

## **OFFICER DECISION**

### **DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES**

**6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

#### **CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE STATUTORY TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATIONS TO INTRODUCE TWO-WAY CYCLING IN GILSTON ROAD, HOLLAND STREET, POWIS TERRACE, QUEENS GATE GARDENS AND VICTORIA GROVE**

##### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 In June and July 2022, the Council carried out statutory traffic order consultation to introduce two-way cycling in Gilston Road, Holland Street, Powis Terrace, Queens Gate Gardens and Victoria Grove. We received a large number of responses. This report considers the responses received and makes a recommendation on how to proceed.

##### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 After considering the responses received to the consultations, officers recommend proceeding with introduction of two-way cycling schemes in Gilston Road, Holland Street, Powis Terrace, Queens Gate Gardens and Victoria Grove.

##### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 From 15 June to 27 July 2022, the Council undertook consultation on introducing two-way cycling in one-way streets at five locations: Gilston Road, Holland Street, Powis Terrace, Queens Gate Gardens and Victoria Grove. A total of 6,896 households living near a proposal received letters sign-posting them to the consultation. Notifications were published in local press, street notices were erected and the consultation was available on the Council's web portal.

- 3.2 In total, 134 responses were received. 74 respondents said that their response applied to all five locations. 23 respondents said their comments applied to the Gilston Road proposal, 14 to Holland Street, four to Powis Terrace, seven to Queens Gate Gardens and 12 to Victoria Grove. A summary is included below:

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No. Objections</b>	<b>No. Support in Part</b>	<b>No. Support in Full</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>
All schemes	17	2	54	1
Gilston Road	19	-	4	-
Holland Street	9	3	2	-
Powis Terrace	1	1	2	-
Queen's Gate Gardens	6	1	0	-
Victoria Grove	9	-	3	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1</b>

#### **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.

**Table 1: Officers' responses to issues raised by respondents**

General themes / 'all scheme' responses

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
<b>The roads are too narrow</b> Respondents considered the proposed locations too narrow to safely accommodate two-way cycling.	24	<p>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 chances 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.</p> <p>Prior to consultation, the potential new two-way cycling schemes were investigated by consultants, including carrying out on-site investigations, traffic counts and video surveys to determine for each street the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Traffic flow volumes (and types including lorries);</li><li>▪ Speed of vehicles;</li><li>▪ Number of cyclists using the street in each direction;</li><li>▪ Geometric layout, and;</li><li>▪ Collision data.</li></ul> <p>Consideration of these data informed our assessment of whether two-way cycling was appropriate in each street, and if so, the level of supporting intervention required to ensure a safe environment for all road users.</p>

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
<p><b>Dangerous for pedestrians</b></p> <p>Promotion of cycling, or introducing two-way cycling in particular, is dangerous for pedestrians and may lead to more collisions. One respondent said that the proposals would encourage them to drive more instead of walking.</p>	23	<p>Officers do not agree that any of the proposals would increase the risk of collision between pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians should always look both ways when crossing streets – regardless of whether they are one or two-way. This is because there is always the risk of a driver or rider ignoring traffic restrictions. Indeed, when the Council provides pedestrian training to children, the training does not differentiate between one or two-way streets.</p> <p>As part of the proposals, signage and road markings would be introduced including cycle symbols in the direction of travel for the new contra-flow for cycling. These will highlight to all road users that two-way cycling is in place.</p> <p>The incidence of cyclist and pedestrian collisions in London, is far lower than those between cars and pedestrians. But the choice of mode of travel remains with the individual.</p>
<p><b>No enforcement of cyclists</b></p> <p>including cyclists not abiding by rules (such as footway riding, red light jumping) and/or don't pay road tax, hold insurance or should have number plates.</p>	17	<p>Some respondents suggested that cycling facilities should not be provided as cyclists exhibit poor behaviour such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement or being abusive.</p> <p>The Council knows that cycling illegally on the pavement can be intimidating and dangerous for pedestrians, and certainly does not condone it, though only the Police have powers to enforce the rules on pavement cycling. However, introducing schemes to make cycling easier and more convenient is entirely consistent with this position; indeed, it is generally recognised that introducing convenient routes for cycling – particularly on quieter streets - can reduce the fear of collisions that can lead some cyclists to cycle on the pavement or jump red lights.</p> <p>Road tax was abolished in 1936, however Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) – the tax levied by Government on vehicles - is paid by many drivers on an annual basis, with the amount varying depending on the vehicle's emissions. As is the case for low emission or electric vehicles, cyclists are not required to pay VED. If a change in legislation were desirable, it would need to be made at a national – not local - level.</p>

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
		<p>Similarly, cyclists are not required by law to hold valid insurance (though many opt to), or to register their bicycles or display a number plate. If a change in legislation were desirable, it would again need to be made at a national – not local - level.</p>
<b>The two-way cycle schemes pose a danger to cyclists</b> <p>Respondents suggest introducing two-way cycling on a one way street is confusing for other road users and may lead to death or injury to cyclists.</p>	17	<p>Prior to consultation, potential new two-way cycling schemes are investigated by consultants, including carrying out on-site investigations, traffic counts and video surveys to determine for each street the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic flow volumes (and types including lorries);</li> <li>▪ Speed of vehicles;</li> <li>▪ Number of cyclists using the street in each direction;</li> <li>▪ Geometric layout, and;</li> <li>▪ Collision data.</li> </ul>
		<p>Consideration of these data inform our assessment of whether two-way cycling is appropriate in each street, and if so, the level of supporting intervention required. Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 1's are also undertaken, with designs amended where any issues raised at the RSA1 are deemed applicable prior to consultation. The Council only takes forward schemes to consultation that it considers safe in a real-world setting. However, a RSA Stage 2 is also undertaken at detailed design stage (following consultation) to further pick up any concerns, and a RSA Stage 3 is undertaken once a scheme is implemented on-street to again identify any post-implementation issues.</p>
<b>One-way Streets already used as two-way for cycling</b> <p>Some respondents believe cyclists (and motorcycles) already travel in both directions so the proposals are unnecessary or a waste of money. One respondent was concerned that these riders often travel in the wrong direction in the centre of the traffic lane.</p>	12	<p>Where a cyclist opts to use a one-way street in the wrong direction, they do so at their own risk and should not assume that the road has not been assessed as suitable for two-way for cycling. Similarly, by formally signing a road as being two-way for cycling, the Council makes it clear to all road users that they should be prepared to find cyclists riding in both directions.</p> <p>The benefit of a designated two-way cycling scheme means that cyclists know where they should position themselves in the road – to</p>

