

`Traffic Management Order Proposed Changes

Proposal Reference Number – Kensington Park Road One-way
Ward – Colville
Street – Kensington Park Road
Title of Proposal – Kensington Park Road: Partial One-way Traffic
Proposed new restriction Provision of One-Way Except Cycles in Part of Kensington Park Road
The general effect of the Order would be to: (a) remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent; and (b) provide a south-eastbound one-way system applying to all vehicles except pedal cycles in Kensington Park Road, between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent, with an accompanying ‘compulsory right turn except cycles’ from Kensington Park Mews into Kensington Park Road.
Reason for change
The Order is required to improve permeability of the road network, whilst maintaining a safe environment for pedestrians and pedal cycles, with the removal of a pedestrian and cycle zone and provision of a south-eastbound one-way system applying to all vehicles except pedal cycles in Kensington Park Road, between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent.
Lead Officer – Caroline Dubarbier, cycling@rbkc.gov.uk
Closing date for statutory consultation for proposal 24 April 2024
Number of objections received
19 objections, 3 emails of support
Reasons for objections
The text of all objections, support, and comments are attached as Appendix One to this report.
Officers’ response to objections
1. Increases access for drivers/introduce ‘rat-running’/Prioritising drivers over healthy streets.
The proposal would increase the volume of southbound vehicles, whereas currently, vehicles can use the section of road southbound for ‘access’ only i.e. to access homes or businesses, or to park to visit shops etc. The Council is not making permeability for cars a priority given that we are not reopening it in both directions.
2. Increases road danger for people walking, particularly children – including those attending the nursery - and cyclists
In the years that this section of road was able to be used in both directions by all vehicles (prior to introduction of the pedestrian and cycle zone in 2021), records between 2017 and 2019 (2020 excluded as traffic levels unusual during the Covid19 pandemic) show collisions resulting in one serious and two slight injuries on this section of Kensington Park Road. In the years 2021 to 2023 – post-implementation of the pedestrian and cycle zone - three collisions (all resulting in slight injuries) were reported. This is a concern for a road that is signed as “access only” and indicates that the 2021 restrictions may not have markedly reduced road danger. The quality of the data held about these collisions is not sufficient to form a view about whether any of the collisions in 2021-2023 involved vehicles breaching the existing traffic restrictions (be that northbound (no entry except cycles) or southbound (access only except cycles). Anecdotally, officers have been told that some people have felt that such breaches have led to increased danger, because other road users have assumed that there would be no or very little motor traffic in the road. Enforcing

a traffic order that prohibits motor vehicles but which, as in this case, has an exemption for access requires considerable resource to check that a vehicle that has entered the road has not done so to “access”. Those resources are not currently available.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment

An Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken and found impact of the proposals on protected groups to be neutral (enclosed as Appendix B)

4. Climate and air quality

It is accepted that the proposal will very locally increase vehicle emissions of local pollutants in this section of Kensington Park Road, by nature of the road being used by more vehicles than presently. It is unlikely to increase the total volume of carbon dioxide emissions or particulates, given that most vehicle trips would otherwise use alternative parallel roads, possibly involving longer overall routes.

5. The Council should make it easier to walk and cycle

The proposals retain the existing provision for cycling in both directions. In October/November 2023, the Council consulted on wider streetscape proposals for this section of Kensington Park Road (<https://consult.rbkc.gov.uk/communities/kensington-park-road/>) which include proposals to widen footways and introduce greening to improve the environment for pedestrians.

6. Proposals are inappropriate for outdoor dining/detrimental to local businesses

In October/November 2023, the Council consulted on wider streetscape proposals for this section of Kensington Park Road (<https://consult.rbkc.gov.uk/communities/kensington-park-road/>) which include proposals to widen footways and introduce greening to improve the street and improve the experience for outdoor diners. Some diners may prefer the road to remain virtually traffic free but there are successful al fresco areas all over the borough that sit adjacent to live traffic. The proposals are not likely to affect businesses in the proposal area, or the proposed streetscape scheme in terms of ‘access’ for customers as access (parking to visit shops or restaurants) is already permitted in a southbound direction – and the streetscape proposals account for this. Permitting drivers to pass through (as opposed to stop in) the street would not restrict this. We do not know which, if any, businesses responded to this consultation, although in response to the autumn 2023 streetscape consultation, some respondents said that the restrictions meant potential customers would not drive past their business.

7. Congestion/traffic displacement/re-open the road to two-way traffic

Some objectors believe the proposal would have the potential to increase traffic, for example at the junction with Elgin Crescent, which is also a bus route, by nature of the road being used by more vehicles than presently. Whilst the proposal would result in more traffic using this section of road, the risk of that impacting on bus journey times is considered minimal – particularly as vehicles exiting KPR onto Elgin Crescent would have to give way to the busier western part of Elgin, so would not affect the buses.

Two objectors felt the road should be re-opened for traffic in both directions. One felt this was needed to allow taxis access in both directions, and one felt more broadly that the present and proposed situation leads to more traffic on surrounding roads by needing to take alternative routes. By introducing one-way traffic southbound, this would reduce the number of vehicles required to take alternative routes. Reintroducing full bidirectional access would require a full redesign of the Streetscape scheme and rule out widening pavements to the degree illustrated in the streetscape proposals. This would apply even if northbound traffic was restricted to, say, just taxis.

8. The Council should not consult on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on recently for which no decision has been made/consultation process is confusing for residents/consultation fatigue

At the time that the streetscape proposals were published for consultation there was no proposal to change the existing traffic restrictions. However, decision-makers are entitled to propose new changes at any time (the reasons for this change at this time are expanded upon in the next response). As this new proposal would affect (albeit minimally) the design of the streetscape proposals, the Council has opted to delay the key decision on those proposals until a decision is made on whether to change the traffic restrictions. The proposed new restriction is set out clearly in the consultation documents and the proposal was promoted via notices in local press, notices on street, and local residents' associations and community groups were contacted by email.

The Council has no evidence of consultation fatigue relating to this section of Kensington Park Road. The number of responses received to both this proposal, and the streetscape proposals, suggest that residents are engaged in local decision making.

