Council should always consider representations made, the Council will not achieve its general policy objective of increasing cycling journeys if its decisions on cycling infrastructure are reduced to the popularity of the decision.

Objection Twenty-Six

I believe this should not be revoked, and I have cycled many one way roads with two-way cycling for many years both in the RBKC and other boroughs. I also say this not just as an active cyclist, but as a local car driver also - as long as the cycle lane/path is clearly visible, and road signs are clear, as a car driver I have no issue with these types of roads and usage by cyclists. These markings help cyclists use lower-traffic roads, and mean the overall road network is used more widely thus reducing overall congestion - especially for vulnerable cyclists. One great example is Phillimore Walk, where cyclists can avoid the Kensington High Street (where there is still, disgracefully, not cycle lane provision!) to make their way relatively safely up the high street in direction towards Westminster.

Objection Twenty-Seven

I would like to express my support for 2 way cycling on Gilston Road and to vehemently object to its potential revocation. I travel to the area regularly to visit family members who live locally. I walk and cycle through this road. Having 2 way cycling in this stretch goes a little way to improving bicycle safety in the borough which is unfortunately, severely lacking. I am now able to use this Road in both directions which keeps me from having to use main roads which have zero bicycle infrastructure. In my time using the area as a pedestrian I have not felt unsafe due to the changes in Gilston Road's use.

Objection Twenty-Eight

I do not support the proposal to remove the two-way cycling system in place on Gilston Road. I believe it is an important part of safer, greener infrastructure in the royal borough and its removal would be detrimental to the safety and well-being of the residents and those moving through the borough.

Objection Twenty-Nine

I understand that RBKC is considering revoking the order made in October 2022 which permits two-way cycling in Gilston Road and making it only one way again. I oppose this proposal. There are a number of streets in RBKC and other central London boroughs where there is two-way cycling and they are perfectly safe and beneficial for cyclists. First, they enable cyclists to keep off busy roads, thus cutting down on accidents; secondly, they therefore encourage cycling, which is an efficient and environmentally friendly means of travel in central London. Thirdly, there is no evidence that two way cycling is “unsafe” either in general, or in this road in particular. I have used the two -way cycle route and it is perfectly safe for cyclists. Provided that motor vehicles drive carefully and keep to the 20 mph limit there is no danger either to them or to cyclists. There is no danger to pedestrians as the two way cycling lanes are clearly marked so pedestrians know to look both ways if they cross the road. I strongly suspect that objections are coming from residents who have very large cars who just want more space for their large vehicles on this road, which is narrow towards the Fulham Road end, where they need to be careful – with or without cyclists.

Please do not revoke the order.

Objection Thirty

I am in favor of two-way cycling in Gilston Road. It’s better and safer that way.

Objection Thirty-One

Please protect 2 way cycling on Gilston Road, which I use safely every day.

Objection Thirty-Two

As a cycling resident of RBKC I am emailing to request, in the strongest terms, that you DO NOT revoke the two-way cycling on Gilston Road.

I have been cycling in the borough for over 20 years. I find that the Gilston road scheme of two-way cycling does make cycling safer as it helps me avoid busier roads. It works safely in other areas throughout London.

Objection Thirty-Three

I appreciate all the work done by all parties try make all of London traffic flow well, for safety , and for good air quality by promoting cycling and walking.

Please keep the cycling two way on Gilston Road. This is very important and positive change.

If there have been any issues, I am sure they can be resolved in other ways, by people just learning to share the roads and watch for all people, cars, pedestrians. Please do not simply do a blanket reverse what is an important and positive upgrade for local cycling residents of RBKC, of which I am one.

It is an important and I feel a more quiet, safer way for me to travel by cycle, instead of other busier and scarier roads. It is a needed throughfare, helping use quiet back streets not just for cars but for our those who need the roads also for their bicycles to get around safely and sensibly. This has been a very helpful improvement for all of London alternative and sustainable travel.

Please do not revoke the two way cycling on Gilston Road.

Objection Thirty-Four

I believe that you are about to reverse the two way cycling on Gilston Road shortly.

I cannot emphasise what a retrograde step this would be. I now regularly use Gilston Road in both directions I find it easy and safe to use (far safer than using the main road).

