

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Results of the public consultation on road humps on Ladbroke Square and
Ladbroke Terrace

Report by the Transport Projects Team

24 September 2025

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This paper summarises the responses received to the recent public consultation proposing to introduce sinusoidal road humps in Ladbroke Square and Ladbroke Terrace following a successful Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) bid.
- 1.2. This paper is not concerned with scheme justification. Nonetheless, for clarity £40,000 as awarded by way of Executive Decision ED06221/22/W/A in relation to the Round 3 NCIL Allocation for PB10, Traffic Measures Ladbroke Square Garden - South Gate access. In June 2025, the Residents' Association that made the NCIL application agreed with officers and ward councillors that the funding would be used to progress road hump schemes on Ladbroke Square and Ladbroke Terrace.

2. Consultation Information

- 2.1. Following a successful application by the Ladbroke Square Gardens Residents' Association for NCIL funding to introduce traffic calming in both Ladbroke Square and Ladbroke Terrace, the Council consulted local residents on the proposed scheme.
- 2.2. The proposal was to install nine sinusoidal road humps: five in Ladbroke Square and four in Ladbroke Terrace.
- 2.3. Details of the consultation can be found here:
<https://consult.rbkc.gov.uk/communities/ladbroke-square-and-ladbroke-terrace/>
- 2.4. The consultation ran for six weeks between 16 June and 27 July 2025.
- 2.5. Letters were delivered to 413 addresses in the vicinity of the proposals.
- 2.6. There were 169 responses to the consultation, 168 using the online survey and one via email.

3. Consultation Results – Ladbroke Square

- 3.1. Eighty-eight of the respondents (52 per cent) supported the installation of road humps on **Ladbroke Square**, eight (five per cent) supported the proposals in part, 68 (40 per cent) of the respondents objected and five (three per cent) had no opinion.

- 3.2. One hundred and forty-six (86 per cent) of the total respondents provided a postcode in Pembridge ward. Of those responding with a Pembridge ward postcode, 75 supported the proposals in **Ladbroke Square**, eight of them supported in part, 58 objected and five had no opinion.
- 3.3. All the responses are provided in Appendix 1.
- 3.4. The main reasons given for supporting the scheme were:
- It will slow vehicles down and reduce inconsiderate driving (raised by 21 respondents); and
 - It will improve road safety (raised by 16 respondents).
- 3.5. Summaries of the main reasons for objecting, as well as their frequency, are set out in Table 1. Some of the objectors cited more than one reason for objecting. Officers' responses to the objections are included in the table. An asterisk denotes comments made by those who supported the proposals in part.

Table 1 - Summary of objections to traffic calming on Ladbroke Square

Summary of Objections (for Ladbroke Square)		Qty.
1.	<p>Road humps are not the right solution. An alternative is needed, such as changing the road to one-way, blocking the road or installing pedestrian crossings.</p> <p><i>Two respondents who fully supported the proposals and one who stated they had 'no opinion' also made this comment.</i></p>	25 (1*)
<p>Prior to the consultation on road humps, some residents had expressed support for one-way working on Ladbroke Square. To ensure that the borough's road network operates efficiently for movement and offers good connectivity, the Council's presumption is against introducing traffic restrictions designed to remove traffic from streets. Examples include one-way restrictions, banned turns, and no entry points. To maintain as much permeability as possible on all our roads, the Council does not support the displacement of traffic from one residential borough road to another, unless one or more of the criteria below are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support a scheme offering benefits beyond the directly affected road. Examples could include supporting a cycle route or street market or a street improvement scheme, as part of the Council's "Amazing Spaces" programme. • The road is too narrow for two-way traffic (resulting in frequent 'stand-offs' or damage to parked vehicles). • To protect our historic (cobble) mews streets with no or limited footways from heavy flows of traffic. <p>In addition, the Council would consider measures to prevent borough roads being used as a cut-through, when these would re-direct traffic only onto a Red Route.</p> <p>None of the above conditions are met for Ladbroke Square so the Council has no plans to develop or consult on new traffic restrictions in this area.</p>		

