

OFFICER DECISION
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAY AND REGULATORY SERVICES
5 AUGUST 2026
CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE PROPOSAL TO
INTRODUCE TWO-WAY CYCLING IN THE SECTION OF PAVILION ROAD
BETWEEN HANS CRESCENT AND BASIL STREET.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 In June and July 2026, the Council consulted on a proposal to introduce two-way cycling in the northernmost section of Pavilion Road between Hans Crescent and Basil Street. This report considers the responses received and makes a recommendation on how to proceed.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 After considering the responses received to the consultation, officers recommend that the Director for Highway and Regulatory Services proceed with introduction of two-way cycling in the section of Pavilion Road between Hans Crescent and Basil Street, with one proposed amendment as set out in paragraph 5.3 subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 From 1 June to 12 July 2026, the Council undertook consultation on introducing two-way cycling in the northernmost section of Pavilion Road between Hans Crescent and Basil Street. The proposals can be viewed [here](#). Introducing two-way cycling here would mean that the entire length of Pavilion Road could be used in both directions for cyclists, providing a low-traffic alternative to Sloane Street. A total of 865 households living near the proposal received letters sign-posting them to the consultation hosted on the Council's Consultation and Engagement hub. Five responses were received; three in support and two objections. The responses received are set out in full in Appendix 1.

4. CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

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

Table 1: Officers' responses to issues raised by respondents

Reason for objection	Officer response
The road is too narrow and will hinder other vehicles.	The width of a street is not the sole consideration when proposing two-way cycling schemes. For example, a mews

	street may be exceptionally narrow, but as traffic flows and speeds are typically very low, the probability of a cyclist and vehicle coming into conflict is also very low. And so, introducing two-way cycling in that street would provide significant benefits at relatively low risk. This section of Pavilion Road is not highly trafficked and the proposals include a splitter island at the junction with Basil Street, to protect cyclists where vehicles are turning into Pavilion Road. Where a cyclist has right of way – for example where parking is on the eastern side – and a driver must give way, it is expected this would be for moments and not cause undue delay to the low number of vehicle movements here.
Cyclists, especially hire cycle scheme users, do as they like with no consideration to other road users and traffic laws.	Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit abusive behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to provide facilities for cycling, in the same way the Council would not refuse to provide roads or car parking because a small minority of people who drive contravene traffic laws.
Introducing two-way cycling would be hazardous to pedestrians and motorists and would promote electric e-scooters to use this route.	The scheme would be clearly signed and road markings including short sections of cycle lane at the junctions will indicate to all road users to expect cyclists. It is unclear why this particular proposal would encourage e-scooter use on this route. As privately owned e-scooters remain illegal, they are not included in the exemption for cyclists in two-way cycle schemes and remain motor vehicles in law. The number of journeys made by rental e-scooters permitted under the DfT's trial remain very low.

5. COMMENT FROM THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE (MPS)

- 5.1 The MPS asked that splitter islands be considered at both ends of the proposals to protect cyclists from vehicles entering and emerging at the

junctions with Hans Crescent and Basil Street, concerned that vehicles turning the corner from Basil Street into Pavillion Road are likely to cut the corner into the path of oncoming cyclists creating conflict and a risk of collisions.

- 5.2 The proposals already include a splitter island to protect cyclists at the junction with Basil Street. The Hans Crescent end of the proposal is not wide enough to accommodate a splitter island, but as cyclists have right of way turning in here and do not need to wait to give-way as they may need to do at the northern end, officers believe a splitter island is not necessary. The Road Safety Audit Stage 1 did not propose an additional island at this location.
- 5.3 However, to provide more space for a vehicle and cyclist to occupy the Hans Crescent end of the scheme, officer recommend shortening the resident parking bay north of Hans Crescent by three metres.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The scheme is expected to cost £30k to implement. These funds have been secured from TfL as part of the Council's Local Implementation Plan allocation.

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

Objection

1	The road is too small and it would hinder further the car traffic which should be able to move out of Basil Str. down Pavilion Road. The Cycling Parking on the corner of the 2 streets is out of control, not properly policed and enforced. It should be abolished or the very least reduced. Our problem is Cyclist who do as they like, no consideration to other road users and traffic laws. On the later point the problem is anyway inexperienced users of the hire cycle schemes they often have no road experience/sense and do not seem to have any idea about UK traffic rules.
2	Hazardous to pedestrians and motorists alike. Also promote electric e- shooters to use this route

Support

1	As a long term resident of the borough, I use my bicycle to get around. Any scheme to improve the facilities for cyclists is to be encouraged and supported.
2	[No comment received]
3	[No comment received]