Can you reconsider this decision as it would put my (and other cyclists) life in more jeopardy than it is already?

Objection Thirty-Five

I would like to object to the revocation of two way cycling in Gilston Road. I work at the Institute of Cancer Research and am regularly at Chelsea & Westminster hospital, so frequently cycle in the area. I struggle to understand on what grounds the residents' association have to say that this is unsafe. It seems a completely innocuous scheme and is of clear benefit in linking up quiet roads and avoiding what is otherwise a hostile area for cyclists around Fulham Rd/Beaufort St. Unlike some contraflows in the borough, there is plenty of space here and no busy junctions along the route. In contrast, revoking the scheme will force cyclists to use other, busier roads in the area, and overall be less safe. I ask the council to reconsider this decision or at least provide a sound argument and objective safety evaluation to justify its removal.

Objection Thirty-Six

I object to the removal of the exception for pedal cycles to part of the one way system in Gilston Road.

I use this road on a daily basis to visit a resident that lives on Gilston Road. It means that I can avoid having to be close passed on Hollywood Road, Drayton Gardens and Fulham Road when I am travelling from the north.

Objection Thirty-Seven

I find 2 way cycling very beneficial in several of my daily journeys around the borough by e-bike; if it is revoked, I will either have to find less safe routes or use my car more often.

Objection Thirty-Eight

Please do not revoke the two-way cycling on Gilston Road.

Objection Thirty-Nine

May I urge the Council to leave in place the traffic order that permits cycling in both directions in Gilston Road?

The idea that the Hollywood Road route, useful though it is, may be seen as a substitute for all southbound cycle trips down Gilston Road, fails to understand aspects of bicycling behaviour. I regularly bike up and down Gilston Road to get between Elm Park Gardens, where I live, and Sainsbury's in the Cromwell Road. I would use the Hollywood Road alternative if I lived in, say, Edith Grove to the west. But not if I lived to the east - as I do.

Stopped from riding down Gilston Road on the way home (going southwards), do you imagine that I would detour to the west? We cyclists are too labour saving for that. I would divert eastwards to a Drayton Gardens route, except that traffic calming at its Fulham Road junction makes it difficult for riders to squeeze past vehicles. I would probably divert further eastwards along Priory Walk to Roland Gardens/Evelyn Gardens and turn south to get to the Fulham Road. But Gilston Road is a nice simple, straight, low traffic route.

If residents' associations are worried about risk of collisions in Gilston Road, please respond by insetting sinusoidal speed humps and even a speed table at the junction of Priory Walk and Gilston Road.....though I personally hate speed tables. They are a jolt.

I have lived for much of my life in the Borough and, as a boy, was in Drayton Gardens in 1945. I have lived in Elm Park Gardens since 1993. Between [REDACTED and REDACTED] I was a Councillor for [REDACTED] Ward. I have ridden a bike around London since 1965.

Objection Forty

To enable as many people to choose to cycle routes must be direct, safe and continuous. Across Europe one way streets to motor traffic are bi-directional for cycling. Camden Council are implementing such schemes very successfully. This makes it easier and safer for people to cycle. It is completely against

all logic to remove the right to cycle in both directions - and why is it that some residents consider it to be unsafe? Do they cycle? Have they vested interest to not allow this. It will really be a disgrace if the Council caves in to a minority number of people who know nothing about cycling. I hope you will hold firm on this and maintain the 2-way cycling - the alternative routes are dangerous and not continuous.

Objection Forty-One

I write today to express my interest in protecting Gilston Road as a two-way cycle road. As a resident who lived nearby on Cathcart Road for years, I frequently used Gilston Road as a North-South throughway. Any feedback that cyclists make it dangerous is unreasonable when compared to speed at which high power motor vehicles drive up Gilston Road into The Boltons.

With proper street markings for cycle traffic going against traffic, the proper can measures can be put into place to alert pedestrians or people getting into their car that cyclists will be in the area.

London is a city with a convoluted street layout and Gilston Road is an import straight North-South artery. Please do not exclude bikes and prioritize cars in this situation.

Objection Forty-Two

I am writing to ask you not to revoke 2way cycling on Gilston road, just off Fulham Road.