9. Why has the Council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network?/Lack of evidence to support the change

In October 2023 the UK Government published its Plan for Drivers, challenging local authorities to improve the experience of driving and services provided for motorists. With no evidence of the 2021 traffic restrictions resulting in a safer road environment (see response to question 2) the Council considers that the current pedestrian and cycle zone (except for access) is disproportionately restrictive and that a safe and attractive environment for pedestrians, cyclists, shoppers and diners would remain if the permeability of the local road network were improved.

10. Proposal is contrary to the Local Plan and the Council's aim to be a safer, greener and fairer borough.

This traffic management proposal does not relate to development and is not subject to regulation under the planning regime. Accordingly, the development management policies within the Council's Local Plan are not directly relevant to consideration of traffic management proposals. Notwithstanding this, this traffic management proposal is not, in the Council's view, contrary to Local Plan objectives, including those cited.

The Council accepts that the proposal does not contribute to becoming a greener and safer borough, but is fairer in its balance between transport modes and traffic distribution between streets. The "except access" exemption from traffic restrictions has proven to be confusing to many motorists. There has been some correspondence from residents since the pedestrian and cycle zone was introduced making this assertion. The proposed one-way restriction would be easier to understand and should contribute towards improving the legibility of the street network for motorists.

11. Cost of proposals, including lost enforcement revenue

The cost involved in these proposals are minimal as it involves the cost of the traffic order and replacement signage (estimated at less than £2k in total). The Council already enforces the existing 'no-entry' at the Elgin Crescent end of the street with CCTV cameras and there is no intention to introduce new camera enforcement. The Council does not make decisions on traffic restrictions based on income that it could receive by enforcing them. Civil Enforcement Officers ('traffic wardens') cannot enforce moving traffic contraventions.

12. The proposal will introduce the potential for two lanes of traffic both going one-way south, causing confusion when entering the mini-roundabout (at the junction with Elgin Crescent)

One-way streets, with a No Entry restriction at one end, are commonplace in London. There is no reason to think that drivers would enter Kensington Park Road on their offside lane. This section of Kensington Park Road already ensures drivers are only able to use one traffic lane southbound by blocking off the former northbound lane with large box planters. The associated streetscape proposals would formalise this by widening footways and reducing the carriageway space to one lane (and contra-flow cycle lane).

Ward councillor response

Cllr Dahabo Isse

Thank you for the update and I support the proposal of one-way traffic. I thank the officers and lead member the fantastic initiative of work improving our Portobello Market at the Kensington Park Road.

Cllr Toby Benton

I am, on balance, supportive of the proposal, with the caveat that I ultimately am in agreement with Objection 18—the block should be reopened to normal traffic. Consultation can be a misleading gauge of local interests and priorities, and I agree with the objection that the proximity of these consultations is confusing. Having engaged with stakeholders on the ground, I believe the officers' responses to the various objections to be correct.

There is reference made to the scheme's effect on businesses, which can be a misleading rubric. Restaurants have often very different needs to retailers, benefits to one in many cases disadvantaging the other. Outdoor dining is, as mentioned, commonplace on streets with two-way traffic, and I believe restaurants are well-placed to weather the perhaps less picturesque environment that comes with car traffic. Since the COVID-19 lockdowns, these restaurants have bounced back quite convincingly; in contrast, retailers—most of which are run by locally-based owners and management—have struggled considerably in recent years, thanks largely to greatly reduced car access and the obscuring of shop fronts by the large footprints of outdoor dining areas.

I acknowledge the effect that reopening the street to two-way traffic would have on planned works, but given the strength of feeling I have encountered, my hope is that this possibility can be revisited soon.

Decision

Whilst the grounds for some of the objections are valid, before deciding to consult on the changes the Council accepted that re-opening the road for southbound vehicles would cause greater traffic flows when it proposed the change. This will have some negative consequences for noise and to a lesser extent, for air quality in this particular section of road. The Council does not accept that the consequences of this would be so great as to make it unreasonable to reopen the road to southbound traffic – there are many one-way streets in the borough, including those with shops and restaurants with outdoor dining facilities.

With that in mind, officers recommend that the proposal to:

(a) remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent; and

(b) provide a south-eastbound one-way system applying to all vehicles except pedal cycles in Kensington Park Road, between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent, with an accompanying 'compulsory right turn except cycles' from Kensington Park Mews into Kensington Park Road

should proceed as proposed.

I agree to this report's recommendations.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Burton". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Andrew Burton – Director for Transportation and Regulatory Services

Date of Decision 30 May 2024

Appendix 1: Responses received during the consultation (the street where the respondent lives is noted where known)

Objection One

Sadly, this scheme seems to be a driver priority scheme, which increases road danger for people walking, particularly children. Rather than increasing permeability, it reduces permeability for people walking.

Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been done for this proposed scheme, with a particular assessment on how it impacts children (who can't drive) and vulnerable adults?

Objection Two

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed changes to Kensington Park Road as a regular patron of the shops and businesses in Notting Hill.

The consultation claims that the changes are "required" to improve the permeability of the road network by reopening a pedestrian and cyclist only zone to private vehicles. This is not true; these changes are not required at all. Permeability for private vehicles should not be the priority when designing a healthy, liveable, and vibrant neighbourhood. The pedestrian and cycling zone should be maintained and vehicle access should continue to be restricted.

London is facing a climate and toxic air crisis. RBKC is the most dangerous borough in inner London for cyclists and has the least protected cycle lanes of any inner London borough. It is crucial that RBKC embrace more measures to deprioritise private vehicle use and make it easier and safer to walk and cycle, not even easier to drive. These proposed changes should not be implemented.

Objection Three

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system.

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space akin to similar schemes south of the borough.

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Reversing the vision of the trialled scheme and ignoring its clear success is not compatible with RBKC's stated aim to be a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Objection Four

I live on Ladbroke Grove and I am against the plan to get rid of the pedestrian zone and replace it with a one way road. I like how it is better now and would like to see it improved with less cars not more cars passing through making it more noisy, less safe and not as nice place to be.

Objection Five

I'd like to object to the proposed changes on Kensington Park Road.

I'd like to object on the grounds that this will add nuisance (noise, pollution, vehicular safety risks) to the Notting Hill neighbourhood by encouraging more and faster through-traffic through the area.

This will be to the detriment of families living in the area, visitors to the area, and the businesses that serve both.

