

Freedom of Information Act Publication Scheme	
Protective Marking	CONFIDENTIAL – not for wider circulation
Publication Scheme Y/N	N
Title	Phillimore Walk Cycling Access
Version	09/03/22
Summary	This note summarises the responses received to the Phillimore Walk Cycling Access consultation.
Author	Caroline Dubarbier – Sustainable Travel Manager
Circulated to	Cllr Thalassites
Response by	
Summary of response	

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Enabling more cycling is one of the Council’s transport objectives, and is a key tool in reducing poor air quality and congestion. Making cycle trips safer is part of the solution to providing alternatives to motor vehicle trips.
- 1.2. The Council has a good history of delivering on Cycleways (and the formerly named ‘Quietways’) on quieter streets, as well as introducing two-way cycling in one-way streets and pedestrian and cycle only cut-throughs that provide valuable connections for cyclists.
- 1.3. For most of its length, Phillimore Walk is one-way westbound for motor traffic but since 2016, it has been legal to cycle in both directions along the full length of the road. At the western end, Phillimore Walk connects to the established cycle path that connects Holland Park Avenue to Kensington High Street, but cyclists must dismount to use the existing footway between the two and take their bike up or down a kerb. The Council wishes to improve the quality of the link, to make it easier to use for cyclists, especially those with disabilities.

2. Proposals

- 2.1. The proposals involve removing just over three metres of the section of wall to the western end of Phillimore Walk which currently separates Phillimore Walk from the Holland Walk cycle and foot path (Fig. 1). Motor vehicles would not be permitted access.
- 2.2. A bollard would be introduced in the centre of the removed section, providing 1.5 metres of space to each side for all types of bicycles - including cargo and adapted bikes. A small section of grass of approximately 18m² (194 ft²) behind the wall between Phillimore Walk and Holland Walk would be removed and resurfaced to connect to the existing cycle and foot path, providing a fully paved connection for use by bicycles and pedestrians.

- 2.3. The existing surfacing would be resurfaced to match the new section of paving. A drawing of the proposal is supplied in Appendix A.



Fig 1. Existing conditions between Phillimore Walk and Holland Walk cycle/foot path

3. Consultation

- 3.1. The consultation was hosted on the Council's Consultations portal and ran from 24 January to 6 March 2022.
- 3.2. Ward councillors, Local residents' associations and community groups were notified of the consultation by email. On 24 January, officers wrote to 412 residences and 66 businesses in close proximity to the proposals. Officers received 13 responses via the online portal – including one from Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea - and one email from The Kensington Society.
- 3.4. Two responses received via the online portal were discarded as "spam" and made no reference to the proposals. Of the valid responses received, eight supported the proposals in full and four supported the proposals in part. No objections were received.

4. Consultation responses

- 4.1. The table below sets out the comments received during the consultation and provides officer responses.

Support in full/in part	Comment	Response
Support in full	<p>Personally, and on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea I support this. However, there are some comments I'd like to feed in:</p> <p>The Holland Walk path has other issues. At the north end, it stops with a "cyclists dismount" sign, and you are then confronted with Holland Park Avenue. This is not a route that would be compliant with LTN 1/20. Equally to access the route from Holland Park Avenue is extremely dangerous. As it is also extremely steep this combines with difficulty to access such that understandably very few people use it as a north/south route, and I can imagine not everyone will feel comfortable using this route at night regardless.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I understand a route across the park has been blocked, with no plans I am aware of to review it. This is a great shame. Many parks have provision for people to travel through them by bike. This would have enabled connection with a better configured north/south route on Abbotsbury Road (although this road is far from quiet and not in its current state suitable for many to travel by bike, and needs traffic reduction measures as it is used basically as a rat-run with often very poor driving)</p> <p>To the south end of Holland Walk there is the obvious question about how to then get anywhere if heading west, or if arriving from the west, how to get to this route. If it is intended genuinely to be a route to take a</p>	<p>All of these comments are outside the scope of the consultation.</p> <p>The proposal is not part of an existing or planned cycle route, it is intended to improve access for cyclists, in the same way our 'two-way cycling' schemes do, even where these are not connecting Cycleways. The fact that dedicated cycling facilities do not exist on all streets of the borough does not mean we should not try to improve access where we can. We know that cyclists already use this link and providing dedicated access means that cyclists do not need to dismount to use the existing footway at this end of Holland Walk.</p> <p>To be clear, the proposed improvement to the existing two-way cycling facility on Phillimore Walk is not designed to be some kind of alternative to the temporary 2020 cycle lane scheme on Kensington High Street. It is an access improvement to a useful local link.</p> <p>The Council's strategy on future cycle routes will be informed by a study into post-Covid travel patterns that is currently being carried out by Centre for London with support from University College London. The Council will await the findings of this study this summer.</p>