I have been using it since it was made two-way for cycling in October 2022. Two-way cycling on one-way roads has many benefits for cyclists including opening up the street network, providing more direct routes and providing safer alternatives to busy roads.

I believe the council are now considering revoking the two-way cycling on Gilston road and make it one-way again, in response to a Residents Association that complained about two-way cycling on the grounds of 'safety'.

There is no evidence that two-way cycling is unsafe; it actually makes cycling safer as busier roads can be avoided. It works safely in other European countries and there are now plenty of one-way roads that allow two-way cycling throughout London.

I would ask you to reconsider.

Objection Forty-Three

I understand that there is a proposal to remove the facility for two-way cycling on Gilston Road.

I am a frequent commuter cyclist and sports cyclist. I have often used the lane on Gilston road as part of a quiet route through the area, which allows me to stay off a big section of the much more dangerous Fulham Road. In particular, travelling west to east from the Brompton Road -> Little Boltons -> Tregunter Road -> Gilston Road -> Priory Walk -> and through to Evelyn Gardens. and then to Fulham Road. The road is usually very quiet and I do not understand how this particular one way system introduces any more danger than other two-way cycling schemes on one-way roads.

Objection Forty-Four

You asked for my views but does it matter? I sometimes don't think so.

You conducted a consultation so why now change it? Resident's association had an opportunity like everyone else to make their opinion known. The majority of respondents thought 2-way cycling was fine so why now the change in decision? What's the point of public consultations if after the fact an organisation can have a quiet word with a councillor and get it overturned?

I believe the two-way cycling proposal was fine -- cycling should be at the core of the council's sustainable traffic strategy.

I hope this attempt to revoke a cycling scheme isn't a cynical attempt by the council to yet again limit cycling on council roads. It all too familiar to what was done with the much needed cycle infrastructure on Kensington High Street.

Lastly, I hope that you will make these revocation representations public. They should not be summarized by the council in some back room, after which RBKC announces "we read what you had to say and well, here is what we decided". There's zero ability to scrutinize how the council arrives at conclusions.

Objection Forty-Five

I support Gilston Road 2 way cycling. It should not be revoked. I do not understand why a consultation's result has not be respected. It's like holding a second election because you didn't like the first result.

If revoked, I think you are duty bound to make the entire process public. Public consultations should not be revoked by private representations.

Objection Forty-Six

Regarding the above revocation.

Is there any evidence of "safety" issues arising from the implementation of the exemption?

As a council resident who has used the route in question on a bicycle, I object to the revocation of the order. Absent any statistical support for the alleged "safety issues" the exemption should remain in place - the default position of the Council should be to support active travel, not act against it. Hollywood Road is not supposed to be a replacement - it should be supplemental.

Objection Forty-Seven

It would be a shame not to allow two way cycling on Gilston Road as it would force cyclists to cycle on Fulham Road. I hope you do not revoke the current scheme.

Objection Forty-Eight

I would like to object to the proposed revocation of two-way cycling on Gilston Road. It is important that this road remains accessible for cyclists in both directions.

Many cycle trips are local, and so even small diversions create inconvenience that significantly increases the chance that they will be driven instead. Permeability at a local level is essential to encouraging cycling.

The council has chosen to make this road one way, and has done so not because there were too many cycles, but because there were too many cars. Therefore, controls to manage this should only apply to cars.

There is ample evidence that contraflow cycling on residential streets is safe, and indeed diverting cyclists onto other busier and longer routes is clearly much less safe.

Objection Forty-Nine

Allowing contraflow cycling on otherwise one-way streets is an important way to expand the available network to cyclists of all abilities, as well as provide safer, quieter routes for those less confident.

Enabling cycling is desirable as it has a number of benefits, including to the local economy, people's health and independence, and transport network effectiveness and efficiency. I urge you not to revoke the two-way cycling on Gilston Road.

Objection Fifty

I write to object to the revocation of this order.

I find it absolutely astonishing that something so obviously sensible as fixing the failure to allow two-way cycling could be in question. Phoney safety 'concerns' should be dismissed and every one-way street in the borough should have an exception for cycling so that it becomes standard. If tiny narrow lanes in the City of London can happily accommodate two-way cycling (they can) then it is absolutely fine on RBKC roads - not to mention all the guidance (for eg 7.3.4 of LTN1/20) and policy supposedly trying to make cycling easier.