Please maintain the existing scheme, and expand schemes like it to more areas in RBKC

I live in neighbouring Hyde Park Estate and frequently visit Notting Hill. I would do so less if roads like Kensington Park Road are made busier, louder, and more dangerous by encouraging more through traffic.

Objection Six

As a fairly local resident and frequent visitor to this part of Kensington Park Road, I am bemused by this proposal. This part of the road is a really pleasant place for outdoor dining, walking and visiting the shops and restaurants. The only improvement would be making it even clearer that motor traffic is not permitted because some vehicles seem to attempt to drive down there and perhaps

some “greening” - ie introducing planters etc. Increasing permeability of motor traffic would be a step backwards and a great shame.

Objection Seven

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

1. Will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall
4. Reduces the road safety on what would be a busy rat run for both pedestrians and cyclists
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways"
7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction on Ladbroke Grove and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street. It is disappointing RBKC and the council leadership team seem incapable of delivering on an ambitious vision for making North Kensington Streets "beautiful" as they seem all too willing to do in South Kensington. I would ask why does the Lead member for planning, place and environment feel North Kensington residents don't need amazing greener and safer streets but "increased permeability of the road network" yet in South Kensington says “we want to create amazing spaces across the borough. Bute Street is already a bustling corner of South Kensington and with new trees, new paving and a new layout we can make it a must visit destination....this transformation will make the road greener and safer for residents and visitors alike”.

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not

compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. On what basis has the council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network, is this based on a robust local traffic survey or is this simply on the whim of the lead member for planning? In 2021 RBKC stated as part of the original proposal this would be monitored yet no data or evidence has been provided in this new consultation to suggest this new proposal has been informed by any data, traffic surveys, or modelling including for nearby bus routes. This consultation lacks any evidence base and the proposal to water down an already compromised vision is contrary to the Councils stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Furthermore, consulting on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on a few months ago for which no report or decision has been made seems completely disjointed. At the very least it is confusing to most people and compromises the basis of consultation. There is already consultation fatigue amongst residents, shown by the low numbers that actually engage with RBKC consultations, people are busy and when the council makes this even more convoluted it dilutes the integrity of the consultation process. RBKC lacks a plan for North Kensington and seems incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Eight

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

1. It will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created.
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside.
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall.
4. Reduces the road safety on what would be a busy rat run for both pedestrians and cyclists.
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians.
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways".

7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes.

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction on Ladbrooke Grove and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street.

It is disappointing RBKC and the council leadership team seem incapable of delivering on an ambitious vision for making North Kensington Streets "beautiful" as they seem all too willing to do in South Kensington.

I would ask why does the Lead member for planning, place and environment feel North Kensington residents don't need amazing greener and safer streets but "increased permeability of the road network" yet in South Kensington says "we want to create amazing spaces across the borough. Bute Street is already a bustling corner of South Kensington and with new trees, new paving and a new layout we can make it a must visit destination....this transformation will make the road greener and safer for residents and visitors alike".

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. On what basis has the council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network, is this based on a robust local traffic survey or is this simply on the whim of the lead member for planning? In 2021 RBKC stated as part of the original proposal this would be monitored yet no data or evidence has been provided in this new consultation to suggest this new proposal has been informed by any data, traffic surveys, or modelling including for nearby bus routes. This consultation lacks any evidence base and the proposal to water down an already compromised vision is contrary to the Councils stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Furthermore, consulting on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on a few months ago for which no report or decision has been made seems completely disjointed. At the very least it is confusing to most people and compromises the basis of consultation. There is already consultation fatigue amongst residents, shown by the low numbers that actually engage with RBKC consultations, people are busy and when the council makes this even more convoluted it dilutes the integrity of the consultation process. RBKC lacks a plan for North Kensington and seems incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Nine (Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea)

Please accept this email as the formal response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea to the current consultation to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea have sought the views and opinions of members as well as making members aware of the Council consultation. Reflecting the views of our members we object to the proposals on the following grounds:

1. Will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside by reintroducing rat running to this quiet backstreet
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall
4. Reduces the road safety for pedestrians and cyclists on what would be a busy rat run
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways"
7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes
8. This stretch of road has a nursery school and reintroducing through traffic is counter to stated policy and objectives of the council to enable more active travel and reduce car journeys
9. The council consulted on a clear scheme at the end of last year which included the pedestrian and cycle zone as part of the proposal designs:
 - There has been no report or update from this, this approach is completely disjointed and we note those who previously inputted into the consultation last year were not given the courtesy of being updated there was such a consultation seeking to amend a core principle of the proposed scheme consulted on last year
 - The councils consultation process is confusing and unclear thus compromising the principles of consultation
 - Consultation fatigue is well evidenced by the disappointingly low engagement levels with RBKC consultations, people are busy and repeating consultations about the same thing dilutes the integrity of the consultation process
10. There is no data of evidence basis to help inform this consultation, it appears to be an arbitrary change to a proposal that has been consulted yet there has been no published outcome

11. This proposal is contrary to many of the principles and objectives of the RBKC Local Plan, **this proposal does not:**

- Support the specialist and individual retail functions of Portobello Road Ladbroke Grove, Westbourne Grove and All Saints Road
- Improve legibility in the area.
- Enhance the public realm and improve connections between Golborne and Portobello markets.
- Improve local air quality.
- Enhance Portobello Road and Ladbroke Grove as neighbourhood shopping centres and Ladbroke Grove's role as a key gateway to Portobello Road and Golborne Road Markets
- Deliver cultural place-making initiatives to enhance and promote the area's cultural attractions to local people and visitors

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat running increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street. This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. This consultation seeks to water down an already compromised vision of what an amazing public space should be and is contrary to the Councils stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

What this highlights, something as an organisation we have been saying for 7 years now, is that RBKC lacks a coherent plan for creating healthier and safer streets across our borough and seem incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire Portobello area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Ten

I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone on Kensington Park Road between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent, and to implement a south-eastbound one-way system.

As a resident who lives, works, shops, and dines in this area, I contributed to the consultation on the previous proposal and supported that scheme. I believe the revised proposal presented will have detrimental effects on our community for several reasons:

1. Impact on Public Space: The removal of the pedestrian and cycle zone will lead to increased through traffic, compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been carefully cultivated.

2. Increased Pollution: The influx of vehicles will result in heightened pollution levels, both in terms of noise and air quality, thereby increasing health risks to those sitting and walking outside.

