

OFFICER DECISION
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAY AND REGULATORY SERVICES
5 AUGUST 2026
CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE PROPOSAL TO
INTRODUCE A PARALLEL CROSSING ON LADBROKE GROVE AT THE
JUNCTION WITH BLenheim CRESCENT

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 In June and July 2026, the Council consulted on a proposal to introduce a new parallel crossing on Ladbroke Grove at the junction with Blenheim Crescent. This report considers the responses received and makes a recommendation on how to proceed.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 After considering the responses received to the consultation, officers recommend that – subject to the outcome of statutory consultation - the Director for Highway and Regulatory Services proceed with introduction of the scheme on which we consulted, with the exception of the amendment below:
- Not to implement the proposed advisory cycle lanes on Ladbroke Grove in order to retain the pedestrian islands on the northern side of the junction.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 From 1 June to 12 July 2026, the Council undertook consultation on introducing a new parallel crossing and footway extensions on Ladbroke Grove at the junction with Blenheim Crescent. The proposals can be viewed [here](#). Enabling more walking and cycling is one of the Council's transport objectives and helping to make it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross the road is an important step in meeting that objective.
- 3.2 Parallel crossings enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross a road safely, with the same level of priority as a zebra crossing gives a pedestrian. Parallel crossings look similar to zebra crossings but include a separate crossing area for cyclists beside the traditional zebra crossing area for pedestrians. The proposed crossing would assist cyclists using Cycleway 27 as part of Transport for London's (TfL) Cycleway upgrade programme. Currently there is no specific provision for cyclists to cross Ladbroke Grove and the only provision for pedestrians are two pedestrian refuges to the north and south of the junction.
- 3.3 A total of 1,663 households living near the proposal received letters sign-posting them to the consultation hosted on the Council's Consultation and Engagement hub. Forty-four responses were received; 25 in support (57 per cent), 15

objections (34 per cent) and four support in part (9 per cent). The responses received are set out in full in Appendix 1.

4. CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

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

Table 1: Officers' responses to issues raised by respondents

Reason for objection	Officer response
Seven respondents objected to the proposed narrowing of the carriageway on Ladbroke Grove stating this was dangerous for cyclists.	No footway extensions are proposed on Ladbroke Grove.
Seven respondents objected to the proposed short sections of shared use footway believing these would introduce unnecessary conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. One respondent said the design ran against national design guidance (LTN 1/20) which states that pedestrian and cycle movements should be separated, that converting footways to shared use should be a last resort only after carriageway options have been rejected, and that shared use should not be used in streets with high pedestrian flows.	Parallel crossings are recognised in LTN 1/20 and the layout is prescribed in TSRGD diagram 1001.5. Parallel crossings are also recommended in TfL's Cycle Route Quality Criteria. Both Toucan and Parallel crossings feature short sections of shared use footway and are facilities well established across London. Other parallel crossings in the borough do not appear to have led to increased collisions between cyclists and pedestrians with zero collisions reported in the last three years at any of our parallel crossings. The proposal here includes measures to lengthen the existing footway extensions on the eastern footways and this, alongside the already widened footways at this junction ensures space to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists.
Six respondents stated the crossing was not necessary, either because they felt the existing traffic islands were adequate, because cyclists and/or pedestrians would not use it, or because existing congestion already means it is easy to cross as vehicles are already giving way or conversely that there is no	The Council's policy is to provide safe and reliable crossings around the borough to improve connectivity and reduce the risk of injury and harm. Under the Highway Code (Rule 195), vehicles must give way to pedestrians using zebra crossings. The proposal therefore offers far greater amenity to

congestion so it is easy to cross. One respondent cited the 20mph speed restriction in place which they argued calms the traffic sufficiently for pedestrians to cross at all junctions, whilst another remarked that there are already multiple opportunities for pedestrians to cross safely in the immediate by way of controlled pedestrian crossings at Ladbroke Grove at both Elgin Crescent and Westbourne Park Road amongst others.	pedestrians than the existing informal crossing islands. Some more confident cyclists may opt to continue using the carriageway to negotiate the junction. But for more nervous or new cyclists, parallel crossings offer an alternative facility where drivers are required to give way to those wishing to cross. People wishing to cross Ladbroke Grove at the Blenheim Crescent would be unlikely to be satisfied by crossing points elsewhere, the nearest signalised crossing being 110 metres away.
Five respondents believed the proposals would lead to congestion (including impacts on bus journey times) and associated poor air quality and noise. One respondent stated that installing a pedestrian crossing immediately adjacent to existing traffic lights is likely to worsen congestion considerably.	Should the crossing be installed, drivers may need to stop more frequently at this point than they currently do. But it is not expected that this would will lead to excessive congestion, poorer air quality, queuing or cause any significant delays or increases to journey times. Vehicle delays are typically six seconds for a single person crossing but may increase where irregular streams of people cross over extended periods or dependent on the mobility of the pedestrian. The nearest existing signal-controlled crossings on Ladbroke Grove are over 100m, or more than a minute's walk, from the Blenheim Crescent junction.
Five respondents felt the proposals were a waste of funds, with some citing use of Council Tax.	The proposals would be funded by Transport for London via their Cycleway Network Delivery funding. These funds are ring-fenced for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists along Cycleway routes.
Four respondents said they objected to removal of the pedestrian islands on the north side of the junction, believing this removed a useful facility for pedestrians, with one observing they felt more pedestrians used	The scheme proposes removal of the northern islands to accommodate short sections of cycle lane as vehicles and cyclists on Ladbroke Grove pass through the junction.