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
		the left rather than the centre of the main carriageway. Motorcyclists would continue to be required to travel in the single legal direction.
<b>Segregated cycle lanes</b> Some respondents appeared to think the proposals involved segregated cycle lanes similar to Cycle Superhighway 9.	8	The proposals do not involve segregated cycle lanes, though some junctions do introduce a 'splitter island' to protect cyclists as they navigate the junction.
<b>Cyclists pose a danger to cars.</b>	7	It is unclear why a cyclist might pose a danger to a car – which are generally larger and heavier than a bicycle and rider – or specifically why the two-way cycling proposals would create a danger to cars or their occupants.
<b>The proposals will increase congestion</b>	7	Whilst vehicles or cyclists may need to slow or pause to pass each other in places, it is not expected that any of the proposals would lead to high levels of congestion. It is generally expected that if convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel confident traveling by bike and reduce their use of the private car, improving air quality and reducing emissions overall.
<b>The Council shouldn't enable cycling</b>	5	<p>Encouraging more trips by cycling is one of the borough's six transport objectives. New facilities to assist cyclists such as introduction of two-way cycling are one of the ways in which we plan to increase the number of people cycling. We expect that if more convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel encouraged to travel by bike and reduce their use of the private car. Nonetheless, we do not believe any of the proposals for two-way cycling give undue precedence to any road user and have not observed that cycling is restricted to any particular class or group of people.</p> <p>Responses include that cycling is an attack on the middle and working classes and therefore elitist, and that encouraging cycling is an unfair, ableist goal. Some respondents also felt the Council should focus on other things like parking, rubbish collection, street cleaning or traffic.</p>
<b>Waste of money/use funds for alternatives</b>	4	Funding for these two-way cycling schemes is ring-fenced from the Council's Recovery Fund. These funds are considered key to

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
<p>Respondents suggested the schemes were a waste of tax payers' money or that the funding could be used better for educational campaigns such as to educate cyclists and introduce a cycling permit once they have passed a test, or a campaign for all road users setting out the rights of cyclists (and scooter riders) and urging motorists and citizens in general to drive cautiously and to expect and tolerate cyclists.</p>	<p>The Council has alternative funds offering cycle training for cyclists. Uptake of cycle training is voluntary and any requirement for a proficiency test and permit would need to be made at a Government – not local - level.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has in the past run road safety campaigns to highlight cycling safety using funding supplied by Transport for London, these funds were withdrawn in early 2020 alongside the majority of the Council's LIP funding. TfL however, does continue to run road safety campaigns periodically.</p> <p>Encouraging more trips by cycling is one of the borough's six transport objectives and opening up new routes to assist cyclists such as introduction of two-way cycling are one of the ways in which we plan to increase the number of people cycling. We expect that if more convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel encouraged to travel by bike and reduce their use of the private car.</p> <p>The Council does not hold any data relating to two-way cycling schemes introduced in the London Borough of Camden.</p>	
<p><b>Already alternative routes for cyclists nearby.</b></p>	<p>4</p> <p><b>Existing two-way streets don't work/are dangerous</b></p> <p>One respondent alleges that two-way cycling schemes in London Borough of Camden has increased collisions. Another respondent said that the Council's two-way facility on Hollywood Road does not work because when turning right onto Hollywood Road from Cathcart Road, motorists must edge forward to see if another car or cyclist is approaching from the left because of the restricted view caused by parked cars.</p>	
		<p>The footway extensions where Hollywood Road meets Cathcart Road extend beyond the rows of parking, allowing vehicles turning right onto Hollywood Road excellent visibility of oncoming cyclists.</p>

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
<b>Enabling two-way cycling in some one-way streets will encourage cyclists to use all one-way streets in both directions</b>	4	<p>A small minority of cyclists may already use one-way streets as two-way and the Council does not condone such behaviour, however it is unlikely that provision for two-way cycling in suitable one-way streets would lead to an increase in this behaviour. On that argument, by making some roads two-way for general traffic, some drivers might consider that all roads are two-way.</p>
<b>Cyclists are abusive</b>	4	<p>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 are abusive.</p>
<b>Cycling shouldn't be prioritised</b> Not everyone can cycle so the Council should prioritise walking or other things.	3	<p>The fact that not everyone can cycle does not mean that we should not seek to enable as many people who can, to do so. Not everyone can drive but the Council still makes provision for those who can. The Council is aiming to improve conditions for both walking and cycling. Most streets in the borough have provision for people travelling by foot through footways, pedestrian crossings and other facilities. We continue to add new pedestrian facilities.</p>
<b>Contra-flows are not properly marked</b> One respondent felt that existing two-way for cycling roads as well as the new schemes are not properly marked and therefore dangerous.	2	<p>All two-way cycling schemes feature signage (such as one-way or no entry signs with 'Except cycles' plates) in order to hold legal status as a two-way cycling street. Additionally, regular bicycle road markings are implemented in the direction of the contra-flow to highlight the presence of cyclists to all road users.</p> <p>Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 1's are undertaken prior to consultation and auditors include consideration of signage as part of this. However, a RSA Stage 2 is also undertaken at detailed design stage (following consultation) to further pick up any concerns, and a RSA Stage 3 is undertaken once a scheme is implemented on-street to again identify any post-implementation issues.</p> <p>If a resident has any concerns about faded or missing road markings or signs, these can be reported to <a href="mailto:streetline@rbkc.gov.uk">streetline@rbkc.gov.uk</a>.</p>

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
<b>Cycle lanes impede cars</b>	2	The proposals do not involve segregated or mandatory cycle lanes.
<b>Cycle lanes used minimally compared to cars especially at peak times.</b>	2	The proposals do not involve segregated or mandatory cycle lanes. The proposals retain adequate carriageway width for vehicles at all times.
<b>Supportive of proposals, but they shouldn't replace the need for segregated lanes or a proper cycle network</b>	2	Segregated cycle lanes are not necessary for any of the roads that are part of these proposals as traffic speeds and flows are acceptable for cyclists and vehicles to co-exist without separation. Two-way cycling schemes are intended to provide more options for cyclists on roads that may not need segregation, or be part of a formal Cycleway.
<b>The Council should minimise white markings and other street clutter</b>	1	Whilst officers do all they can to minimise street clutter, for example making use of existing lamp columns for signage, the Council is legally obliged to use road markings and signage appropriate to the designation of a particular street. In this case, two-way cycle schemes require additional signage and road markings to highlight to all road users that the road is two-way for cyclists.
<b>Cyclists are lethal weapons</b>	1	It is unclear why a cyclist might be more of a lethal weapon than a motor vehicle – which are generally larger and heavier than a bicycle and rider. In general, collisions involving cyclists are more harmful to the cyclist than other road users. The frequency of cyclist and pedestrian collisions is lower than those between cars and pedestrians.
<b>They do not control bicycles in the same way as a motorcycle does</b>	1	Officers are unclear to what this comment refers [see Objection Two, Appendix 1].
<b>Bicycles should have dedicated facilities</b>	1	On most roads, dedicated facilities are not required, where cycle route design standards advise traffic flows and speeds are appropriate for cyclists and general traffic to mix. It would be hard to provide dedicated space for cycling on most roads due to the width of the carriageway, and the few roads that may be suitable would not add up to a very coherent network, meaning some cyclists could not easily get where they want to go. Schemes like two-way cycling schemes improve the network providing more options for cyclists overall.