<p>Making a street one-way is not a solution to a problem of speeding; indeed, it is usual for average speeds to increase if a road is made one-way.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossings are not a solution to concerns regarding speeding. The cost of a new crossing exceeds the available NCIL funding, so new crossings are not being considered as part of this consultation.</p>		
2.	<p>The changes are a waste of money (or not required) and the money should be spent elsewhere.</p> <p><i>One respondent who stated they had 'no opinion' also made this comment.</i></p>	12
<p>NCIL funding is ring-fenced to schemes proposed by local residents. In this case the application was made by a resident of Ladbroke Square. The application was reviewed and approved by ward councillors, subject to the outcome of the consultation.</p> <p>If this traffic calming scheme does not go ahead after consultation, the remaining funds will be returned to Pembridge ward's NCIL allocation for the next round of NCIL applications.</p>		
3.	<p>The changes will not be effective at slowing traffic or preventing people using the road as a cut-through.</p> <p><i>One respondent who stated they had 'no opinion' also made this comment.</i></p>	11
<p>In March 2023, speed monitoring revealed that 20% of vehicles on the western side of Ladbroke Square were travelling above 25mph, while 18% exceeded this speed on the eastern side. Traffic surveys on similar residential roads with newly installed road humps show that 15% of drivers exceed 21 mph.</p> <p>Less traffic is not the aim of the scheme. Traffic calming may discourage some drivers from using Ladbroke Square as a cut through, but there is unlikely to be a significant reduction in the volume of traffic.</p>		
4.	<p>The road humps will increase vehicle noise and air pollution.</p> <p><i>One respondent who stated they had 'no opinion' also made this comment.</i></p>	9 (2*)
<p>The Council is proposing to install sinusoidal road humps, which have a smoother profile than standard round-topped road humps. Sinusoidal road humps have been shown to be significantly quieter than standard round-topped road humps and they are also more comfortable to pass over, when driving at an appropriate speed. However, commercial traffic with loose loads may still generate some noise when travelling over the road humps.</p> <p>With regards to the concern that the humps may encourage drivers to brake heavily then accelerate hard at each hump, the humps are spaced less than 60 metres apart, as recommended by national guidance for roads with a 20 mph speed limit. Keeping the spacing between the humps at less than 60 metres encourages drivers to maintain a consistent speed, rather than accelerating and braking between each hump.</p> <p>In 2001 the Transport Research Laboratory published a report into the findings of a three-year study investigating the impacts of traffic calming measures on vehicle</p>		

exhaust emissions. It concluded that while road humps may increase exhaust emissions, the dis-benefits are offset by reductions in vehicle speeds and improved road safety. It also concluded that in most cases road humps are installed on relatively low trafficked residential roads (as is the case for Ladbroke Square), so any increase in exhaust emissions is unlikely to reduce air quality to an unacceptable level.

We acknowledge the TRL report is 24 years old but since its publication 20mph speed limits have been widely adopted across London and the sinusoidal road hump design is much more common. Those factors mean it is unlikely that the emissions from vehicles would have increased since the time of the report.

Most studies agree that the effect of slower speeds on exhaust emissions depends on the vehicle type, the nature of the road and driving style. The proposed road humps are spaced and shaped to encourage a steady driving speed and minimise accelerating and braking (two of the significant causes of increased emissions). A steady driving speed, with minimal acceleration and braking results in lower emissions.

5.	The road humps are restrictive to traffic and will cause more congestion.	8
----	---	---

Similar traffic calming schemes show that road humps slow traffic to an average 85th percentile speed of around 21mph. Road humps do not cause drivers to come to a complete stop, so assuming drivers are observing the 20mph speed limit, the humps will not cause any noticeable delays.