Objection Fifty-One

Please rethink the removal of the two-way cycling route on Gilston road. I use this route regularly and appreciate it allowing me to not be on as busy a road when trying to get to and from the supermarket etc.

Two way cycling is not what makes this road unsafe. The thing that makes this road unsafe is black taxis barrelling down there at high speed, distracted drivers on mobile phones in oversized SUVs, and ubers doing unsignalled U turns.

Support in Full One

Please accept this email as formal endorsement of my support to revoking the Traffic Order for a two-way cycle lane in Gilston Road, SW10.

The arguments against the original Traffic Order are well rehearsed, so I will not repeat them here other than to say such a proposal was illogical in light of the overwhelming evidence of it being a serious danger to public safety, as described from the lived experience of actual residents.

I am most grateful to you and our councillors for having listened to our concerns; reviewed the decision, and offered now to revoke the Order. I do hope mine and other responders' emails similarly supporting revocation will now close this matter.

Support in Full Two

I have previously sent several emails to the Council, and our Councillors stating the numerous reasons why this proposal was totally unnecessary (given available alternatives) and potentially extremely dangerous.

I 100 % support the revocation order for this scheme and am glad RBKC has seen sense on this issue.

Support in Full Three [The Boltons Association]

I am writing to you in my capacity as Chairman of The Boltons Association, to support Michael's comments endorsing the revocation of the relevant Traffic Order. You will know that the Association has throughout been strongly opposed to the prospective two-way cycling in Gilston Road - on the grounds that such cycling would be dangerous for those concerned.

The alternative proposal that cyclists coming south through The Boltons, turn right into Tregunter Road and then left into the dedicated Hollywood Road contraflow cycleway is a far safer and more practical solution.

Support in Full Four

You will have seen the e-mail I sent a minute or two ago, in my capacity as Chairman of The Boltons Association.

I am now writing to you in my capacity as a resident of Gilston Road since 1995 - living at [Redacted].

During such period I have had ample opportunity to observe just how dangerous it is for cyclists to proceed south - against the one way system - down the major part of Gilston Road. The carriageway is narrow, and there is no 'run off' available as the east side of Gilston Road comprises Residents Parking Bays.

Accordingly, I endorse the Revocation Order, and support the proposal for cyclists coming south though The Boltons to turn right into Tregunter Road and then left into the Hollywood Road dedicated contra-flow cycle lane.

Support in Full Five

I am a home owner in RBKC at [Redacted].

It has come to my attention from a concerned neighbour that a plan to impose a two way cycling plan for Gilston Road

Please accept this email as formal notification of my support to revoke the Traffic Order, so that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road SW10 does not go ahead

On a separate note it would be nice, if as residents, we were aware of plans such as these before they are implemented ... I had no idea that this idea was even mooted let alone approved.

Support in Full Six

I would be grateful if you would please accept this email as formal notification of my support to revoke the Traffic Order covering Gilston Road, SW10. I feel very strongly that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road must not be allowed to go ahead.

Support in Full Seven

Please accept this email as formal notification of my support to revoke the Traffic Order, so that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road SW10 does not go ahead.

As a bicycle rider, and car driver the plan to create this a two way cycle route filled me with horror. It was scary enough on a bicycle riding up the first bit of Gilston Road with the oncoming traffic and the seemingly endless number of huge construction lorries coming straight for you. As a car driver it is equally unnerving with some cyclists under the firm impression they are immortal and aiming straight for you with no consideration of any risk of riding the wrong way on a one way street and that if there might be any danger it didn't apply to them and it is always the motorists fault.

Please don't allow this to happen. It seems that there is always new construction/refurbishment to many houses in Gilston Road and The Boltons and the frustrations the lorry drivers must feel seem to come out with a vengeance on this road especially.

Support in Full Eight

I would very much like to support the revocation of the dangerous plan to allow bicycles to ride against the traffic in Gilston Road. An accident waiting to happen. The sight lines are terrible, the traffic very heavy and the crossing at Priory Walk and egress onto Fulham Road absolutely suicidal. Hollywood Road is wider and much more suitable.