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
<b>Road should not be transformed in leisure places or gardens.</b>	1	Officers are unclear to what this comment refers. The proposals do not involve any changes to leisure facilities or gardens.
<b>No demand for two-way cycle schemes</b>	1	Many of our two-way cycling schemes have been proposed as a direct result of requests from residents. But even were that not the case, encouraging more trips by cycling is one of the borough's six transport objectives, as well as being objectives in our Green Plan and Air Quality and Climate Change Action Plan. Cost-effective initiatives such as two-way cycling streets can open up a network for cyclists, especially as an alternative to busier roads that can be intimidating for new cyclists.
<b>Electric bikes need tougher regulation.</b>	1	Any change in legislation relating to electric bikes would need to be made at a Government – not local - level.

### Gilston Road

<b>Visibility concerns</b>	8	<p>New signage and road markings will illustrate to drivers that Gilston Road is two-way for cycling and that cyclists traveling in both directions should be expected. Drivers pulling out of the parking bays, or exiting Milborne Grove or Priory Walk should therefore look both ways before undertaking any manoeuvre. For the first six months, there will be red warning signs further alerting drivers to the new changes.</p> <p>The distance between the junction and parked cars is similar to that of most junctions in the borough – even those that are two-way for all vehicles. Drivers should take care to look both ways and creep forward to ensure the way is clear before turning.</p> <p>One respondent said that drivers of cars parked on the east side of Gilston Road would be unable to see cyclists coming when they pull out (as drivers are on the right-hand side).</p> <p>Two respondents felt that the view to the right for drivers looking north up Gilston Road is partially obscured by the parked cars on right side of Gilston Road.</p>
<b>Construction traffic in Gilston Road</b>	4	<p>Unless physically too narrow, most roads have construction vehicle traffic using them at some point. Cyclists and drivers should follow usual practice, looking thoroughly around them before making any manoeuvres.</p> <p>Several respondents raised the issue of building works being undertaken in Gilston Road necessitating large numbers of</p>

HGVs and contractor vehicles and were concerned about cyclists coming into conflict with these vehicles.	<b>Too many parked cars for a cycle lane/contra-flow cycling</b>	4	Prior to consultation, potential new two-way cycling schemes are investigated by consultants, including carrying out on-site investigations, traffic counts and video surveys to determine for each street the:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic flow volumes (and types including lorries);</li> <li>▪ Speed of vehicles;</li> <li>▪ Number of cyclists using the street in each direction;</li> <li>▪ Geometric layout, and;</li> <li>▪ Collision data.</li> </ul> <p>Consideration of these data inform our assessment of whether two-way cycling is appropriate in each street, and if so, the level of supporting intervention required to ensure a safe environment for all road users.</p>
	<b>Southern end of Gilston Road is too narrow</b>	4	The proposals include cutting back the footway build-out at the junction with Fulham Road to providing 6.2m of space - enough for cyclists and vehicles to pass each other.
	<b>Traffic travels too fast and there is no space for a dedicated contra-flow cycle lane.</b>	2	The proposals do not involve creation of a dedicated cycle lane. Dedicated facilities are not required as the existing traffic flows and speeds are appropriate for two-way cycling. Gilston Road has a 20mph speed limit.
	<b>More visible signage is needed where cyclists coming down Gilston Road from the north are obliged to turn left onto Priory Walk, as this is often currently ignored by cyclists.</b>	2	The proposals mean that the compulsory left turn onto Priory Walk would no longer be required. Therefore, existing signage related to this turn would be removed.
	<b>Creation of the cycle lane will remove an important stretch of residents' parking in Gilston Road</b>	1	The proposals do not involve creation of a segregated cycle lane. No residents' parking is proposed to be lost, however five metres of single yellow line on the approach to the footway build out at the junction with Fulham Road is proposed to be converted to double yellow lines to provide additional passing space close to the junction.

<b>Prevalence of Zapp e-bikes using one-way streets the 'wrong way'</b>	1	Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit poor behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to provide facilities for cycling where a road has been assessed as suitable to accommodate two-way cycling.
<b>Increased traffic</b> The respondent believes permitting two-way cycling will increase the amount of traffic using Gilston Road, reducing enjoyment of their property and requests that Gilston Road becomes a formal 'low traffic' road with access for residents only.	1	<p>Any increase in traffic is likely to be bicycles who would now be able to use Gilston Road in two directions rather than one. It is not expected that these additional bicycles would reach levels that would cause congestion.</p> <p>The purpose of 'low traffic neighbourhoods' or roads is to restrict motor traffic and thereby reduce the associated congestion and emissions. Bicycles and pedestrians are usually exempt from these restrictions, and this would be the case if the Council proposed restrictions in Gilston Road.</p>
<b>Two-way cycling not in keeping with a conservation area</b> The respondent feels two-way cycling is not in keeping with the character of the street.	1	<p>It is not clear why cycling in two directions would be less in keeping with a conservation area than in one direction. Conservation areas do not restrict the introduction of two-way cycling (including signage and road markings) if the Council is proposing them to satisfy our statutory role as highway authority.</p>
<b>Inconvenience during construction.</b> The respondent is concerned that this location is regularly excavated for utility works and believes residents deserve some peace.	1	<p>The Council must often balance the needs of residents with the disruption caused by new infrastructure. The long-term benefit to residents and others wishing to cycle is thought to outweigh the temporary inconvenience road works may cause. The majority of works to implement two-way cycling schemes consists of quiet works such as installing signage and painting road markings. However, there will be some construction works at the junction with Fulham Road to cut back the footway build-out. The Council has 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.</p>
<b>One respondent reported witnessing a near miss between a digger (coming down Gilston Road) and a cargo bicycle.</b>	1	<p>Officers are unclear why a digger traveling the wrong way 'down Gilston Road' with the cyclist travelling in the correct direction is a reason not to introduce two-way cycling.</p> <p>If the respondent meant that the cyclist was travelling south against the one-way flow,</p>