6.	Road humps are ugly and will detract from the aesthetic appeal of Ladbroke Square. <i>One respondent who stated they had 'no opinion' also made this comment.</i>	4
----	--	---

The Council must often balance the safety of residents and visitors with the visual impact of interventions on-street. The road humps will be visible along the road and combined with the additional road markings some people may feel that the road is less attractive. Of 169 people who responded to the consultation, only four of them raised the visual appearance of the road humps as a concern, so officers conclude that it is not a compelling reason to abandon the scheme.

7.	The humps will cause more wear and tear to vehicles or may damage them.	3
----	---	---

TRL research evidences that vehicles are only damaged by road humps if their drivers traverse them at a speed somewhat higher than the 20mph speed limit.

The Council has had one claim made against it since 2020 for damage to a vehicle which the claimant stated was caused by passing over a sinusoidal road hump. The claim was unsuccessful and rejected.

8.	Road humps will be uncomfortable or cause problems for cyclists.	2
----	--	---

This is not the case; these road humps will have a sinusoidal profile which gives a more comfortable ride for cyclists than regular round topped humps.

9.	Introduce a scheme which improves air quality.	1 (1*)
<p>See response to item 1, in table 1.</p> <p>A traffic reduction scheme is outside of the scope of this consultation.</p>		
10.	<p>Install speed cameras.</p> <p><i>One respondent who fully supported the proposals also made this comment.</i></p>	1
<p>The council has no powers to install speed cameras or enforce speed limits. Only the Metropolitan Police Service, in partnership with Transport for London, can enforce speed limits by camera. They only deploy speed cameras in response to a history of people having been injured in collisions in which excess speed was a factor. This criterion is not met in Ladbroke Square.</p>		
11.	Large vehicles cause congestion problems along the road and should be banned.	1
<p>See response to item 1, in table 1.</p> <p>An HGV ban is outside the scope of this consultation.</p>		
12.	The road humps will cause problems for the emergency services.	1
<p>The emergency services were informed of the consultation and they have not raised any objections to the traffic calming proposals.</p>		
Summary of comments from ‘support in part’ responses (Ladbroke Square)		Qty.
13.	There are too many road humps, and/or they are not required on the eastern section of Ladbroke Square (east of Ladbroke Terrace).	0 (3*)
<p>The number of road humps proposed in the consultation is a consequence of following national design guidance that road humps be spaced at no more than 60 to 70 metres apart on roads with a 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>It is not good practice to introduce road humps halfway along a stretch of road, so we would not consider installing road humps on only half of Ladbroke Square.</p>		
14.	<p>Changes or traffic calming should be considered on Kensington Park Road.</p> <p><i>One respondent who fully supported the proposals also made this comment.</i></p>	0 (1*)
<p>Changes on Kensington Park Road are outside the scope of this consultation. Also, as Kensington Park Road is part of a bus route, TfL would object to a road hump scheme along that road.</p>		

15.	The road humps will make it harder to park.	0 (1*)
The road humps will cover the full width of the road (other than a small gap by the kerb to allow for drainage), and they are relatively low (75mm high at most), so they should not cause any significant difficulties for cars parking in the parallel parking bays. When placing the humps we avoid motorcycle bays, as the profile of the hump could make parked motorcycles unstable.		
16.	Add double yellow lines to the north side of Ladbroke Square, to prevent people parking and loitering by the gardens. <i>One respondent who fully supported the proposals raised this comment.</i>	0
Parking changes are outside of the scope of this consultation.		
17.	The road needs resurfacing. <i>One respondent who fully supported the proposals raised this comment.</i>	0
The road will not be fully resurfaced as part of this scheme. Each year our highway maintenance team inspects all the roads in the borough and identifies which ones require resurfacing in the next year's maintenance programme. We will confirm with our Highways Team whether either of these roads are due to be resurfaced, to ensure any resurfacing works are integrated with the construction of the road humps.		
18.	Install a raised crossing hump and/or footway buildout outside the garden entrance near Ladbroke Square. Also consider a pedestrian crossing here. <i>Three respondents who fully supported the proposals also made this comment.</i>	0
The proposed road humps stop slightly short of the footway, to allow for drainage. Installing a raised table with a flat top would introduce considerable additional cost due to the drainage implications. The cost of a new crossing exceeds the available NCIL funding, so new crossings are not being considered as part of this consultation.		