the northern footway as they approach Ladbroke Grove and another saying they did not want to cross the road in one go.	However, as residents appear to value the islands on this side, and the Council has previously removed cycle lanes at this location and Ladbroke Grove is not a Cycleway, officers recommend amending the scheme to remove the proposed advisory cycle lanes and retain the islands on the northern side.
Three respondents believed a parallel crossing would introduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (on the crossing itself, rather than the shared use footways).	Unlike Toucan crossings, parallel crossings feature clearly defined areas for both pedestrians and cyclists to cross. Other parallel crossings in the borough do not appear to have led to increased collisions between cyclists and pedestrians with zero collisions reported in the last three years at any of our parallel crossings.
Two respondents objected to the proposals on the grounds of street clutter.	Officers believe the benefit in providing a parallel crossing outweighs the negligible addition to street furniture by way of the proposed Belisha beacons, particularly as the informal crossing islands on the south side would be removed.
One respondent objected to the proposed footway extensions on Blenheim Crescent believing this is a corner where buses turn into Blenheim Crescent and that the extensions would therefore impede buses turning, slowing traffic on Ladbroke Grove and causing increased congestion and consequential air pollution, and impact response times for emergency services vehicles.	There are no bus routes using Blenheim Crescent from Ladbroke Grove. The proposals do not propose any footway extensions at the junction (all arms already feature footway extensions). However, the design does propose lengthening the existing extensions eastwards on the eastern arm to increase the footway width to enable shared use footway for cyclists to access the parallel crossing. As the carriageway is already narrowed at the junction, this lengthening should have no new impact to turning movements. However, as cyclists are expected only to use the shared use footways on the southern sides of the junctions, officers can explore at detailed design stage whether the proposed extension on the north-east corner are truly necessary.
One respondent objected to loss of parking space.	The designs make no proposed changes to parking or loading.
One respondent said that the crossing only assists the east to west movement and makes other	The parallel crossing is intended to assist cyclists using Cycleway 27, which runs east to west along Blenheim Crescent.

cyclist movements through the junction more awkward. The design does not appear to reflect the actual desire lines of cyclists or pedestrians here.	Ladbroke Grove is not a Cycleway but the proposals did include providing space for an advisory cycle lane through this junction to ensure enough space for both vehicles and cyclists heading north or south. Residents have told us they value the pedestrian islands on the northern side and the recommendation is to remove the cycle lanes from the scheme in favour of those islands. But this does not worsen existing conditions here for cyclists.
One respondent said the parallel crossing would create a hazard for cyclists and pedestrians using the crossing if a motor bike came along the outside of the traffic lane unseen, such as alongside a van.	Motorcyclists, like all other vehicle traffic, are obliged to stop at parallel crossings under Highway Code (Rule 195). The crossing will be visible to all road users, including motorcyclists by way of Belisha beacons on both sides of the road as well as road markings.
One respondent said the parallel crossing would confuse drivers, walkers and cyclists alike.	Parallel crossings are recognised in LTN 1/20 and the layout is prescribed in TSRGD diagram 1001.5. Parallel crossings are also recommended in TfL's Cycle Route Quality Criteria. The borough has four parallel crossings and none have a poor collision history.
One respondent believed the road works involved to implement the scheme would cause unnecessary and lengthy disruption in Ladbroke Grove.	While any highway improvement schemes will create some disruption, and Ladbroke Grove is known to suffer congestion already, officers consider that the short-term disruption will be justified by the scheme's benefits. The Council and its contractor have experience of implementing such schemes and have learned lessons along the way in keeping residents informed at all stages, and how to minimise impact on residents during building works.
One respondent said that it is not clear whether the sections of shared use footway includes use by rental e-bikes and e-scooters, and/or private e-bikes and e-scooters that can be made to exceed the 15.5 miles per hour speed of rental equivalents.	Rental e-bikes would be able to use the parallel crossing and the shared use footway. E-scooters remain motor vehicles under law and cannot use the footway. Modified e-bikes and personally owned e-scooters remain illegal and are not permitted to use any part of the public highway.
One respondent was unclear whether the parallel crossing was supported by cyclist/pedestrian	The Ladbroke Grove/Blenheim Crescent junction (the proposal area) does not feature traffic lights.