Support in Full Nine

Further to the consultation process concerning the matter of 'Gilston Road Revocation of Two Way Cycling', I would like to give my full and formal support to revoke the Traffic Order, in order to ensure that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road SW10 does not proceed.

Support in Full Ten

We are pleased to hear that you have seen the light of day and abandoned what was an extremely stupid and very dangerous proposal and totally unnecessary.

We wholly support the revocation order for the cycle scheme.

Support in Full Eleven

Please accept this email as formal notification of our support to revoke the Traffic Order, so that the plan to impose the two way cycle route along the full length of Gilston Road SW10 does not go ahead.

Support in Full Twelve

Please accept this e-mail as formal notification of my support to revoke the traffic order, so that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full length of Gilston Road, SW10, does not go ahead.

Support in Full Thirteen

I am in complete support of the revocation of the Traffic Order that would have turned Gilston Rd into a two-way cycle lane. This plan to create a two-way cycle lane is too dangerous and ill thought out.

Support in Full Fourteen

I understand that the Order creating this has been revoked. I totally agree with this action. It should never have happened.

I did object originally but was ignored. In my opinion the main reason for objecting to the original scheme was that Gilston Road is not wide enough for cycles to go against the flow of car etc traffic. At the Fulham Road end it is particularly narrow and lorries and SUVs frequently have trouble getting through. The main danger areas would be the corners of Milborne Grove and Priory Walk - motorists facing arrows to turn right would not expect to face cycles coming from the north, against them. If extra signs were put up this would only confuse things. It would be an accident waiting to happen.

[Additional comments]

I have already responded, but having received a further email about this I just want to confirm that I totally support the revocation of the order. It was ill conceived and would have created a most dangerous situation. Gilston Road is just not suitable for cycling south from Priory Walk to Fulham Road. It is too narrow, particularly at the Fulham Road end, where lorries and SUVs already struggle to get through. And the corners of Milborne Grove and Priory Walk, where cars turn right into Gilston road would be the most dangerous points. Those motorists could be confronted with cycles going the opposite way to the arrows they were following. And if the signs were amended it would only complicate matters.

So just to confirm, I support revocation, which would mean that cycling south in Gilston Road would be allowed only from The Bolton's to Priory Walk.

Support in Full Fifteen

I would like to express our support for the revocation of the cycle lane.

Gilston Road is not wide and very congested with construction lorries often getting stuck at the top when turning from Fulham road. There is no passing space for a bike. Already the construction lorries will often knock off a wing mirror of parked cars.

The right turn from Milborne grove into Gilston Road is also an accident waiting to happen as it is a completely blind turn.

Drivers only see the one way sign and are blind to bicycles coming against the direction of traffic.

Support in Full Sixteen

I support 100% the proposal on revocation of two-ways cycling in Gilston Road. It was a huge mistake in first place to grant it. It is about time that it gets revoked.

Support in Full Seventeen

I support the proposed revocation order.

Support in Full Eighteen

Thank you for sending out this information. I consider it a very wise decision to keep a one way traffic system on Gilston Road for motor traffic and cyclists.

Support in Full Nineteen

Thank you for asking for comments on the above and I hereby support the proposed revocation.

Support in Full Twenty

As per my original concerns sent to Councillor Bennett on 28/06/2022, please see below the reasons why I believe the two-way cycling scheme on Gilston Road should be revoked.

I feel that enabling two-way cycling would be extremely dangerous for the following reasons:

- a) Cars turning right out of Milborne Grove onto Gilston Road are looking to the left for oncoming cars, and not to the right for cyclists (I have seen several near misses) as cyclists do not slow down at this junction. Also, at this junction the view to the right for drivers looking north up Gilston Road is partially obscured by the parked cars on right side of Gilston Road.
- b) Cars parked on the east side of Gilston Road are unable to see cyclists coming down when they pull out (as driver steering wheel on the RHS). Again I have observed several near misses, as cyclists who are currently not observing the rules come down Gilston Road way too fast.