3. Detrimental to Local Businesses: The proposed changes undermine the efforts of local businesses that have adapted to the existing setup, and it diminishes the potential for further development of the area as a vibrant public realm to attract shoppers and diners.

4. Reduced Road Safety: Turning this shopping and dining street which captures a lot of footfall from nearby Portobello Market into a busy rat run will significantly reduce road safety, posing risks to pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

5. Impact on Accessibility: The current setup allows for pavement dining and pedestrian movement, which would be severely hampered by the proposed changes, making the area less usable and attractive for shoppers and diners.

6. Risk to Cyclists: Increased vehicular movements on Kensington Park Road and nearby junctions will heighten the risk for cyclists, contradicting the aim of promoting safe cycling routes such as the "Quietways."

7. Congestion on Bus Routes: The proposed changes will divert traffic onto Elgin Crescent, leading to congestion on vital local bus routes, which would inconvenience residents and commuters alike.

8. Reduced opportunity for tree planting and greening: The previous scheme with reduced vehicle access allowed more space for urgently needed tree planting and greening. This opportunity will now be lost.

It is disheartening to see a reversal of a successful scheme that has benefited residents, businesses, and visitors alike. The previous proposal had the potential to cement those improvements in place for future generations. The lack of concrete evidence or data supporting the need for removal of a much appreciated and supported pedestrian and cycle zone raises concerns about the integrity and transparency of the consultation process. Moreover, I would like to point out that I was not informed by your department of the plan to drastically change this scheme and only became aware of this by word-of-mouth. This approach seems less than transparent. The absence of a coherent plan for North Kensington's development further exacerbates the situation.

In light of these issues, I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and to prioritise the preservation and enhancement of our community's well-being and liveability. Any decision should be based on comprehensive data analysis and genuine engagement with residents and stakeholders to ensure that the interests of the community are adequately represented.

Thank you for considering my objections. I trust that you will take the necessary steps to address these concerns, reinstate the proposal for a pedestrian and cycle zone, and uphold the principles of creating a greener, safer, and fairer borough.

Objection Eleven (Lewisham Cyclists)

I am emailing on behalf of Lewisham Cyclists, local group of the London Cycling Campaign who have 700 members, a vast number of whom work and cycle in RBKC.

Lewisham Cyclists object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

1. Will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall
4. Reduces the road safety on what would be a busy rat run for both pedestrians and cyclists
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways"
7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction on Ladbrooke Grove and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street. It is disappointing RBKC and the council leadership team seem incapable of delivering on an ambitious vision for making North Kensington Streets "beautiful" as they seem all too willing to do in South Kensington. I would ask why does the Lead member for planning, place and environment feel North Kensington residents don't need amazing

greener and safer streets but "increased permeability of the road network" yet in South Kensington says "we want to create amazing spaces across the borough. Bute Street is already a bustling corner of South Kensington and with new trees, new paving and a new layout we can make it a must visit destination....this transformation will make the road greener and safer for residents and visitors alike".

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. On what basis has the council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network, is this based on a robust local traffic survey or is this simply on the whim of the lead member for planning? In 2021 RBKC stated as part of the original proposal this would be monitored yet no data or evidence has been provided in this new consultation to suggest this new proposal has been informed by any data, traffic surveys, or modelling including for nearby bus routes. This consultation lacks any evidence base and the proposal to water down an already compromised vision is contrary to the Councils stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Furthermore, consulting on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on a few months ago for which no report or decision has been made seems completely disjointed. At the very least it is confusing to most people and compromises the basis of consultation. There is already consultation fatigue amongst residents, shown by the low numbers that actually engage with RBKC consultations, people are busy and when the council makes this even more convoluted it dilutes the integrity of the consultation process. RBKC lacks a plan for North Kensington and seems incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Twelve

I'm writing to strongly oppose the plan to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone on Kensington Park Road and implement a one-way system.

Having lived on Elgin Crescent and still being in the neighbourhood, my family and I often visit the restaurants there. We were thrilled when it became a cycling/pedestrian zone. We need more of those.

As someone deeply integrated into this community, I participated in the consultation for the previous proposal and supported it. However, the revised plan poses several issues:

- Negative Impact on Local Businesses: The changes undermine local businesses and hinder further development of the area.
- Public Space Impact: Removing the pedestrian and cycle zone will increase traffic, harming the outdoor dining experience.
- Increased Pollution: More vehicles mean more pollution, affecting both noise and air quality.
- Impact on Pedestrian Accessibility: The changes will hinder pedestrian movement.
- Reduced Road Safety: Turning the street into a thoroughfare will decrease safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Bus Route Congestion: Diverting traffic will congest vital local bus routes.
- Reduced Green Space: The previous scheme allowed for more space for tree planting.

It's disheartening to see a reversal of a successful scheme. The lack of evidence supporting the changes raises concerns about the consultation process. I urge the council to reconsider and prioritise the community's well-being.

Objection Thirteen

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in the part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent. First of all, it is well established that the long term goal of decreasing traffic , reducing pollution and improving well being of resident is by restricting traffic and offering safe alternatives solutions. To open that section will increase through traffic , compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created. It will reduce cycling and pedestrian safety by increasing rat runs.

Objection Fourteen

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

1. Will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall
4. Reduces the road safety on what would be a busy rat run for both pedestrians and cyclists
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways"
7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction on Ladbrooke Grove and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street. It is disappointing RBKC and the council leadership team seem incapable of delivering on an ambitious vision for making North Kensington Streets "beautiful" as they seem all too willing to do in South Kensington. I would ask why does the Lead member for planning, place and environment feel North Kensington residents don't need amazing greener and safer streets but "increased permeability of the road network" yet in South Kensington says "we want to create amazing spaces across the borough. Bute Street is already a bustling corner of South Kensington and with new trees, new paving and a new layout we can make it a must visit destination....this transformation will make the road greener and safer for residents and visitors alike".