signals and that the existing junction traffic lights do not appear to be shown on the plan.	
One respondent said that the short sections of cycle lane would cause congestion and associated poor air quality.	The proposed cycle lanes are advisory – not segregated – meaning vehicles can pass over them when a cyclist is not using them. But this report proposes dropping the cycle lanes in favour of retaining the pedestrian islands on the northern side of the junction.
One respondent said that they were concerned that where the parallel crossing was located will mean that some cars driving on Ladbroke Grove from the south would suddenly brake to let a pedestrian cross, thereby blocking the access to/from Blenheim Crescent and a “Keep clear” marking or a Zig Zag marking at the junction of Ladbroke grove and Blenheim Crescent should be added.	The proposals do feature zig-zag markings across the junction, but these only prevent parking at the kerb, not vehicles stopping to give way to pedestrians/cyclists crossing. As Ladbroke Grove traffic has right of way, vehicles on Blenheim Crescent will need to wait for vehicles to clear the junction, as they do now for pedestrians using the refuge islands. This is more likely to be where traffic heading south temporarily blocks the exit from the eastern arm of Blenheim Crescent. However, as noted above, this is likely to be for only around six seconds. As Ladbroke Grove is a straight road with high visibility, and the crossing would be highlighted by use of road markings and Belisha beacons, there is no reason that a driver should have to brake sharply to give way to waiting pedestrians or cyclists.
One respondent was concerned that if the ability to turn right is removed, it would result in more traffic at the Westbourne Park/Ladbroke Grove traffic lights.	No changes to turning movements are proposed. The proposal area is not a traffic light-controlled junction.

5. COMMENTS FROM THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE (MPS)

- 5.1 The MPS requests that the proposed tactile paving at either side of the crossing be red in colour in line with guidance stating tactiles should be provided in high visual contrast for sight-impaired pedestrians. They further request that tactile stems be added in line with guidance that controlled crossings should have stems that extend to the rear of the footway / building line in order to guide sight impaired pedestrians to the crossing.

- 5.2 They highlight that the plan shows no mention of any shared space sign provision, which in its absence could lead to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.
- 5.3 The MPS comment on there being only two sets of zig zags shown on the south side of the crossing which could lead to vehicles parking close to the crossing affecting intervisibility and also limiting the prohibition of vehicles overtaking the lead vehicle on approach creating potential conflict and enforcement issues.
- 5.4 The Council uses tactile paving in accordance with the Council's Streetscape Guidance, which is not red but would be of a similar material to the surrounding paving but in a contrasting colour tone. The Council acknowledges that this is a departure from DfT guidance. The Council is currently reviewing its policy on the design and colour of tactile paving at controlled crossings, and this will inform the final detailed design if the proposal proceeds.
- 5.4 Shared space signs will be implemented if the proposals proceed, the locations of which will be detailed as part of the detailed design process.
- 5.5 Officers would consult with the scheme designers during detailed design to check stopping sight distances on both approaches with recent speed data to determine whether the zig zags should be extended.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The scheme is expected to cost £80k to implement. These funds would be secured from Transport for London as part of the 2027-28 Cycleway Network Development allocation.

Appendix 1 – Responses received to the Ladbroke Grove/Blenheim Crescent Parallel Crossing Proposal