		then introduction of the two-way scheme would have alerted the digger driver to the possibility of oncoming bikes, and the proposed road markings would guide both vehicles to position themselves appropriately on the carriageway.
	<b>The proposal includes creating a cycle lane at the top of GR and a 5m double yellow line section. This is where delivery vehicles unload. If the DYLS are introduced, the vehicles will use the pavement to park or just ignore the markings and park.</b>	<p>1</p> <p>The cycle lane at the top of Gilton Road is not part of the proposals. It is an existing fixture of the street.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on footway can be subject to a Penalty Charge Notice. Parking to unload on double yellow lines is permitted as long as loading is continuous.</p>
	<b>Alternative options are already available such as onto Priory Walk and then on to Drayton Gardens.</b>	<p>1</p> <p>As cycling is largely a self-propelled mode of transport, any saving on time or energy can be of value to the rider. Encouraging more trips by cycling is one of the borough's six transport objectives and opening up new routes to assist cyclists such as introduction of two-way cycling are one of the ways in which we plan to increase the number of people cycling. We expect that if more convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel encouraged to travel by bike and reduce their use of the private car.</p>

#### Holland Street

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
<b>Parts of the pavement in Holland Street are exceptionally narrow (such as near Carmel Court), which means people are often stepping into the road to get past each other.</b>	3	The section of Holland Street to which these proposals apply is between Hornton Street and Campden Hill Road. This section has large footways with ample space for pedestrians to pass each other.
<b>Introduce two-way cycling on one of the wider roads like Campden Grove.</b>	2	Campden Grove is already two-way for all vehicles. The purpose of introducing two-way cycling on one-way streets is to improve the availability of routes for cyclists – who may not wish to travel that far north out of their way when they could use Holland Street instead.
<b>The distance from the end of the resident car parking bay at the bottom of Kensington Church Walk/Holland Street is precisely 2 metres (60 inches) [sic]. There is the concern that a child going to/coming from school with a parent is unable to see a cyclist approaching, especially if that cyclist is at speed.</b>	1	The section of Holland Street to which these proposals apply is between Hornton Street and Campden Hill Road.

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
<b>Because of the narrowness of the road, introducing two-way for cycling will increase congestion and hence emissions.</b>	1	<p>Prior to consultation, potential new two-way cycling schemes are investigated by consultants, including carrying out on-site investigations, traffic counts and video surveys to determine for each street the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Traffic flow volumes (and types including lorries);</li> <li>■ Speed of vehicles;</li> <li>■ Number of cyclists using the street in each direction;</li> <li>■ Geometric layout; and;</li> <li>■ Collision data.</li> </ul> <p>Consideration of these data inform our assessment of whether two-way cycling is appropriate in each street, and if so, the level of supporting intervention required to ensure a safe environment for all road users.</p> <p>It is generally expected that if convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel confident traveling by bike and reduce their use of the private car, improving air quality and reducing emissions overall.</p>
<b>Investment should go towards more underground parking spaces at reasonable prices and including EV charging which would release more space above ground to facilitate the two-way cycling scheme.</b>	1	<p>Schemes requiring deep excavation - such as underground parking - are expensive to implement and these funds are not currently available. Because of existing utilities and services, it is also unlikely that the Council could implement enough underground car parks to suit residents across the borough.</p>

#### Queens Gate Gardens

Issue raised	No.	Council's response
Parking in Queen's Gate Gardens is already difficult following removal of restrictions on Saturday and Sunday.	1	<p>The proposal includes conversion of three metres (less than one parking bays' worth) of residents parking to single yellow line – this would mean that formal residents' parking is not lost entirely as residents would still be able to park there outside of the hours of control (Monday to Friday 8.30am to 1.30pm and Saturday 8.30am to 6.30pm – when the majority of cycle trips are more likely to be taking place). Overnight parking - when occupancy tends to be highest for example - would still be possible. Moreover, the loss of three metres will not change the effective capacity of this run of parking, which is 12 cars.</p>

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
<b>Cycling around the square (as other road users do) is not a big inconvenience.</b>	1	As cycling is largely a self-propelled mode of transport, any saving on time or energy is of value to the rider. The respondent appears to presume that cyclists will want to come and go from major roads such as Gloucester Road, but people often want to avoid riding on such busy roads. The proposals will, for example, mean that a cyclist entering from the Cromwell Road end of Queen's Gate Gardens can travel northbound (against the normal traffic flow) rather than having to use Cromwell Road as well as either Gloucester Road or Queen's Gate to access the many smaller roads in this area.
<b>Two-way cycling will detract from the tranquillity of the garden squares becoming 'rat-runs' for delivery boys on electric bikes</b>	1	Whilst facilitating two-way cycling is likely to lead to more cyclists using the street than previously, it is not expected that cyclists would have the same impact that motor vehicles rat-running tend to cause, such as noise or congestion.
<b>Implement cycle lanes by removing parking from one side of the road instead of the two-way cycling scheme.</b>	1	Queens Gate Gardens does not experience the high levels of traffic flow or speeds that would make this necessary under Cycle Route Quality Criteria guidance and it is considered that the disbenefit to residents in terms of loss of parking would prove unpopular with residents.
<b>Victoria Grove</b>		
<b>Alternatives are already available</b>	3	As cycling is largely a self-propelled mode of transport, any saving on time or energy can be of value to the rider. Encouraging more trips by cycling is one of the borough's six transport objectives and opening up new routes to assist cyclists such as introduction of two-way cycling are one of the ways in which we plan to increase the number of people cycling. We expect that if more convenient routes for cycling are provided, more people will feel encouraged to travel by bike and reduce their use of the private car.
Making the eastern part of Victoria Grove two-way for cycling would create a direct east-west route across Gloucester Road into Queen's Gate Terrace in a way that Kynance Mews would not do.		