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. On what basis has the council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network, is this based on a robust local traffic survey or is this simply on the whim of the lead member for planning? In 2021 RBKC stated as part of the original proposal this would be monitored yet no data or evidence has been provided in this new consultation to suggest this new proposal has been informed by any data, traffic surveys, or modelling including for nearby bus routes. This consultation lacks any evidence base and the proposal to water down an already compromised vision is contrary to the Councils stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Furthermore, consulting on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on a few months ago for which no report or decision has been made seems completely disjointed. At the very least it is confusing to most people and compromises the basis of consultation. There is already consultation fatigue amongst residents, shown by the low numbers that actually engage with RBKC consultations, people are busy and when the council makes this even more convoluted it dilutes the integrity of the consultation process. RBKC lacks a plan for North Kensington and seems incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Fifteen

Please please please stop demoting cycling. What happened to the cycle route along Kensington High Street put in during lockdown? It made my life s joy and I noticed so many more cyclists.

However, I digress. I am writing to object to the proposals to remove pedestrian and cycleways below:

I am emailing to object to the proposal to remove the pedestrian and cycle zone in that part of Kensington Park Road that lies between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent and to provide a south-eastbound one-way system on the following grounds:

1. Will increase through traffic on this section of road compromising the public space and outdoor dining experience that has been created
2. Increased pollution (noise and air) and exposure to those sitting outside
3. Detrimental to the local businesses that have developed a new offering and undermines future potential for developing this space as a public realm to attract footfall
4. Reduces the road safety on what would be a busy rat run for both pedestrians and cyclists
5. This is now a busy stretch of road with pavement dining as well as other street furniture, it is now common for people to be walking in the road and crossing between shops, this would reduce access and be less usable for pedestrians
6. Would see increased movements of vehicles both on this road and at nearby junctions increasing risk to cyclists on what should be a quiet back street routes linking with "Quietways"
7. Increased traffic flow onto Elgin Cres will increase congestion on important local bus routes

This proposal is a step backward from the scheme that has been trialled which has maintained access for local residents and businesses. By removing the existing pedestrian and cycle zone the council will be reinstating a rat run albeit just one way. This will facilitate drivers wishing to avoid the signal junction on Ladbroke Grove and increase through traffic on what is supposed to be a new outdoor space just off the bustling world famous Portobello Road for people to enjoy akin to similar schemes south of the borough such as Bute Street. It is disappointing RBKC and the council leadership team seem incapable of delivering on an ambitious vision for making North Kensington Streets "beautiful" as they seem all too willing to do in South Kensington. I would ask why does the Lead member for planning, place and environment feel North Kensington residents don't need amazing greener and safer streets but "increased permeability of the road network" yet in South Kensington says "we want to create amazing spaces across the borough. Bute Street is already a bustling corner of South Kensington and with new trees, new paving and a new layout we can make it a must visit destination....this transformation will make the road greener and safer for residents and visitors alike".

This section of Kensington Park Road has become increasingly popular with outdoor restaurants and people mingling, this has got better since camera enforcement started and signage gave a clear indication that the road is a pedestrian zone. By choosing to reverse what is a tremendous success is short sighted and the council should be looking to build on this scheme not compromise the benefits it has brought to local residents, businesses and visitors alike. On what basis has the council decided there is a need to increase the permeability of the road network, is this based on a robust local traffic survey or is this simply on

the whim of the lead member for planning? In 2021 RBKC stated as part of the original proposal this would be monitored yet no data or evidence has been provided in this new consultation to suggest this new proposal has been informed by any data, traffic surveys, or modelling including for nearby bus routes. This consultation lacks any evidence base and the proposal to water down an already compromised vision is contrary to the Council's stated objectives to create a greener, safer and fairer borough.

Furthermore, consulting on changing a council proposal that was only consulted on a few months ago for which no report or decision has been made seems completely disjointed. At the very least it is confusing to most people and compromises the basis of consultation. There is already consultation fatigue amongst residents, shown by the low numbers that actually engage with RBKC consultations, people are busy and when the council makes this even more convoluted it dilutes the integrity of the consultation process. RBKC lacks a plan for North Kensington and seems incapable of delivering even the most minimal of improvements on the smallest of scales. The entire area needs a place based approach that is centred on walking, cycling and public transport with adequate provision for service and residential access.

Objection Sixteen

I strongly oppose the proposal to scrap the existing cycling provisions on Kensington Park Road. I use these all the time and they have made my journeys both much safer and less stressful. To scrap these provisions in favour of a one-way system would endanger cyclists and halt the growing use of the street as a pleasant public realm.

Objection Seventeen

The London Cycling Campaign strongly opposes these proposals.

- These plans would likely result in an increase in use of motor vehicles – by providing more capacity for them. This is running counter to policy direction and particularly poor for a council that has declared a climate emergency.
- The plans would negatively impact a walking and cycling corridor by establishing a one-way through motor traffic route – likely both reducing cycling and walking rates here, and also increasing collision rates.
- The plans would also negatively impact amenity of and likely footfall for local retailers along this street, again counter to policy.
- The trialed scheme worked, was popular locally, and was consulted on effectively in 2023. The consultation page for these new proposals says they are "required to improve permeability of the road network, whilst maintaining a safe environment for pedestrians and pedal cycles." There is no evidence presented to establish that "permeability" needs

improvement or was negatively impacted to significant degree by the trialed scheme. Whereas the proposals would clearly reduce safety by adding through motor traffic to this street.

Objection Eighteen

I have noted a revision to the original Kensington Park Road Streetscape Scheme KD1007503. According to the current notice posted by RBKC, the original pedestrianisation scheme has now been downscaled to just a simple restriction on Kensington Park road between Blenheim Crescent and Elgin Crescent to make the road one-way north-to-south for MOTOR traffic, but with cyclists still being permitted to travel in both directions (i.e. south-north and north-south).

I've lived in the immediate area for a very long time, and am extremely familiar with the section of Kensington Park Road (KPR) on which the one-way restriction is being proposed. I simply do not understand the proposed restriction at all. Knowing well how this bit of KPR is used, I am unable to identify any traffic problem with it. So, as far as I am concerned, there is no issue that exists that needs to be addressed by the introduction of a one-way system.

In fact, the proposed restriction has drawbacks and is actually going to introduce and create problems, rather than solve a non-existent one! And I am left wondering if RBKC has actually done a traffic survey of Kensington Park Road (KPR) before proposing the one-way scheme?

So, Kensington Park road (KPR) is over 3/4 mile long, running in a mostly straight line north from Notting Hill Gate, terminating at Westbourne Park Road. KPR is wide enough along its whole length to allow full 2-way traffic - INCLUDING the section where a one-way system is being proposed - and KPR flows easily, with only one set of traffic lights and two mini-roundabouts to negotiate. Two bus routes also run along most of its length, and another bus route crosses it.