4. Consultation Results – Ladbroke Terrace

- 4.1. Ninety of the respondents (53 per cent) supported the installation of road humps on **Ladbroke Terrace**, four (two per cent) supported the proposals in part, 74 (44 per cent) of the respondents objected and one (one per cent) had no opinion.
- 4.2. Of those responding with a Pembridge ward postcode, 78 supported the proposals in **Ladbroke Terrace**, three of them supported in part and 65 objected.
- 4.3. All the responses are provided in Appendix 1.

4.4. The main reasons given for supporting the scheme were:

- It will slow vehicles down and reduce inconsiderate driving (raised by 16 respondents); and
- It will improve road safety (raised by 12 respondents).

4.5. A summary of the main reasons for objecting, as well as their frequency, are set out in Table 2. Some of the objectors cited more than one reason for objecting. Officers' responses to the objections are included in the table. An asterisk denotes comments made by those who didn't object to the proposal but did raise that particular issue. Most of the reasons for objecting to road humps in Ladbroke Terrace mirror those given for objecting to road humps in Ladbroke Square.

Table 2 - Summary of objections to traffic calming on Ladbroke Terrace

Summary of Objections (for Ladbroke Terrace)		Qty.
1.	Road humps are not the right solution. An alternative is needed, such as changing the road to one-way, blocking the road or installing pedestrian crossings. <i>Two respondents who fully supported the proposals also made this comment.</i>	22
See response to Table 1, Item 1.		
2.	The changes are a waste of money (or not required) and the money should be spent elsewhere.	15 (2*)
See response to Table 1, Item 2.		
3.	The road humps will increase vehicle noise and air pollution.	13
See response to Table 1, Item 4.		
4.	The road humps a restrictive to traffic and will cause more congestion, and the congestion is caused by large vehicles, which should be banned.	12
See response to Table 1, Items 5 and 11.		
5.	The changes will not be effective at slowing traffic or preventing people using the road as a cut-through.	7
See response to Table 1, Item 3.		
6.	Road humps are ugly and will detract from the aesthetic appeal of Ladbroke Square.	7
See response to Table 1, Item 6.		

7.	The humps will cause more wear and tear to vehicles or may damage them.	3
See response to Table 1, Item 7.		
8.	Road humps will be uncomfortable or cause problems for cyclists.	2
See response to Table 1, Item 8.		
9.	Install speed cameras.	1
See response to Table 1, Item 10.		
10.	The road humps will cause problems for the emergency services.	1
See response to item 12, table 1.		
11.	Make the 20mph signs more obvious.	1
<p>The Council's streetscape policy is to keep unnecessary signage to a minimum. In line with this policy, the 20mph repeater signs are painted on the road, rather than being installed on new posts on the footway.</p> <p>Ladbroke Terrace has 20mph repeater markings at its northern and southern ends. If the traffic calming scheme does not go ahead, officers will consider additional 20mph markings near the Ladbroke Road junction.</p>		
12.	Ensure the humps aren't installed too close to Ladbroke Walk <i>One respondent who fully supported the proposals made this comment.</i>	0
The road humps either side of Ladbroke Walk will be at least 10 metres from the junction.		

5. Finance

- 5.1 £40,000 was awarded by way of Executive Decision ED06221/22/W/A in relation to the Round 3 NCIL Allocation for PB10, Traffic Measures Ladbroke Square Garden - South Gate access.
- 5.2 £1,100 has been spent to date on traffic surveys and consultation costs. Implementation of the nine road humps is estimated at £22,000. Any remaining NCIL funding will be returned to the Pembridge ward NCIL allocation.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1. Following consideration of all comments received, Officers recommend to the Director of Highway and Regulatory Services that the traffic calming schemes on Ladbroke Square and Ladbroke Terrace should both proceed.

- 6.2. Councils are required to give statutory notice of road humps before construction. Officers would arrange this prior to construction.