<b>Visibility issues</b> One respondent felt that as a pedestrian, it would be hard to see cyclists coming towards Launceston Place particularly if cyclists are travelling fast. Another felt there would be visibility issues turning into Victoria Grove coming south from Gloucester Road due to bend at north entrance. The third felt that exiting Albert Mews is already dangerous due to poor visibility and that the proposal will makes this situation worse.	3	Cyclists and cars can already travel towards Launceston Place. The proposed change would be to also allow cyclists to go east, away from Launceston Place.
Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 1's are undertaken prior to consultation. The audit found no issues with visibility. However, a RSA Stage 2 is also undertaken at detailed design stage (following consultation) to further pick up any concerns, and a RSA Stage 3 is undertaken once a scheme is implemented on-street to again identify any post-implementation issues.	3	Whilst facilitating two-way cycling is likely to lead to more cyclists using the street than previously, it is not expected that cyclists would have the same impact that motor vehicles rat-running tend to cause, such as noise or congestion.
<b>Congestion in Victoria Grove</b> As there are few parking facilities on Victoria Grove, vehicles unloading must stop on the yellow lines. This causes congestion on the small street which would be exacerbated if some of the road space is used by cyclists travelling in the other direction.	3	The Council no longer supports older 'hoop' signage. New signage is internally lit providing greater visibility for the 'No Entry' sign. The existing uplighters to illuminate the hoop signage are not as effective and are more difficult to maintain. It would also be difficult to retrospectively fit the requisite 'Except cycles' plate to the existing hoop frame.
<b>Signage</b> Respondent objects to the proposed removal of the existing 'hoop stand and uplighters' to provide new posts for the required signage. They believe the current arrangement enhances the character and appearance of the De Vere Conservation Area.	1	The Council has no plans to undertake a review of signage in the Victoria Grove area.
<b>Albert Mews has a very narrow exit onto Victoria Grove. To Entering or exiting driveways or Albert Mews</b> Respondent believes that two-way cycling would not be possible as vehicles exiting Albert Mews or driveways would occupy the full carriageway width as they turned.	1	Drivers exiting Albert Mews or driveways must check that Victoria Grove is clear of both other motor vehicles and cycles before making the manoeuvre.

#### 4.2

The Metropolitan Police provided comments on three of the schemes as follows:

Scheme	Met. Police Comment	Officer Response
Gilston Road	Removing the buildout (increasing the carriageway width) without vertical/physical deflection may increase vehicle entry speeds.	There is an existing raised entry treatment (speed ramp) where the footway build out is proposed to be cut back.
	Narrow carriageway width may lead to cycle vs vehicle collisions as both vehicles compete for the same road space.	The feasibility study and RSA1 found no issues with the width of the carriageway in the proposal area.
Powis Terrace	Junction with Talbot Road - without deflection vehicles may use all available road width when entering Powis Terrace, which could lead to collisions with cycles waiting to exit/approaching the junction.	The proposals include splitter islands at both ends of Powis Terrace, meaning cyclists are physically separated from vehicles exiting/entering Powis Terrace, and preventing motor vehicles from occupying all available road width.
Queen' Gate Gardens	Narrow carriageway widths at the junction with Gloucester Road may lead to cyclist vs vehicle collisions as both will be competing for the same road space.	The proposals include a splitter island at the junction of Queen's Gate Gardens and Gloucester Road meaning cyclists are physically separated from vehicles exiting/entering Queen's Gate Gardens.

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 £95k was secured to deliver two-way cycling schemes in 2022-23, comprising £60k from the Council's Recovery Fund and £35k from TfL as part of the Council's Local Implementation Plan allocation.

- 5.2 £32k was spent to develop the feasibility studies, initial designs and Road Safety Audit's and cover consultation costs. £63k therefore remains for detailed designs and implementation.

## 6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no legal or resource implications.

### Contact officer:

Caroline Dubarbier, Sustainable Travel Manager

**Tel:** 020 7361 3766 **E-mail:** caroline.dubarbier@rbkc.gov.uk

## **Appendix 1: Responses received to proposals at all locations**

### **Objection One**

Generally the more two way cycling you enable will just encourage two way cycling on one way streets where it [isn't] marked or enabled. It is SO dangerous for pedestrians - I can't tell you the number of near misses I have encountered or witnessed. Delivery riders are the main culprits. I do understand the problems but cycling seems to be prioritised over walking. We are encouraged to walk and cycle but not everyone can cycle. More people walk so you must and should make pedestrian safety your priority. There is no enforcement of cyclists, so they can get away with using one-way streets the wrong way. They don't have number plates or other identifying features so they can even be reported. Yet vehicle drivers can be reported by the general public. A cycle with a 12 stone person plus a full delivery box is a lethal weapon.

### **Objection Two**

Roads are dangerous places, cyclists tend not to follow strict rules imposed to car drivers. They have no plates and cannot be identified when committing offenses. They do not control the bicycles in the same way as a motorcycle does. Road should not be transformed in leisure places or gardens. Bicycles should have dedicated ways off road.

### **Objection Three**

I am a regular cyclist (at least twice daily in the borough). The problem with using one way streets this way is that they are rarely properly marked and often too narrow. The end result is a road that is more dangerous. I have already complained about the poor marking in Elystan Street and particularly the junction around Sprimont Place, where near misses are the norm. The road is not wide enough with parked cars and/or restaurant outdoor dining. If these schemes are to work the road needs to be marked as such.

In the case of Gilston Road, the Fulham Road end is much to narrow. With cars turning into Gilston Road, inevitably swinging out as they round the corner, I would not feel at all safe. There are already options to go down Hollywood Road and Drayton Gardens, so there is very little to be gained in making another dangerous junction. As for the concept of cycling 'advisory' markings, they do not work. Drivers of cars do not understand or deliberately ignore them, so I am frequently pushed off the road. In such circumstances, creating more pinch points leads to more problems than it solves.

It seems these schemes are dreamt up by a intransigent cycling/anti-car minority who will only be happy when all other road traffic is banned, blessed by council members desperate to be seen acting green with no appreciation for the consequences, namely increased division between most cyclists and most other road users, when we should all rub along together.

If you want to improve driving for all, improve standards especially of buses which think nothing of overtaking too close only to pull in at a bus stop yards in front, commercial vehicles parked blocking junctions and vision and e-scooters used illegally.

#### **Objection Four**

Too many cyclists ignore the Highway Code and too many ride on the pavements for pedestrians (and some in a manner oblivious to pavement users), jump red lights and ignore pedestrian crossing green men, without the Council doing anything about it.

I fear this will only encourage them to continue and in any case they already ignore how they should behave on streets and roads; and pavements.

So I am against this until the Council can clearly and robustly demonstrate that they enforced road, street and pavement use by cyclists.