I am a big supporter of cycling in London, but I feel that on a one-way street such as Gilston Road, it would be extraordinarily dangerous for the reasons stated above, and implementing two-way cycling would sadly result in accidents. I have already observed several near misses on the corner of Milborne Grove and Gilston Road, mainly due to cyclists coming way too fast south down Gilston Road, and believe it is a matter of time before a serious accident occurs.

I believe the current set-up where cyclists coming down Gilston Road from the north are obliged to turn left onto Priory Walk, to be the safest option, and it is not necessary for them to continue all the way down. Albeit, there needs to be much more visible signage as this is frequently currently ignored by cyclists.

I hope you take my comments into serious consideration, and perhaps take the time to come to have a look as a driver to understand the situation, as I feel this will avoid a serious accident. If for any reason, the council chooses to go ahead with two-way cycling, at the bare minimum they should install traffic calming ramps to slow down cyclists.

Support in Full Twenty-One

I live at and own [Redacted].

I am strongly of the view that the part of Gilston Road that is south of Priory Walk is unsuitable for two way cycling.

That stretch gradually narrows as it gets closer to Fulham Road to the point that it is just too narrow to be suitable for cyclists to be allowed to cycle against the flow of cars. When there are cars parked on both sides, in the southern end, it is often that wide vehicles get stuck as it is. Also with cars turning into Gilston Road either from the West or East and suddenly confronting an oncoming bicycle at a stretch that is poorly lit, when it is dark and rainy, in addition to being too narrow, would increase the risk of accidents to an unacceptably high level. It would be easy for a motorist to miss a sign warning of oncoming cyclists when they are turning and looking out for pedestrians and being distracted by the Bailey & Sage shop windows.

Support in Full Twenty-Two

This is to notify my support for revoking the Traffic Order that would impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road SW10. I frequently see near-misses between cars and pedestrians caused by cyclists ignoring the current rules and it would be totally wrong to create even more danger to pedestrians and hassle for drivers by effectively authorising anti-social behaviour.

I thank you for consulting residents.

Support in Full Twenty-Three

Please accept this email as formal notification of my support to revoke the Traffic Order, so that the plan to impose the dangerous two-way cycle route along the full-length of Gilston Road SW10 DOES NOT go ahead.

Support in Full Twenty-Four

I completely share the residents association comments and objections. It is dangerous, for the cyclists, to transform London's roads in a gigantic cycling track. If such trucks must be provided it can only be done through the creation of safe, isolated and dedicated ways. Also, by direct observation of the cyclist's often reckless way of driving in the traffic, I strongly believe they should be submitted to the same rules that regulate car driving.

Support in Full Twenty-Five

I agree with the plan to revoke the two way cycling scheme. And to return Gilston Road to a one-way northbound road.

For the record I find the two way cycling schemes horrendous. They are SO dangerous. They should all be abolished. Hollywood Rd. Whitehead Grove are both particularly unpleasant.

Support in Full Twenty-Six

To whom it may concern

In my opinion the main reason for objecting to this scheme is that Gilston Road is not wide enough for cycles going against the car traffic flow, particularly with cars parked on both sides of the road.

At the Fulham Road end it is particularly narrow and lorries and SUVs frequently have trouble getting through.

I think that the main danger areas would be cars turning right into Gilston Road from Milborne Grove and Priory Walk. Motorists facing arrows to the right do not expect to face cycles coming in the opposite direction.

In short it is a badly thought-out scheme and is an accident waiting to happen. It should be rejected.

Support in Full Twenty-Seven

I write in support of the revocation of the two way cycling scheme in Gilston Road.

The proposed two way cycle scheme is a danger to pedestrians and especially children with more cyclists using this road.

Cyclists travel at a greater speed than motor vehicles on this road and therefore there is a danger of accidents to pedestrians including children and the elderly. I do not believe there is any need for a two way cycle lane.

Support in Full Twenty-Eight

I support the proposed revocation.

Support in Full Twenty-Nine

Forgive me for asking but have any of you experienced traffic in Calcutta or New Delhi please? If not you very soon will as the chaos is slowly being sanctioned here in UK.

As far as we are aware Cyclists are not required to have mandatory Driving Licences, or Insurance, and despite relentless negative accusations directed towards car drivers, if you keep your eyes open you will witness plenty of ignorant and foolhardy behaviour from cyclists of all ages (sometimes two or three abreast) every single day. These ideas are mostly theoretical, in practice they do not improve the situation.