	substantial proportion of the thousands of daily cyclists on HSK then it isn't fit for purpose. Of course, this route would have severe limitations in any case as an alternative to the much-needed provision for safe cycling on High Street Kensington itself (whether because many will want to get to the high street for shops, restaurants etc rather than a back street, the limited segment this represents, the delay caused by this diversion, or the limits of the route to connect north to Kensington Gardens (whether in routing, hours of operation)	
Support in full	Connect that route to Kensington Garden is greatly needed.	Support acknowledged
Support in full	I think the proposal is excellent. Many cyclists already use this route to avoid KHS but cycle on the pavement at the end of Phillimore Walk to gain access to Holland Walk.	Support acknowledged
Support in full	[No comment supplied]	-
Support in full	[No comment supplied]	-
Support in full	This is a good thing to do but isn't enough. We need a better exit to that cycle path that joins at the north end of Holland Park and doesn't include a "cyclists dismount" sign but a properly integrated and safe cyclist right of way. We also need a proper integrated east / west segregated and safe cycle route across the borough - High Street Kensington, for example, before you wasted huge amounts of taxpayers' money ripping out a cycle lane rather than working with people to make it work, based on flawed and biased data.	All of these comments are outside the scope of the consultation. The Council's strategy on future cycle routes will be informed by a study into post-Covid travel patterns that is currently being carried out by Centre for London with support from University College London. The Council will await the findings of this study this summer. The fact that dedicated cycling facilities do not exist on all streets of the borough does not mean we should not try to improve access where we can. We know that cyclists already use this link and providing dedicated

		access means that cyclists do not need to dismount to use the existing footway.
Support in full	<p>As far as I am concerned, anything to improve access for cyclists and pedestrians is great, thank you.</p> <p>However, while I applaud RBKC's plans to make cycling safer and to improve air quality in the borough, what we really need is a proper cycle way running west to connect with the one along South Carriage Drive and east to Hammersmith. I know many people loudly complained about the cycle lane on Kensington High Street when it was set up last year, but it encouraged me to start using Santander bicycles in London for the first time (I'm in my late 50s) as I felt safe, and I was very sorry when it was removed.</p> <p>I currently use Phillimore Walk and Holland Street to get to Kensington Gardens, but the only path cyclists can use across the park has pedestrian priority and you have to watch out for people and dogs so it can be dangerous and it is not suitable for cyclists using it to commute. It's great when I get to Hyde Park and can use the cycle lane to reach Marylebone, Oxford Street or all the way to east London safely and I also use the Quietway to Chelsea, yet I'm too scared to cycle to Hammersmith or Shepherd's Bush from my home on Stafford Terrace just off Kensington High St so I never go there.</p> <p>I'm not a militant cyclist, just an ordinary middle-aged woman who wants to be able to cycle more so please, please can you provide more safe cycle lanes. That</p>	<p>All of these comments are outside the scope of the consultation. The Council's strategy on future cycle routes will be informed by a study into post-Covid travel patterns that is currently being carried out by Centre for London with support from University College London. The Council will await the findings of this study this summer.</p>