Support

1	[No comment supplied]
2	[No comment supplied]
3	[No comment supplied]
4	I often cross Ladbroke Grove at this very point, on foot and on bike, and there is always a risk from the speed of some vehicles using the road. These proposals should make the crossing so much safer.
5	This improvement is both welcomed and necessary as this junction is rather busy, and often that are car crashes/accidents occurring precisely there. This will definitely make the junction safer for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers alike.
6	Would be much safer with a crossing, lots of children cross at this junction and I've personally seen many near misses
7	I am in favour of the proposed parallel crossing. This section is currently confusing and feels unsafe for pedestrians, particularly because of the way some cars approach and drive through the area. As a pedestrian, I feel that any improvement which makes the crossing clearer, safer, and more visible would be a positive step. I therefore support the proposal, as it has the potential to improve safety for both pedestrians and cyclists.
8	[No comment supplied]
9	It's a busy junction that I walk my kids to school and currently many of cars and pedestrians from all directions do not mix well
10	It will make it easier to cross Ladbroke Grove and/or turn into Ladbroke Grove on a bicycle.
11	[No comment supplied]
12	Crossing much needed, a busy crossing point for pedestrians and cycle route Difficult to cross and little giving way on what is often a busy flow of traffic Junction should have a keep clear/yellow box to keep crossing clear for cycle traffic crossing Ladbroke Grove - traffic stopping for zebra crossing will likely block the junction Zebra crossing should be on raised platform to encourage traffic to slow on approach South of zebra should have parking removed as per the north side to remove pinch point for southbound cyclists on Ladbroke Grove with general traffic after zebra crossing
13	The Council proposals will provide a safer crossing.
14	A crossing here would be a huge relief, serve the bus stop well and also the cycle route. This junction has always been really difficult and relies on drivers being kind for pedestrians to cross. I would very much be in favour of tree planting (as long as it's in the ground not planters) and perhaps a planted area to facilitate the natural surface water drainage
15	This is much needed! Lots of people cross Ladbroke Grove at this point and it's very dangerous currently. A pedestrian crossing would be perfect and as Ladbroke Grove is already 20mph, wouldn't affect traffic.

	Another suggestion is to remove the bollard at the corner of Bleinheim Crescent and Ladbroke Grove as it's nearly impossible to turn left there if a car is waiting at the junction on Bleinheim crescent to Ladbroke Grove.
16	I cycle across this junction several times a week, and have done so for 26 years. It is very hazardous! I welcome the proposals wholeheartedly.
17	It is a dangerous area for children.. your project is a brilliant idea. Thank you!!!
18	[No comment supplied]
19	I am very pleased you are putting a crossing here. I cross here regularly and have to rely on the goodwill of drivers to allow me to cross. Sometimes I have to wait a long time because I cannot hurry across the road.
20	As a frequent cyclist I believe that the proposal would significantly improve cyclist safety.
21	This junction has become extremely busy with all traffic users and pedestrians. It would greatly enhance ability to cross safely. There are many elderly, visually impaired and schools that cross at this point. It would also be EXTREMELY good to not have the bicycle hire point at this junction. They are regularly left abandoned across the pavements and into the road causing major problems. I was knocked over by a cyclist here who did not stop and my leg took a month to repair, as an elderly resident this is very concerning. *Additional Comments* This would be a great improvement as the junction has become increasingly busy with all traffic vehicles. There are a great number of pedestrians who are elderly, visually impaired and school children that use this crossing point. It would also be EXTREMELY good for the bicycle hire at the corner of Blenheim and Ladbroke Grove to be moved as they bicycles are often left across the pavement and road causing major obstruction. I also was knocked down by one cyclist who did not stop. This causing damage to my leg from hip to foot impeding mobility for over a month. Any improvement to this corner crossing would be greatly appreciated.
22	[No comment supplied]
23	I got knocked off my bike at exactly this point about a year ago, so I am strongly in favour!
24	[No comment supplied]
25	I have received a letter [] concerning proposed parallel crossing on Ladbroke Grove and have tried to reply, but I cannot get through on the website address provided. I wish to register my approval for the plan.

Objection

1	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to object to the proposed pedestrian crossing at the junction of Ladbroke
---	--

	Grove and Blenheim Crescent. Ladbroke Grove is already a heavily congested route, carrying significant volumes of traffic throughout the day and serving as a major bus corridor for local residents and visitors. Installing a pedestrian crossing immediately adjacent to existing traffic lights is likely to worsen congestion considerably, resulting in longer queues, increased vehicle idling, and higher levels of noise and air pollution for nearby residents. The proposal is also likely to have a detrimental impact on public transport. Ladbroke Grove is an important route for several bus services that are relied upon daily by residents travelling to work, school, medical appointments, and other essential destinations. Additional stopping points and traffic delays will inevitably affect bus reliability and journey times, making commuting more difficult for those who depend on public transport. I am also concerned about the impact on parking provision in the area. Parking around Blenheim Crescent is already extremely limited, and as a Blue Badge holder I frequently find it difficult to locate suitable parking spaces. The introduction of a pedestrian crossing is likely to require the removal of additional parking bays, further reducing accessibility for disabled residents and visitors. Any loss of parking would have a disproportionate impact on those with mobility challenges. I have written to the Council on several occasions regarding this matter and remain unconvinced that there is a compelling need for a new crossing at this location. There are already multiple opportunities for pedestrians to cross safely in the immediate vicinity. Kensington Park Road is pedestrianised, Portobello Road is heavily pedestrian-focused, and controlled pedestrian crossings already exist at the traffic lights on Ladbroke Grove at both Elgin Crescent and Westbourne Park Road. Given the existing pedestrian infrastructure, it is difficult to see how the proposed crossing would provide sufficient additional benefit to justify its cost and the disruption it would cause. At a time when local authority budgets are under significant pressure, I believe taxpayers' money would be better spent on projects that address more pressing community needs and deliver a clearer public benefit. I would therefore ask the Council to reconsider this proposal and to publish the evidence supporting it, including any pedestrian demand assessments, traffic impact studies, bus network impact assessments, parking loss analysis, and safety data that demonstrate a clear need for a crossing at this location. I respectfully request that the Council carefully consider the impact this proposal would have on traffic congestion, public transport reliability, local residents, disabled parking provision, and value for money before proceeding.
2	Ladbroke Grove is a major through route and traffic turning onto it. There is a 20mph speed restriction in place which calms the traffic sufficiently for pedestrians to cross at all junctions. The lights at the junction just north of the proposed parallel crossing further slow the traffic. At peak times the traffic backs up as far as Elgin Crescent. The experiment at closing St Marks Road to allow school drop off and pick up at Thomas Jones Primary School created what can only be described as traffic chaos - jamming Ladbroke Grove and as traffic was forced onto the main road from the side road. It proves that the best way to ensure good air quality and to prevent log jam in the area is to allow traffic to circulate