Add to this the misery of masses electric bikes and scooters, often with two passengers whizzing on and off pavements far faster than any car can speed in town, regularly looking at their mobile phones or swaying from side to side to ear-phone music, discarding those scooters on any pavement when finished with them, this is all adding up to a recipe for complete disaster.

If the Public Transport Services were more widespread, more convenient, more frequent and more cost effective maybe more people would use them, but deliberately making life more dangerous for cars and vans by introducing so many constantly changing rules and regulations that drivers spend more time reading road signs than concentrating on the road ahead...well it really is NOT a good way forward

[Additional comments]

In plain English, PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW two-way cycling in one-way streets.

Support in Full Thirty

I totally agree that the two cycle scheme for Gilston Road is unsafe and unworkable. The pavement are already narrow and there is resident and general parking on both sides of the road.

I'm 100% in favour for cleaner air and cycles, but they may have to make a short detour via Priory Walk and Drayton Gardens.

Support in Full Thirty-One

I wish to object that Gilston Road will allow two way cycling. It is a recipe for disaster allowing both ways for cyclists and vehicles one way. Gilston Road is busy with residents and vans/lorries. The road is not wide enough for safety for two way cyclists.

Support in Full Thirty-Two

It is puzzling to me as a resident that you continue to increase cycling privileges without enforcing any infractions of the Highway Code against cyclists. There have been numerous times on Gilston Road prior to the two way scheme when cyclists have been illegally riding and almost collided with our children. Additionally, cyclists constantly ride through red signals on the pedestrian crossing nearby on Fulham Road, again I have almost been hit many times while legally crossing. While cycling is a good thing generally, before the council opens up further routes, it needs to have REAL ENFORCEMENT.

Additionally, the council MUST stop bicycle sharing where the bicycles are left in our pavements with no respect to other residents.

Support in Full Thirty-Three

Gilston Road is already an a very narrow road itself with a lot of activity. It is often the sight of criminal activity including car theft and home burglaries. Inviting two way cycling traffic is not only dangerous for the cyclists AND pedestrians crossing the road, but it also increases foot and cycling traffic from the criminals that operate in the area. I'm firmly against the two-way cycling scheme in Gilston Road.

Support in Full Thirty-Four

That particular stretch of road is just too narrow for two way cycle lanes and car /van / lorry traffic. I sometimes ride a bike as well as use a car.

Support in Full Thirty-Five

I have previously sent several emails to the Council, and our Councillors stating the numerous reasons why this proposal was totally unnecessary (given available alternatives) and potentially extremely dangerous. I 100 % support the revocation order for this scheme and am glad RBKC has seen sense on this issue.

Support in Full Thirty-Six

Hello as a resident of Redcliffe Road who frequently turns into Hollywood Road at the junction where the cycle lane runs counter to the Hollywood Road one way traffic, I would like to ask on what basis you consider that cycle lane any safer than the one that has been rejected for safety reasons on Gilston Road?

Per my submission to the last consultation the cycle lane on Hollywood Road is rarely used anyway - it's hard to understand any basis for its further expansion, and the Gilston Road outcome is equally applicable to the Hollywood Road situation in my view.

[Additional comments]

To answer your question my comment should be taken as support for the revocation of the proposed Gilston Road two way scheme.

Since, if I recall correctly, the consultation also referenced possible expansion of the existing Hollywood Road two way as an alternative to the proposed Gilston Road scheme, I feel my comment on the safety of the existing Hollywood two way is also, by logical extension, a safety issue of equal merit, and that revocation of the Hollywood two-way should also be considered in the same context.

As a driver and a cyclist I find navigating the Hollywood two way hazardous and avoid using it unless necessary. It is not frequently used by cyclists; in any event, both cyclists and scooter riders continue to do whatever they wish on roads and pavements. While this situation should be better regulated, in my immediate experience painting patterns and signs on roads like Hollywood to encourage two way traffic on a one-way is an irrelevance in the real world and works only to create safety risks.