#### **Objection Five**

I encounter the existing 2 way cycling lane on Hollywood Road via the Cathcart Road junction on a weekly basis. While I support an increase in cycling and a reduction in car use in the Borough, and am myself a cyclist as well as a motorist, the Hollywood Road cycle lane is rarely used and when it is used it creates unnecessary risks. This is because when turning right onto Hollywood Road from Cathcart Road a motorist needs to edge forward to see if another car or cyclist is approaching from the left because of the restricted view caused by parked cars on Hollywood Road. In my experience the cycle Lane on Hollywood Road is very rarely used by cyclists travelling counter to the one way traffic. However, very occasionally a cyclist comes fast and, although I am cautious and aware of the rights of cyclists, this is unexpected because of the infrequency of use by cyclists and can create a greater than average collision risk. In my experience also, cyclists and increasing numbers of people using electric scooters etc tend to travel where they want to anyway without regard for signs whether painted on the road or attached to the proliferation of signs that already exist. Would it not be more sensible to acknowledge the reality of how cyclists and scooter riders approach one way streets in general, allow them to do so on a general basis, and invest the money you would otherwise spend on piecemeal road painting and signs (of which we have an excess already) with an education and communication campaign aimed at those in the Borough setting out the rights of cyclists and scooter riders and urging motorists and citizens in general to drive cautiously and to expect and tolerate cyclists / riders travelling counter directionally on a one way street. This would have the added effect of avoiding confusion on the part of motorists as to which one way street allows counter flow cycling and riding as they all would do.

#### **Objection Six**

I do not support the proposal as this will only further increase congestion during peak hours

#### **Objection Seven**

I am a cyclist myself so this is intended to be a considered response. I am increasingly concerned that cyclists in general are a real liability to pedestrians and cars. In addition to being a cyclist myself I also walk a lot around my area and there have been so many times that I have nearly been knocked off/over by a cyclist. My view is that before we provide more infrastructure for them to use as outlined in the proposal, we consider what can be done to either have bikes number plated or a technological solution to nudge safer cycling and that they are subject to penalties?

#### **Objection Eight**

The cycle lanes impede cars and the cycle lanes are only in minimal use compared to usage for cars. In addition, cyclist do not pay road tax nor do they obey or are aware of the highway code. The council should use the money to educate cyclists and to introduce a cycling permit once they have passed a test!

#### **Objection Nine**

Two way cycling on a one way street is a recipe for confusion. The inevitable result - death or injury to cyclists and pedestrians.

#### **Objection Ten**

Cyclists are dangerous and inconsiderate. It is an unfair ableist goal to increase cycling. No new cycle lanes and absolutely do not allow them to break rules cars have to follow. I and my young children have been hit several times by cyclists.

#### **Objection Eleven**

I am very concerned about the impact on pedestrian safety. Proposals do not seem safe at all and would encourage me to drive more instead of walking. Similar schemes have led to an increase in pedestrian/cycle casualties e.g. London Borough of Camden schemes. Other quieter roads close by perfectly suitable for cyclists and much quieter/safer for them. Bad use of taxpayers money/very little actual demand for this.

#### **Objection Twelve**

Your proposal of using one-way streets for bicycles going against the flow of traffic is alarming to say the least and an obvious recipe for disaster. Have you actually done a Time and Motion study of what happens when you relax these rules? I suggest you take yourself off to New Delhi or similar and see just how appalling the situation becomes when everybody is allowed to go in any direction at will. WHERE IS THE PROTECTION FOR PEDESTRIANS please.

We all witnessed and felt the resultant chaos and dangers of the “bicycle scheme” RBKC put in place along Kensington High Street, which fortunately has since been removed. On ONE WAY STREETS it is dangerous to cross the road because vehicles invariably accelerate along them. With badly ridden bikes and scooters coming from the other direction at the same time effectively they remain “TWO WAY STREETS” for pedestrians.

As far as I know there is no obligation for cyclists to pass Road Safety Tests, if such a thing is required the culprits plainly do NOT exercise what they are required to practise. The Lycra-Louts who are mostly an angry breed, fly along two-abreast with no regard for pedestrians or traffic flow. The foreign tourist brigade wobble about on the heavy rental bikes whilst simultaneously sightseeing or looking at their Sat-Navs on the mobile phone.

All over London we experience these new Electric Scooters hurtling on and off pavements weaving in and out of traffic, flying along the centre of the road, often ridden by children, or “youngsters having fun,” only to be abandoned at random on pavements thereby creating hazards for pedestrians.

Cyclist and electric scooter observations include:

- OBESE CHILDREN (sometimes 2 clamped together on one scooter)
- MOBILE PHONES (sometimes reading texts whilst on the move)
- HEADPHONES (often listening and jiggling to a lively tune, unaware of traffic behind them)
- NO HELMETS
- NO DRIVING LICENCE
- NO INSURANCE
- NO ROAD SAFETY TRAINING
- NO MANNERS OR CONSIDERATION.

If you are serious about making London safer maybe you need to consider a few of these points. City cars are now ENORMOUS. They take up the roads widthwise and parking spaces lengthwise. Watching BUSES taking it in turns to struggle down the centre of a road is a sight to behold. Why not TAX cars on their SIZE. Back in the 1960s when we had road space, cars were all very modest in size. Now we have no space these GIANTS have been allowed to take over.

CYCLISTS can always dismount and cross on foot to another direction. This current obsession with cyclists and scooters is crazy.

London has become a filthy and disgusting place: every road is being dug up mostly by G5; constantly shifting diversions cause traffic havoc; giant cars driven by big bullies think they own the space; If RBKC should be thoroughly ashamed of itself. If the counsellors don’t have enough to keep themselves occupied maybe they could more seriously address a few other street problems like: TRAGIC LACK OF RUBBISH BINS, PERPETUAL FLY TIPPING, FILTHY

**STREETS THAT COULD DO WITH A GOOD REGULAR SCRUB:** There is no comparison in the amount spent per capita to that in cities like Paris, Stockholm and Berlin.

#### **Objection Thirteen**

TLD; London roads are too narrow to accommodate a further reduction of space. Furthermore, the nigh non-existent reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> does not warrant the reduction in quality of life and attack on the middle and working classes who rely on using London's streets to access their place of business, i.e. this scheme is very elitist.

It is also very unsafe as pedestrians attempting to cross from in between parked cars will be struck by cyclists who have no way to see them.

The pavement has become heavily used in recent years with constant foot traffic, which is not helped by never-ending construction, closed-off roads, and vanity schemes the council keeps attempting to introduce (not only did nobody ask for those High Street Kensington Cycle Lanes - they were an absolute disaster, and they were unsafe, as will be the case here).

Furthermore, in it's superfluous quest of going green, the council is ensuring that only the affluent can navigate London. The government's (and council's) reckless spending has driven up the costs of living enormously. The less well off (the working class) have been priced out of London by short-sighted government policies, as so must travel longer distances into London to earn a living; and to add insult to injury, the council choose to rob them of more money by taxing them to high heavens for coming into work and making them lose business by further inconveniencing them by crippling the already weak infrastructure.