KPR is currently routinely and well-used by residents who want to drive to/from Notting Hill Gate and points south to their home in North Kensington (or indeed Westminster); in particular, using KPR does avoid the better known but much more congested Ladbroke Grove (LG) route, and residents using KPR instead of LG are also helping to reduce the congestion on LG.

I do note that cafes and restaurants in this section KPR have tables and chairs out on the road in summer (parking suspended), but there is ample road room for both tables AND for residents driving to continue to use the road, as there is plenty of space for 2-way traffic in the given road space as well.

Unfortunately, the proposed one-way section will block KPR for motor traffic for just 80 yards going south-to-north, but in doing so, is going to end up breaking the essential functionality and usefulness of the whole length of KPR for residents who drive, and for other vehicles such as delivery trucks and taxis.

It will require drivers going south-to-north on KPR to adopt unnecessary diversions to get back on to KPR; all of the diversion routes to bypass the 'road block' are long (400 to 600 yards), complicated and unsatisfactory, involving dumping drivers either down Elgin Crescent on to the already congested Ladbroke Grove, or leaving them criss-crossing Portobello road, to the risk of pedestrian shoppers. And the unnecessary extra mileage obviously adds that little bit extra pollution.

Kensington Park Mews (KPM) - the entrance/exit of KPM is actually within the proposed one-way section of KPR. I don't live in KPM and so I cannot claim to speak for them, but perhaps consideration should be given to the KPM resident driver wanting to leave and go north, but having to 'go round the houses' to do so, or similarly returning from the south up KPR and again having to take an unnecessary detour in order to get home?

And, importantly, traffic having to divert from KPR down Elgin Crescent (EC) also interrupts the 23, 52 and 452 bus routes, which all use the section of Elgin Crescent between KPR and LG in both directions. EC is sufficiently narrow that, though 2 cars can pass in opposite directions, a car and a bus cannot, so it is my personal experience using these buses that regular conflicts and delays are occurring, exacerbated by more cars currently having to detour via EC. The proposed one-way system for KPR would make this problem permanent.

Also, as KPR is two lanes wide, the proposal will introduce the potential of two lanes of traffic both going one-way south. What happens when two side-by-side lines of traffic try to filter in to one lane for the mini-roundabout at the end of the section of KPR? What happens to a cyclist going north encountering two cars side-by-side coming at them (which is an introduced extra risk)?

To summarise, a cost-benefit analysis

- there is no identifiable problem that needs addressing in the first place, therefore no possible benefit
- the proposed scheme introduces a range of disbenefits, to drivers, cyclists, residents of KPM, and to public transport
- the scheme if implemented would cost, both capital for the structural changes and signage, and revenue for compliance to the one-way system by cameras or wardens, and it is not reasonable for RBKC to expect residents to pay for the scheme through their Council Tax, when the scheme is actively to their disbenefit

So, please stop this unnecessary scheme, and also remove the current temporary closure to revert the road to full, proper traffic use.

Objection Nineteen

Just one quick point regarding the new one-way scheme that will become permanent. Can you just add .. & Taxis. It's a popular social area and residential street and it's extremely difficult to drop or pick up elderly or passengers with some disabilities (not all disabilities are visible either) Allowing taxi access to what is a quiet street where I doubt there has been any recorded collisions between taxis' pedestrians or cyclists in its life time ..

You shouldn't make it harder and costly to those people who have stopped using a car to remain mobile.

I have an elderly relative who lives in the street and relies on taxis as they are easy to get into rather than trying to get into a normal saloon car (when you get older trust me you'll look back at this email and say [redacted] was right trying to bend down to get into or out of a car when your old is hard) .. So please cycling isn't for everyone but the street is.

[Additional comments]

Hi thanks for reply ... access for taxis please

[Additional comments]

It would be handy for taxis to be able to access through it both ways ..

So they don't have to drive a fortuitous route particularly when portobello rd is closed

I understand the want to close roads that are rat runs or restaurant areas but you must appreciate that residents need some vehicle access..

[Additional comments]

Thanks .. taxis please .. as a priority.. you can close it for everyone else if you want ..

Support One

Having spoke[n] to you earlier today I just wanted to confirm that I approve of the proposed changes to the pedestrian and cycle zone at the part of Kensington Park Road between Blenheim and Elgin Crescents, I also support the earlier proposals that were published about a year ago to that section that intends to enhance and pedestrianise that section. If possible, I would like to be updated on any progress regarding these works, or possible a link to where I can check progress.

Support Two

An excellent idea and will improve safety for pedestrians and reduce vehicles trying to pass each other.

Support Three

I approve of the proposed changes.

Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment

SECTION 1: Programme details

<p>Name of the policy, project, service, or strategy being assessed, and a brief overview of its aims and objectives</p>	<p>REMOVAL OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ZONE AND PROVISION OF ONE-WAY EXCEPT CYCLES IN PART OF KENSINGTON PARK ROAD</p> <p>The Council is proposing removal of the pedestrian and cycle zone (except for access) in the section of Kensington Park Road between Elgin Crescent and Blenheim Crescent, and provision of a one-way (except cycles) restriction instead.</p> <p>Under the current pedestrian and cycle zone (except for access) restrictions, pedestrians and cyclists may use the street at any time, for any purpose. 'Access' means that anyone wishing to stop in the road, for the purpose of parking (both as a resident of the road, or as a visitor wishing to shop for example) and/or loading/unloading (including of people) may do so. Pedestrian and cycle zone restrictions are intended to restrict drivers from passing straight through a street.</p> <p>The Lead Member for Planning and Public Realm has notified officers that he no longer considers restricting southbound traffic to be proportionate. Accordingly, the Council plans to consult on a Traffic Order that would reopen the road to all southbound traffic (except cycles, which would continue to be able to use the road in both directions).</p>
<p>Name of person completing this EqlA</p>	<p>Caroline Dubarbier, Sustainable Travel Manager</p>
<p>Name of Director</p>	<p>Andrew Burton, Director of Transport and Regulatory Services</p>
<p>Team</p>	<p>Transport & Highways</p>
<p>Directorate</p>	<p>Environment and Neighbourhoods</p>
<p>Contact Email</p>	<p>caroline.dubarbier@rbkc.gov.uk</p>
<p>Where is this EqlA stored. (This is to ensure colleagues can pick this up in your absence.)</p>	
<p>Is this EqlA accompanying a report that is going through a formal decision process?</p> <p>If so which meeting, is it going to for decision?</p>	<p>Statutory Traffic Order</p>

SECTION 2: EqlA Screening – Do you need to complete a full EqlA?