	freely. I therefore strongly oppose the addition of the parallel crossing which will: 1. serve little purpose in assisting pedestrians to cross the road 2. takes no account of the current provision for pedestrians which is more than adequate 3. impede the smooth circulation of traffic 3. promote poor traffic circulation
3	I regularly use the islands for crossing the road and feel totally safe with them. Also it does not interrupt the traffic flow as you can choose when to cross. This road gets a lot of traffic and if both sides have to stop frequently to let people cross the road it will increase congestion and air pollution. Free flowing traffic should be encouraged, not inhibited like on the narrowed road separating Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. I would not want to have to cross the road in one go, I wouldn't feel safe. Nor would I like to share parts of the pavement with cyclists. I have been a cyclist in the past and always found that junction fine. I am now 75 years old.
4	the road should not be narrowed but to have an island. I am 88 and us oldie's much prefer islands. It is obvious that the proposal in and of itself is over complicated. Keep things simple and cost effective.
5	My view is that this is, firstly, an unnecessary waste of money. There's no need for it. I think that this money would be better spent policing the bike hire pollution plaguing this area. There is a bike hire park on the junction of Blenheim Crescent and Ladbroke Grove which would be fine if it was restricted to docked bikes, i.e. Santander but now that we have Lime and other rental bikes increasingly causing obstructions on both the road and the footpaths both there and many other places in the area causing congestion and inconvenience to pedestrians and motorists alike. One morning last year I found four Lime bikes parked at the foot of the outside steps to my house blocking access and was forced to move them out of the way. I am a 70 year old with severe health issues. RBKC should also prioritise policing cyclists, many of whom ignore the laws and rules of the road cycling along footpaths, the wrong way down one-way streets and ignoring traffic lights etc. I also noticed that the footpaths will be extended further into the road on all four corners of the junction making it even more difficult and dangerous for vehicles and other road users to navigate which will cause even more congestion and pollution. I do not accept that there is a logical argument for the proposed project and it will simply piss everyone off; residents, pedestrians and road users alike. Let's get our priorities straight and put idealistic policies to one side? I look forward to your comments.
6	1) Ill thought through by someone youngish agile from behind a desk. 2)Bikes , increasing numbers electric- go at speed. Ridden by the careless/ novice. Dangerous enough as is esp for the no longer agile/ disabled, temporarily or permanently. 3) Need to deal simultaneously with 2 directions of traffic not changed by a shorter crossing with no welcome safe midway halt. Especially important on a busy road such as Ladbroke Grove. 4) I sincerely hope this is squashed, the safety of less agile pedestrians considered. You must have better things to spend our money on.