	way, you might be able to persuade more people like me to abandon their cars.	
Support in full	I have asked several of our members in the immediately area and all were supportive of the actions suggested - The Kensington Society	Support acknowledged
Support in-part	Ok, but why are you making a very expensive mountain out of a molehill? You absolutely do not need a 3 metre opening 'with bollard' to make cycling access easier at this point. Cycling is and should remain a form of transport that does not require grandiose and unnecessarily expensive infrastructure- that's the whole point. Plus, it's a good idea to make emerging cyclist slow down at what is effectively a T junction with the main north south cycle route. It's our money you're spending, don't overthink and overspend for such a simple modification!	The proposal to remove a three-metre section of wall is considered a low cost, low impact intervention to improve access for cyclists who currently must dismount to use the existing footway. The provision of 1.5m of space either side of the bollard is the minimum required to meet London Cycling Design Standards and facilitate use by adapted and cargo bikes. Acknowledged, officers propose incorporating 'give-way' markings where the proposed path meets the existing pedestrian and cycle path (westbound).
Support in-part	We would need to deter cyclists from passing at speed across the existing pedestrian route, which many use to reach Holland Park.	Acknowledged, officers propose incorporating 'give-way' markings where the proposed path meets the existing pedestrian and cycle path (westbound).
Support in-part	The proposed scheme is not clear and does not appear aligned with road. The proposals do not make clear if the design (slope and widths) can accommodate adapted cycle, cargo bikes and mobility aids. This proposal is a piecemeal approach to cycling without a plan for a safe, convenient or logical route for cyclists in the area.	Traffic flows in this cul-de-sac end of Phillimore Walk are extremely low, it therefore seems more sensible to remove an end section of the existing wall rather than a central section which would leave an odd portion of wall and strip of grass – or removal of the wall in its entirety. As set out in the proposals, 1.5 metres of space would be provided on either side of the bollard to allow access for a wide range of adapted and cargo bikes, in line with TfL's Cycle Route Quality Criteria and the London Cycling Design Standards.

	<p>While making it easier to join the cycle path along Holland Park this does nothing to address providing a safe and coherent East/West route.</p> <p>The road from Holland Park up to the Town Hall and connecting with Kensington High Street is not safe or convenient crossing a number of roads which are congested with rat running traffic and no other interventions to make this route safe.</p> <p>This is now 18 months since RBKC removed the cycle lane on the High Street, this does nothing for residents who visit the High Street or use it for school drop offs and getting to work.</p>	<p>The proposal is intended to improve access for cyclists wishing to join or leave the existing Holland Walk cycle path to head north or east. The fact that dedicated cycling facilities do not exist on all streets of the borough does not mean we should not try to improve access where we can. We know that cyclists already use this link and providing dedicated access means that cyclists do not need to dismount to use the existing footway.</p> <p>Many of these comments are outside the scope of the consultation. The Council's strategy on future cycle routes will be informed by a study into post-Covid travel patterns that is currently being carried out by Centre for London with support from University College London. The Council will await the findings of this study this summer.</p>
Support in-part	<p>The grass should not be removed as it is essential to keep as much green ground as possible.</p> <p>Part of the fence should be removed and a bicycle path put in.</p> <p>Children, vulnerable and elderly pedestrians need to feel safe and relaxed as soon as they step into the curtilage of Holland Park so complete removal of the fence would not be conducive to this.</p>	<p>A small strip of grass of approximately 18m² (194 ft²) would need to be removed to facilitate the proposals. This is considered an acceptable loss of greening considering the wider setting and anticipated benefits to cyclists and pedestrians. The existing grass has a very low amenity and ecological value.</p> <p>The proposal involves removing a section of the fence to facilitate a bicycle path. Full removal of the fence is not proposed.</p>

5. Recommendation

- 5.1. In view of the above, officers recommend that the Council proceed with the proposals to improve the link between Phillimore Walk and Holland Walk cycle/footpath, with the addition of 'give-way' markings where the proposed path meets the existing pedestrian and cycle path (westbound).

Appendix A – Phillimore Walk Cycling Access Design