Please complete the checklist below, including impact to help determine if a full EqlA is necessary.

Please see table in Section 3 for a breakdown of the protected characteristics

Question	Answer	Impact
----------	--------	--------

	(Yes, No, Unclear)	(Positive, Negative or Neutral)
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect men, women or those who identify as non-binary?	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of a particular race or ethnicity? This includes refugees, asylum seekers, migrants and gypsies and travellers.	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people with a disability? Consider physical and learning disabilities and mental health conditions.	Yes	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of certain sexual orientations?	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different age groups? Consider children and elderly populations.	Yes	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those undergoing or intending to undergo the process of gender reassignment?	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those due to pregnancy or maternity? The Equality Act protects women or birthing people from discrimination from when you become pregnant until your right to maternity leave ends and you return to work. If you do not have the right to maternity leave this is 2 weeks after the child is born.	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different faiths and beliefs?	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people on low incomes or living in poverty?	No	Neutral
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people living in the most deprived areas of RBKC? Think about North Kensington, in particular Golborne, Notting Dale, Dalgarno and those living on the Worlds End Estate. There is further detail in Section 3 below in the socioeconomic and geographical box.	No	Neutral

If you have assessed the impact to any of the above questions to be Negative, Neutral or Unclear, then you will need to complete Sections 3, 4 and 5. If you have assessed the impact as Positive, explain the rational for this in the box below and then go to Section 5.

Please use this box to outline how residents are positively impacted.

N/A

SECTION 3: Assessing the Impact

Protected characteristic	Analysis	Impact (Positive, Negative or Neutral)																								
Age	<p>2021 census: The average age of residents in Kensington and Chelsea is 40.45 years, making it the fourth oldest population in London.</p> <p>The age breakdown of our population is:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="459 887 1315 1099"> <tbody> <tr> <td>4 years and under</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>25-34 years</td> <td>17.5 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-9 years</td> <td>4.4%</td> <td>35-49 years</td> <td>21.2 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10-15 years</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>50-64 years</td> <td>20.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16-19 years</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>65-74 years</td> <td>7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-24 years</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>75-84 years</td> <td>4.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>85 years and over</td> <td>1.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In England, older people are more likely to hold a Blue Badge than younger people¹ and even older people without a Blue Badge may be more reliant on cars or taxis than other age groups. The ability to park, or be picked up or dropped off, close to shops or homes is likely to be important to older people who may not be able to walk, or walk as far, as younger people. The existing pedestrian and cycle zone already permits access to stop to park, or pick up or drop off, regardless of the age of the driver and/or passengers. However, some drivers may be anxious or uncertain about what the existing traffic signs mean in practice. Re-opening the road to full southbound operation (and removing the pedestrian and cycle zone sign) may give some car users more confidence about entering the road without fear of penalty.</p> <p>We expect the reopening of the road to lead to an increase in motor traffic volumes, and therefore to an increase in traffic noise. This increased noise may affect some groups more than others – for example, those with dementia (which is more common among older people).</p> <p>Older people and those with reduced mobility may find it more difficult to cross a road than others, so increasing the volume of traffic on the street may impact such people more than others. However, the proposal must be understood in the context that there is already southbound traffic on the road, both legal and illegal.</p>	4 years and under	4.3%	25-34 years	17.5 %	5-9 years	4.4%	35-49 years	21.2 %	10-15 years	5.4%	50-64 years	20.5%	16-19 years	3.8%	65-74 years	7.9%	20-24 years	8.5%	75-84 years	4.8%			85 years and over	1.7%	Neutral
4 years and under	4.3%	25-34 years	17.5 %																							
5-9 years	4.4%	35-49 years	21.2 %																							
10-15 years	5.4%	50-64 years	20.5%																							
16-19 years	3.8%	65-74 years	7.9%																							
20-24 years	8.5%	75-84 years	4.8%																							
		85 years and over	1.7%																							

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/blue-badge-scheme-statistics-data-tables-dis>

	Moreover, the vast majority of roads in London are open to traffic in two directions.	
Disability	<p>2021 census: 12.8% of residents in the borough said they had a long-term condition or disability that limited their life in some way. LGA Data from the academic year 21/22 highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,379 young people have Special Educational Needs in RBKC. • 746 have a statement of Special Educational Need or an Education and Health Plan. • 62 children in the Borough have a disability in schools. <p>Whilst private cars, private hire and taxis can be an important means of transport for disabled people, the Travel in London: Understanding Our Diverse Communities report (Transport for London, 2019) suggests that transport modes used by disabled Londoners (at least once a week) are varied, with 81% walking, 58% bus, 42% car (as passenger) and 24% car (as driver). People with disabilities may, by definition, be more reliant on cars or taxis than people without disabilities. The ability to park, or be picked up or dropped off, directly outside of shops or homes is therefore likely to be more important to people with disabilities - who may not be able to walk, or walk as far, as people without disabilities. The existing pedestrian and cycle zone already permits access to stop to park, or pick up or drop off, regardless of whether the driver (or passengers) have a disability or not. However, some drivers may be anxious or uncertain about what the existing traffic signs mean in practice. Re-opening the road to full southbound operation (and removing the pedestrian and cycle zone sign) may give some car users more confidence about entering the road without fear of penalty.</p> <p>Promoting walking and cycling, for example via provision of pedestrian and cycle zone streets, can benefit people with disabilities in terms of improving health, reducing obesity and contributing to good mental health. The reduction of traffic collisions associated with reduced traffic can also benefit people with disabilities from mobility impairments to reduced visual or aural ability, as they provide a safer space in which to spend time or travel through by foot or cycle. We expect the reopening of the road to lead to an increase in motor traffic volumes, and therefore to an increase in traffic noise. This increased noise may affect some groups more than others – for example, those with dementia or some neuro-divergent conditions.</p>	Neutral
Gender reassignment	<p>The 2021 census captured this information those aged 16 and above. Approximately 90% of our residents stated that their sex is the same as it was at birth. Nearly 9% of residents did not answer the question. The remaining identified themselves as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.2% said that their sex is different to that registered at birth • 0.1% identify as Trans woman • 0.1% as Trans man 	Neutral