7	From my experience (as a former cyclist, driver and now pedestrian and public transport user) this will be a hindrance, rather than make an improvement, to that junction. I can't see how it will benefit cyclists who won't use it properly. This area is highly populated with Electric Bike users and 'tourist' cyclists who, sadly, either disregard or don't understand, the street markings and who are not likely to comply. (Thankfully there are still some cyclists - usually on non-electric bikes, who do comply with the Highway Code but these are safe anyway). I don't think it will be useful for pedestrians either who are normally on the north pavement in Elgin Crescent as they approach Ladbroke Grove or who use the bus stop on that pavement to pick up the (increasingly less frequent!) number 52 and 23 buses. Furthermore, we do not need anymore traffic markings, or street furniture. We need more trees and I think it's worth saying (though probably not your concern) we need the 452 bus reinstated!
8	I submitted an earlier response to this consultation in support of the proposal. On reflection, and as both a daily cyclist and a resident living on this junction, I would like to revise my comments. Please treat this as my considered position. I strongly support the Council's active travel objectives. It is precisely because I want better conditions for cycling that I am concerned this particular design will not deliver them, and may make things worse. My main objection is the conversion of the corner footways to shared use. This runs against national design guidance LTN 1/20, which states that pedestrian and cycle movements should be separated, that converting footways to shared use should be a last resort only after carriageway options have been rejected, and that shared use should not be used in streets with high pedestrian flows. Ladbroke Grove at this junction is exactly such a street. Government funding guidance also carries a presumption that schemes meet LTN 1/20 standards. My specific concerns: 1. Forcing cyclists onto the pavement creates conflict with pedestrians and is a poor, indirect provision: weaving up a dropped kerb, across, and back down fails the 'direct' principle in LTN 1/20. 2. The crossing only assists the east to west movement and makes other cyclist movements through the junction more awkward. The design does not appear to reflect the actual desire lines of cyclists or pedestrians here. 3. Removing the pedestrian refuges on both sides reduces safety for pedestrians, particularly disabled and visually-impaired people, older residents, and parents with children a relevant consideration under the Public Sector Equality Duty. Anecdotally my feeling is that demand to cross is, if anything, higher on the north side. 4. This is currently an approach to Ladbroke Grove without signals, so traffic flows freely, which already creates frustration and noise pollution from motorists. I worry a zebra style crossing, plus lane narrowing would exacerbate frequent stop start, increasing acceleration, braking and horn use at this junction. As a resident I already experience significant noise here, and this risks worsening both noise and local air quality, contrary to

	the scheme's stated air quality aims. I would ask whether this net effect has been modelled, and would be keen for this to be shared with residents. Please see none of this as opposition to cycling provision the opposite. I am keen to reverse the boroughs historical resistance to cycle infrastructure (considered one of London cycle campaigns problem boroughs) , so I would be glad to support a scheme here, and what would win my support is straightforward: keep the principle of a safe, priority crossing of Ladbroke Grove, but drop the shared use footway elements and keep cyclists on the carriageway with proper approach treatment; retain the pedestrian refuges, especially on the north side; and design the cycle approaches around the movements people actually make. It would help to see the pedestrian and cyclist counts and desire line analysis underpinning the current design, which I would ask the Council to publish.
9	I am a cyclist and have cycled in London for 40 years. I have lived in Blenheim Crescent for 35 years. It seems to me the proposed measures are counter-productive, will be obstructive to all road and pavement users, and will actually prove to be hazardous. First, I believe pedestrians prefer to have the central island since it allows people to cross in their own time, as they judge fit, and you only have to check (look) one way at a time when you cross. If you are crossing both carriageways at once you simply must keep an eye both ways all the time since not all vehicles adhere to the rules and you have to err on the side of caution. The fact that the crossing is next to a junction makes this hazard all the more real because drivers on the main road can be easily distracted by activity in the side road – and they can't watch in all directions at once any more than anyone else can. I also think pedestrians and cyclists on the same crossing just invites conflict. Half the time (a statistical necessity if you think about it) the pedestrians will want, and need, to cross the path of the cyclist. Necessarily there will be accidents. This indicates bad road layout and design. Indeed many cyclists are reluctant to go on any pavement (not only does it go against the grain, but cyclists view pedestrians as ultra-unpredictable – a hazard inviting collision by some random change of direction/pattern of walking). In any case, most experienced cyclist will go straight across (although if traffic has stopped at zebra-style markings, it creates a hazard when a motor bike comes along the outside of the lane unseen (e.g. next to a van) – oops, and two bodies hit the deck! And worse to come because: the proposed new buildouts on Ladbroke Grove would reduce the carriageway for all cyclists, forcing them to swerve into, and in front, of moving traffic, and inevitably there will be accidents. The buildout creates a hazard that did not previously exist. If it is a zebra/pelican style crossing, it also means that traffic will stop, instead of people using common sense and judgment to time their crossing, which in turn will burn more fuel, produce more brake dust, cause more congestion, and raise blood pressure. Obviously the proposal means well, but it is designed without due consideration or experience of the real world. If implemented it would do everyone a disservice. The