The council's attack on the working class is unacceptable, and really, there should be an option to withdraw taxes when council seeks to spend so irresponsibly.

#### **Objection Fourteen**

[No comment supplied]

#### **Objection Fifteen**

I live near C9 and can testify that this type of cycle lane in dangerous to pedestrians and road users alike. They have also increased congestion in the area.

#### **Objection Sixteen**

The increased aggression amongst cyclists following the recent changes in Highway Code rules in their favour has generated mounting confrontations with cars as well as pedestrians. Cyclists feel a renewed sense of entitlement on the road, not merely in their attitudes to cars but cursing and shouting at pedestrians which I have increasingly encountered in recent months. To allow them to proceed against the permitted flow of traffic in a one-way street is utter insanity and totally pointless. Why can they not abide by traffic regulations like every other person and vehicle using our roads? Who on earth dreamt up the idea that they can contravene every rule in the book, including jumping red lights, with impunity and now legislation. What madness is this?

### **Objection Seventeen**

These cycling lanes are:

1. Destroying homes and communities as no one parks along side them, stops for a chat.
2. Causing distress and uncomfotred for pedestrians by cyclists on super fast speed racer lanes. They are incredibly uncomfortable to be around if you are not on a cycle or a scooter.
3. Scarring a beautiful borough with an eye sores, lanes painted in ugly bright colours and over sign posted.
5. Killing off communities: with less parking, less people come in to the area and there is less eating and out and shopping.
5. Destroying crucial biodiversity and wildlife by cutting down trees and nature.

You will no doubt get a heavy response from lycra cladded speed cyclists and have a poorly weighted sample of responses, and make more decisions off that, just for the sake of change and having to do something. Good luck, I'm out.

### **Support in Part One**

We need to minimise the white markings to save cost for essential services and to make the more essential messages clearer.

I am a cyclist but, as a senior, aim to avoid "trouble"- not worth the risks. Victoria Grove is so quiet why do you need to put any white lines down? Similarly probably Holland Street? I don't know the others enough to comment.

Cycling should be encouraged as the use of scooters but some controls need enforcing. Cycling lanes are mostly well under used except in a few places at rush hour. The lanes are often counterproductive as they narrow the roads to one lane of traffic - There are too many cars and the pinch points are much worse post the quiet of covid (when I much enjoyed cycling)

### **Support in Part Two**

Supportive of the principles to improve cycle connectivity however these schemes appear isolated and once there is no overarching cycle strategy or active travel plan for the borough. Such piecemeal improvements provide localised benefits for particular stretches but there remains an absence of any coherent effort to develop safe, continuous and coherent networks.

For each of these schemes:

1. parking should be changed to ensure there is no or minimal parking on the contraflow side to avoid cyclists being put into conflict with oncoming vehicles and to avoid be pushed into a door zone
2. when these routes cross busy roads there should be much more consideration to improving the safety of crossing these roads and reducing vehicle traffic in particular rat running which is a particular issue on some of the section covered by these schemes

#### **Support in Full One**

Not a moment too soon. RBKC has a very poor record on cycling provision and this will be a small step in the right direction. Nevertheless it will in no way make up for the shameful removal of the Kensington High Street segregated cycleway which has helped to make RBKC one of the most lethal Boroughs in London for cyclists

#### **Support in Full Two**

Cycling is the best way to get around for personal health and the health of our environment. Although it may seem people don't use the cycle paths, it's some are still afraid and worried about cycling with vehicles around... the more we promote these paths and make them safer, the more people with gain confidence and use them! Please keep adding cycling paths! They are wonderful additions to our city!!

#### **Support in Full Three**

Schemes like this have been implemented elsewhere in London and I find them very useful and safe- please do this and PLEASE reinstate the protected cycle lane in Ken High St!

#### **Support in Full Four**

Thanks for your concerns about cycle lanes. I fully support all your ideas, especially the Victoria Grove one which would only help as few cars use this street and cyclists would immensely benefit from the added option. Our household uses at least twice daily Victoria Grove for school runs and we therefore have a relatively clear understanding of the traffic.

**Support in Full Five**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Six**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Seven**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Eight**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Nine**

We require more secured bicycle parking or CCTV cameras.

**Support in Full Ten**

In favour of any schemes to encourage cycling and, especially, those that can help make it more convenient than driving, as these will do. On other one-way streets with two-way bicycle lanes in RBKC, I never have any issues as a pedestrian with ensuring that I look both ways. This scheme seems to have no downsides but will help encourage people to cycle.

**Support in Full Eleven**

In general I am in favour. I have a slight hesitation about the downhill stretch of Holland Street between Campden Hill Road and Hornton Street, I cycle along there quite frequently and find myself on the right hand side of the street quite often in anticipation of turning right at Hornton Street. Most cars turn right/south, too.

<p>I do not recall seeing a cyclist go the opposite way (illegally...). That said, maybe there is little traffic most of the day, so it may be quite safe. I suppose.</p> <p>Perhaps it would be better to make Observatory Gardens two-way as another convenient option for going east/west between Campden Hill Road and Hornton Street?</p>	<p>Making Holland Street two-way between Hornton Street and Kensington Church Street would be very useful.</p> <p><b>Support in Full Twelve</b></p> <p>Creating additional routes for cyclists will increase permeability of the area for cyclists, encouraging more people to take up bikes as an alternative to driving. There still needs to be cycle lanes on areas where there is no back route, such as getting from Kensington through to Hyde Park. At present, it's fairly dangerous for cyclists to get to the relative safety of Hyde Park.</p>	<p><b>Support in Full Thirteen</b></p> <p>Would encourage more people to use the bike hence reduce pollution.</p>	<p><b>Support in Full Fourteen</b></p> <p>More cycle options are badly needed and this will help.</p>	<p><b>Support in Full Fifteen</b></p> <p>[No comment supplied]</p>	<p><b>Support in Full Sixteen</b></p> <p>[No comment supplied]</p>	<p><b>Support in Full Seventeen</b></p>
--	--	---	---	--	--	---

More and more should be done to encourage and support active travel, not just for harmful vehicle emissions, but individual health and well-being to help a long list of illnesses, and to enable the economy to keep moving during Covid-19. It is also cheaper than upgrading the tube system and supports to aim at a short, medium and long term strategy in regards to energy and gas supplies following the conflict with Russia and Ukraine.

#### **Support in Full Eighteen**

Facilitating safe cycling is great for active travelling, air quality and climate change. I'm fully in support of this.

#### **Support in Full Nineteen (Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea)**

I am supporting all of the proposed introductions of two-way cycling. These are useful additions. Where relevant as much on-street parking should be removed to enhance safety. I understand comments have also been submitted by [redacted], to which I would also draw your attention.