The intention of the two way scheme may be noble in it's objective of encouraging cycling, which I support. However, I continue to believe the two-way schemes introduced on one-way motor vehicle streets emerge from a similar school of thought as "smart motorways". While you may be labouring under restrictions in the creativity you can apply to encourage cycling and reduce pollution, both of which I applaud, if this comes with an excessive risk to personal safety, which I believe it does, these two way schemes risk a similar outcome to "smart motorways". The law of unintended consequences sadly prevails, and the risk of possible injury or actual death (in the case of smart motorways) is unacceptable in my view.

Even if outside the scope of your immediate consultation, therefore, the issue remains of practical importance to residents of the immediate area and my question still stands: if the Gilston Road two way scheme is to be revoked on safety grounds, what possible justification is there for the maintenance or expansion of the Hollywood two way scheme?

Support in Full Thirty-Seven

Thank you very much for correcting a irrational and dangerous road plan.
it is a one way road and people especially kids are only pay attention to the traffic flow and are nor not aware of incoming cycles from the wrong direction. This will cause accidents and put vulnerable people in danger.

Support in Full Thirty-Eight

Thank you for your letter re the above and inviting me to give my views. I believe the proposal is at the very least potentially dangerous. There have been an overwhelming number of changes to road use recently and it is difficult for both cars and pedestrians to keep ahead of them.

Comments (neither in support or objection)

Comment One

I find it somewhat bizarre after a first consultation and decision that another is needed, but setting that aside, it is very clear that there is not enough road space at the Fulham Road end of Gilston Road to accommodate two way traffic thanks to parked cars on both sides of the road. Sometimes there is barely room to drive a car, let alone space for a bike to pass a car.

According to your comments to the previous consultation, you and your consultants do not seem to think that road width matters, that traffic is so low that it will never be an issue. From personal experience of using two other bicycle lanes on a daily basis – Cale Street by Royal Brompton Hospital and Elystan Place from the junction with Sprimont Place to Chelsea Green – the lack of road space is very dangerous. I have already brought the latter to the council's attention on more than one occasion. I would expect at least once a week to be forced to take evasive action when drivers do not look or do not want to stop. When a road is not wide enough for traffic to pass in both directions comfortably and there are insufficient road markings, it is an accident waiting to happen.

I am mystified that your consultants do not understand this; perhaps they do not ride bicycles at rush hour or school pick up times.

If the council is unwilling to make sufficient space, in the case of Gilston Road by removing the parking spaces on one side or other (as is the situation at the other end where it joins the Boltons), you are simply creating a road hazard, which is of no benefit to anyone, cyclist or motorist. The same applies to the other two roads which I mentioned above, neither of which is properly marked to delineate space between road users.

[Additional comments]

Thank you for your response. Where proper allowance is made for bicycles and cars to pass safely, I am in favour. If, however, you are going to leave the parking on both sides of Gilston Road as is, there is not enough room for everyone to use the road safely and I am not in favour.

To make my point, please see the picture below taken at about 3:45 this afternoon. Per my email yesterday, here is a very good example of what happens. The driver claimed that she did not see any signs showing the bike lane and simply did not stop at the junction to look.

Judging by the comments to points raised I the initial consultation, it seems that neither the council nor the consultants have any regard for how people tend to drive. It's further evidence that the signage at this junction is inadequate and the road layout is dangerous , as I previously pointed out to the council. Since drivers are not capable of giving way, perhaps a Stop sign might help.

[Additional comments]

I thought it might encourage your analysis to see a few more examples of where badly marked roads with one way systems cause problems. In the last few days, I have variously faced drivers going down the one way roads backwards, pulling out without looking, driving down the middle without leaving enough space and cutting straight in front, not to mention opening doors without checking. The motorcyclist road straight across the road marking and is seemingly oblivious of the fact that there is a bicycle lane; this is perhaps unsurprising since there are no other markings on the corner where the roads come together.

These occur daily, but where roads are not properly signposted and marked such as in Chelsea Green and I suspect may be the case with Gilston Road, they are dangerous. I trust that better road markings and signage will be put in place in Chelsea Green, so that cyclists and potentially other drivers do not have to play 'guess which driver will cut straight across or pull out from a side road'.

Your driving consultants make pretty heroic assumptions about driving standards.