	accidents that will happen there will be entirely unnecessary and the finger of blame would surely point directly at those advocating the scheme.
10	I am a cyclist and a pedestrian and feel that this intervention is over engineered and unnecessary. Too much street clutter and cost for very marginal gain for inexperienced cyclists. I like central islands as they provide a refuge on busy crossings. But if you want to get rid of one that is dangerous the one at the east end of Ladbroke Square in Kensington Park Road makes the road too narrow and I have been nearly killed there by buses trying to squeeze through at the same time. A more important improvement of routes for cyclists is the connection out of the north side of Kensington gardens onto the side road of Bark Place.
11	Not necessary. It will confuse drivers, walkers and cyclists alike. A lot of residents in Blenheim Crescent actually feel the road should be one way to slow the mess created by people abandoning lime and other bikes and the narrow entrance to Blenheim Crescent. Either the traffic is heavy in which case cars already stop to allow crossing or it is not busy and it's ok for people to cross easily. Thank you for the idea but not supported by the people really affected. Please revisit the one way option which would significantly help all of us. Thank you or your help.
12	As a cyclist, using Ladbroke Grove and Blenheim Crescent every day, I see little or no need for this. The crossing does not seem heavily used by cyclists. And I don't like the idea of the narrowing of Ladbroke Grove which might force cyclists into the traffic. My experience of bicycling in London (over 40 years) is that cyclists and pedestrians do not mix. There will always be enough aggressive and inconsiderate cyclists to disrupt any plan, and to bully and instill fear in pedestrians - even if most cyclists behave OK (and I'm no longer sure about that). Cyclists are really quite unlikely to use the crossing - they don't like to deviate, except when it suits them, when a large proportion of them will go wherever they like, as we know. They shouldn't be encouraged to leave the carriageway, and should be kept off pavements at all costs. I also think the work involved will cause a lot of unnecessary and probably lengthy disruption in Ladbroke Grove. Driving in London is difficult enough without yet more roadworks on this arterial route. There are many better ways to use the money we pay in council tax than this scheme.
13	I object to the proposal firstly on safety grounds. The proposal will unnecessarily, and at considerable unnecessary cost, endanger pedestrians by removing essential crossing islands south and north of the Ladbroke Grove/Blenheim Crescent junction; pedestrians, including the elderly and those with prams and buggies, hugely rely on, and seek out, central islands for safe crossing on an extremely busy stretch of Ladbroke Grove, where traffic is often coming fast - and, importantly, coming fast downhill in one direction - and vehicles, motorbikes, mopeds and cyclists routinely speed. The islands should remain as a vital safety feature for pedestrians, who seem to come last on the Council's priorities for sustainable travel, despite the fact that pedestrianism is the most sustainable form of transport. The proposal is not only unnecessary, it sets a dangerous and irresponsible precedent for pavement sharing by cyclists, who can, and do, cause serious injury to pedestrians when illegally riding on pavements, not to mention catastrophic injuries, including those caused to a child, with a £20m payout, by motorised vehicles, e-bikes and e-scooters that RBKC is promoting. It is not made clear in the RBKC proposal whether the pavement sharing by cyclists includes pavement sharing by rental e-bikes and e-scooters, and/or private e-bikes and e-scooters that can be made to exceed the 15.5 miles per hour speed of rental equivalents. The BBC announced this week huge increases in payouts for accidents involving e-bikes and e-scooters. It is not clear on the RBKC proposal plan whether the proposed shared crossing is supported by pedestrian/cyclist traffic lights, and the existing junction traffic lights do not appear to be shown on the plan. There may well