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 0.1% identify as non-binary • 0.1% identify as other <p>The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.</p>																																													
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>2021 Census data shows 49.24% of residents are single. Nearly 35% of residents are married to someone of the opposite sex and 0.5% are married to someone of the same sex. The remaining 0.15% of our residents are in a civil partnership with someone of the opposite sex and 0.39% are in a civil partnership with someone of the same sex.</p> <p>The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.</p>	Neutral																																												
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>The 2019 JSNA showed there were 1,612 births in the borough. It also showed an estimated 335 cases perinatal mental illness.</p> <p>The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.</p>	Neutral																																												
Race	<p>2021 Census: The broad ethnic breakdown of the borough's population is White at 70.6%; Asian, Asian British at 11.8%; Black, Black British at 7.9%; Mixed or multiple ethnicities at 6.6%; and Other at 9.9%.</p> <p>A more detailed breakdown is:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Asian Bangladeshi</td> <td>1%</td> <td>Mixed White and Asian</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Chinese</td> <td>2.7%</td> <td>Mixed White and Black African</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Indian</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Pakistani</td> <td>0.9%</td> <td>Mixed Other</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Other</td> <td>5%</td> <td>White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black African</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td>White Irish</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Caribbean</td> <td>2.3%</td> <td>White Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Other</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>White Roma</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>White Other</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Other Arab</td> <td>4.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Other ethnicities</td> <td>5.2%</td> </tr> </table> <p>The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.</p>	Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian	2.2%	Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African	0.2%	Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2.2%	Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other	2.2%	Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British	32%	Black African	4.8%	White Irish	2.2%	Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.2%	Black Other	0.8%	White Roma	0.2%			White Other	28%			Other Arab	4.2%			Other ethnicities	5.2%	Neutral
Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian	2.2%																																											
Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African	0.2%																																											
Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2.2%																																											
Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other	2.2%																																											
Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British	32%																																											
Black African	4.8%	White Irish	2.2%																																											
Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.2%																																											
Black Other	0.8%	White Roma	0.2%																																											
		White Other	28%																																											
		Other Arab	4.2%																																											
		Other ethnicities	5.2%																																											
Religion/belief	<p>A breakdown of religious groups in RBKC from the 2021 census are:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Buddhist</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Jewish</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>Other</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christian</td> <td>48.4%</td> <td>Muslim</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>No religion</td> <td>24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Sikh</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>did not answer</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </table> <p>The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.</p>	Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other	0.7%	Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion	24.8%	Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer	10%	Neutral																										
Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other	0.7%																																									
Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion	24.8%																																									
Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer	10%																																									

Sex	2021 Census: Female 53.2% and Male 46.8%. The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.	Neutral
Sexual Orientation	2021 census information on sexual orientation is only captured for people aged 16 and above. Approximately 85% identify as Heterosexual, nearly 3% identify as Gay or Lesbian, 1.3% as Bisexual and 0.3% as other, the remaining 10.4% did not answer this question. The proposal is deemed to have no impact on this category.	Neutral
In addition to the nine protected characteristics, where relevant we ask that you also think about the socio-economic and geographical considerations of our residents. Some data has been included below for your reference.		
Socio-economic and Geographical	<p>A recent report on data from the Index of Multiple Deprivation for 2019 showed that a high concentration of the most deprived Lower Super Output Areas are found in the Golborne, Notting Dale and Dalgarno wards.</p> <p>North Kensington also has higher numbers of people on low incomes, who are unemployed or who have no qualifications than the rest of the borough and has a higher proportion of social housing. There are also pockets of low income, higher unemployment, and lower skills levels in parts of the south and west of the borough, again in areas where there are greater proportions of social housing.</p> <p>According to recent ONS data RBKC continues to have the highest life expectancy in the country, however this varies between the north and the south, between people from different ethnic minorities, and between homeowners, private renters, and those in social housing.</p> <p>ONS data also shows that life expectancy in the borough can vary significantly by different wards. There are larger gaps between the least and most deprived wards, these are as much as 14.8 years for males and 11.9 years for females. Females in Notting Dale live on average 15 years less than their neighbours in Holland Ward.</p> <p>The 2021 census data on general health of our residents shows that 58% of all residents, reported being in 'very good' health, 29.6 reported 'good' health, 10.1% reported 'fair health', 3.7% reported 'bad health' and 1.1% of residents reported 'very bad' health. However, these figures vary greatly across the Borough. Campden residents had the highest proportion reporting 'very good' health, 67.4% and Dalgarno in the north of the Borough had the lowest, 48.5%.</p> <p>The proposal is not expected to have any additional effect based on socio-economic or geographical factors.</p>	Neutral

Other Groups	<p>Please consider groups that may be affected by your work, such as Grenfell Bereaved and Survivors, Carers and Members of the Armed Forces etc.</p> <p>Groups such as Grenfell Bereaved and Survivors, Carers and Members of the Armed Forces will not be any more or less impacted by the proposal than other people, except insofar as they fall into one of the other categories above.</p>	Neutral
---------------------	--	---------

SECTION 4: Action Plan

Have you identified the need to reduce or remove any negative impacts, conduct work with those from protected groups to participate where their participation is disproportionately low, or fill any data gaps? If so, complete the Action Plan below to show the work that is planned.

The assessment has concluded that overall impacts are Neutral, and that there is no case for an action plan, however this is a live document and will be updated at each stage of implementation. This will include reviewing the document after the consultation stage.

Issue identified	Planned Action	Lead Officer and Timeframe

SECTION 5: Sign-off

Director/ Head of Service Name	Mark Chetwynd, Head of Transportation and Highways
Contact Email	Mark.chetwynd@rbkc.gov.uk
Date of sign off	12 March 2024
<p>Review It is important to consider equalities issues at every stage of the process. Remember an EqIA is a live document which means it must be regularly reviewed and updated considering new evidence or information, for example, have you now completed your consultation or has there been news on funding. Please ask your Director or Head of Service to sign-off at every review stage. You can have as many reviews as are appropriate for your work.</p>	
Date of 1 st Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	
Date of 2 nd Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	