	be confusion at the crossings between pedestrians and cyclists. What about safety issues on proposed pavement sharing with cyclists when there are young children and or dogs being walked at the junction? The proposal is unnecessary, ill-conceived, and an unnecessary waste of financial resources. Similarly problematic in practical terms is the proposal for widening the pavement/pavement build-out on Ladbroke Grove and Blenheim Crescent, is at corner turn junction for bus routes on both sides of Blenheim Crescent/Ladbroke Grove. This will potentially impede bus turning, slowing traffic on Ladbroke Grove, causing traffic back-up, unnecessary increased congestion and consequential air pollution, and the increased congestion may in turn potentially detrimentally impact response times for emergency services vehicles which routinely rely on Ladbroke Grove as a vital conduit, including the London Fire Brigade station on Ladbroke Grove. Ditto for the proposed 'Introduction of short sections of painted advisory cycle lane on Ladbroke Grove to help cyclists'. What does this mean for traffic lanes and potential increased vehicle congestion, which has an economic and air pollution knock-on? What is RBKC doing for pedestrians? This proposal should be stopped.
14	To whom this may concern !! I am disabled my bay and flat are on the corner of Blenheim Crescent and Ladbroke Grove. This will dramatically increase the risks, danger and accidents if this was to go ahead! Not only we day and night have to endure increasing numbers of rude tourists treating our area as an amusement park, rubbish dump and criminality adding the noise level of more and more Police Ambulance Fire engines but worse of them all are the also increasing amount of dangerous abusive Deliveroo, UberEats scooter riders who literally are scaring car drivers and pedestrians you want on top of all this add cyclists and people who can't ride a bike? Kensington Park Road has been blocked for over 2 and half years now can you please realise what you are trying to do? Making us, life long residents an absolutely nightmare of a daily existence! I am scheduling a meeting with our MP and also have written to other departments at the council!
15	I am a regular cyclist, motorbike rider and car driver who lives and works on the junction of Ladbroke Grove and Ladbroke Road (since 2010 and in Notting Hill generally for almost 40 years). I have yet to see a cyclist making use of the existing cycle crossings in the area and therefore conclude there isn't much evidence to support the cost of doing the works proposed for the parallel crossing on Ladbroke Grove (at the junction with Blenheim Crescent). Even if this were not the case, please can we reduce the extent that the pavement eats into the carriageway (see point 3 below) and surely it is much preferable to maintain the island which allows for a staged crossing of the road. More generally I would like to propose the following principles be fundamental whenever considering any schemes relating to the interplay between pedestrians, cyclists and road traffic: 1. We should keep pedestrians away from cyclists, and cyclists away from cars (to the extent that this is possible without causing undue road congestion). 2. Cyclists belong on the road or in cycle lanes where available (not the pavement and not pedestrian crossings either!). 3. Narrowing the carriageway (e.g. by widening the pavement when rebuilding existing crossings) is probably the MOST dangerous thing they can do to cyclists because it reduces the ability to keep cyclists away from cars! Finally, may I also comment on the increasing number of separated two-way cycle lanes

	which run along one side of an existing road/carriageway. These may seem to enhance cycling infrastructure (although they cost the earth and add to road congestion and therefore fumes breathed in by out of breath cyclists) but they pose significant safety risks. When vehicles have to turn across these lanes, they often have limited visibility of oncoming cyclists from both directions, increasing the likelihood of accidents. Many thanks for your consideration of these comments.
--	---

Support in part

1	I am a cyclist, My support is limited to having a pedestrian crossing for walkers but no other changes . I think that in the round the proposal makes life more dangerous for cyclists because for those cyclists using Ladbroke Grove the proposal to widen the pavement at this point and therefore narrow the road is potentially dangerous. This is because those cyclists using Ladbroke Grove are therefore forced towards the centre of the road and into the path of other following vehicles. This is particularly dangerous for the wider cycles used to ferry children which are slow (unlike electric bikes which go at the same speed as cars). My view is that it is much safer for everyone if the usable road is kept the same width all along Ladbroke Grove as far as possible. With regard to cyclists crossing Ladbroke Grove, the proposal adds nothing in that they will take advantage of stopped traffic caused by the zebra crossing whether or not they are allowed to use the crossing itself. I note that the other zebra crossing further north along Ladbroke Grove do not have any special arrangement for bicycles and seem to work fine. It is much better that we make it clear to cyclists that they are expected to use the road at all times. Further encouraging bikes including electrified 25+kg bikes onto the pavement for any reason is ridiculous when the pavements are already fully taken up by heavy pedestrian traffic.
2	I think it is a good idea as this junction is dangerous. However I am concerned that the parallel crossing where it will be located will mean that some cars driving on Ladbroke grove from the South would suddenly break to let a pedestrian cross, thereby blocking the access to/ from Blenheim crescent (west part). It might be good to add either a "Keep clear" marking or a Zig Zag marking at the junction of Ladbroke grove and Blenheim Crescent
3	Pedestrian crossing is a great idea but please consider the traffic complications on the already busy Ladbroke Grove. Vehicles coming from Holland Park turning right to Blenheim Cr might block the traffic on Ladbroke Grove. If the ability to turn right is removed, it will result in more traffic on the Westbourne Park/Ladbroke Gr traffic light, which doesn't allow any time for the vehicles turning right and only one can cross each time. I would also consider more pedestrian crosses at the Blenheim Cr and Kensington Park Rd crossing, which is much busier.
4	This is a busy junction because Ladbroke Grove - Blenheim Crescent - St Marks Road - St Quentins Avenue is a vehicle "rat run" to by-pass heavy Ladbroke Grove traffic. Consequently there is a heavy traffic flow between Ladbroke Grove and Blenheim Crescent. This is particularly undesirable because this "rat run" passes immediately adjacent to Thomas

	Jones Primary School, where the playground is exposed to a high level of vehicle exhaust particles.
--	---

	Please consider discouraging this "rat run" by one way systems that prevent through traffic - as has been done successfully around the Clarendon Road area.
--	---