#### **Support in Full Twenty**

Fully support efforts to enable cycling so that it is easier and more convenient.

Where one-way contra-flows are implemented please ensure sufficient space is created with consideration given to reducing any on street parking that creates pinch points or conflicts.

Please also ensure contraflow does not force cyclists to cycle in door zones when there is oncoming traffic - links to above point about ensuring good design principles used and changes to street use to deliver this

Attention should be paid to junctions where cycle contra flows link e.g. Holland Street - these are creating continuous routes however they are intersected frequently with roads that are generally busy and in terms of Campden Hill and Hornton Street are very busy roads used to ran run. This would make such routes unattractive for many reasons - wider changes should be considered to enable safer crossing of these roads that do carry fast moving traffic which has a moderate gradient ,measures to reduce through motor traffic and to even give priority at these crossing points to cycling as this will very likely be local people travelling Vs the through traffic using N-S roads.

#### **Support in Full Twenty-One**

Great idea. Increase more convenient cycle routes and also great for finding safer quieter routes away from main roads.

**Support in Full Twenty-Two**

I cycle myself and can only support the improvement for cyclists.

**Support in Full Twenty-Three**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Twenty-Four**

Great the council is improving cycling infrastructure but more must be done on safety. The streets are still not safe for even experienced cyclists. A step forward but much more should be done to support RBKC net carbon zero goal.

**Support in Full Twenty-Five**

The contraflows are useful - other boroughs have been doing these for years. The City of London has, reportedly, contraflowed every viable one-way street, including roman and medieval alleyways wide enough for little more than a cart. So, there's no excuse for other London boroughs such as K&C not to follow.

But let's not pretend these five contraflows add much to the dire state of the cycling "network" in K&C. I expect K&C's ruling clrrs and compliant officers to trumpet the implementation of these as a major success later this year. But I and other students are still risking life and limb on K&C's roads which do not have a single segregated cycle lane.

**Support in Full Twenty-Six**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Twenty-Seven**

Let's please take the Netherlands as example, the more cycling the merrier. There are also no safety concerns on those streets with two-way cycling. Great supporter, please get in touch in case any questions.

**Support in Full Twenty-Eight**

Yes. Fully agree to the proposals. Go for it!! Make it happen ..... Been cycling in the borough for years. Make me and every other cyclist happy!!!!

**Support in Full Twenty-Nine**

Working in and around Chelsea and Kensington being able to cycle is best for the city, people and area.

**Support in Full Thirty**

Thanks for small steps. You need to do much more on your key routes - Holland Park and [Kensington High Street] in particular to create safe segregated cycling routes.

**Support in Full Thirty-One**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Thirty-Two**

A thought should be given to adding a cycle line in Fulham Road as there are many accidents and this will have a huge impact on air quality.

**Support in Full Thirty-Three**

Many other boroughs has cycle lanes. Hammersmith just installed a cycle lane around the Hammersmith round about. I don't understand why RBKC can't provide cycle lanes for cyclists. we need to encourage greener travel and keep people safe.

**Support in Full Thirty-Four**

I strongly support these proposals which I believe will encourage people to cycle more.

**Support in Full Thirty-Five**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Thirty-Six**

Super pleased to see RBKC finally investing in improving cycling Infrastructure and really hope this will continue to include important and currently lethal routes such as Holland Park Avenue, High Street Kensington etc

**Support in Full Thirty-Seven**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Thirty-Eight**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Thirty-Nine**

I have no objection to two-way cycling on one-way streets as long as the major routes in and out of London are to remain clear of cycle lanes.

**Support in Full Forty**

I hugely value anything that supports cycling, especially in this borough where our roads feel so unsafe. Markings need to be clear so other road users realise it's 2 way for bikes -motorists in particular often drive too fast around corners seemingly unexpecting of cyclists coming the opposite way to them.

**Support in Full Forty-One**

We should make cycling more accessible, convenient and safer but should also ensure bicycles stay on roads they are allowed on. I support the Gilston Road proposal in particular. However, the council should look to enforce the “no cycling” on Thistle Grove. There is a large number of cyclists who use this as a rat run (especially at commuting times) as well as delivery bikes who go very fast on their delivery bikes - a lot of people use Thistle Grove with their small children and dogs and it is only a matter of time before there is an unpleasant accident.

**Support in Full Forty-Two**

The set up of a two lanes system on all those roads will fix obvious shortcomings on those routes. These additions will be appreciated from residents cyclists of the borough.

### **Support in Full Forty-Three**

Two way cycling streets are great! It means as a cyclist you can go a direct route which cars can't use making the route quieter and safer. Although I live in Fulham I cycle through K&C a lot and I think two way cycling streets will definitely improve cycling in the borough. It would also be good to have some fully segregated cycle lanes. Cycling in K&C is not great, it doesn't feel safe much of the time. There is much room for improvement.

### **Support in Full Forty-Four**

[No comment supplied]

### **Support in Full Forty-Five**

I recently started to cycle in the Borough but ended up walking my bicycle to get to cycle lanes. This is not great especially when traffic is busy. I'd like to have as many cycle lanes or ability to cycle without traffic as much as possible. I also drive so understand the need for both.

### **Support in Full Forty-Six**

I support the proposals but they really are very unambitious. Many of them seem to go nowhere in the absence of a more extensive network (especially Holland Street and Queen's Gate Gardens).

Elsewhere in the borough many of the contra flow schemes are dangerous as drivers don't look properly when they turn into them, presumably accustomed to them being one way streets. Elysian Place is notorious for this. I can see similar things potentially happening at the Holland St/Campden Hill Road junction and Queens Gate Gardens schemes, which are both used as rat runs. Why not just close them to through motor traffic and make the streets safer and more pleasant for everyone?

### **Support in Full Forty-Seven**

Absolutely support. More please.

### **Support in Full Forty-Eight**

In support of all proposals - great initiative!

### **Support in Full Forty-Nine**

This is a good start, but please also make cycling safer. More cycling lanes, low traffic neighbourhoods and safer cycling junctions with specific cycling lights.

### **Support in Full Fifty**

Great idea! Better still would be to have no cars on these streets, or throughout London unless they are electric.

### **Support in Full Fifty-One**

While provision of safer cycling on both Kensington High Street and Holland Park Avenue is stalled, it is even more important that these schemes are introduced. While they cannot provide a substitute, they will at least offer some alternative cycling routes.

### **Support in Full Fifty-Two**

Excellent idea.

### **Support in Full Fifty-Three**

Consideration should be given to the provision of similar schemes on all of the Borough's one-way streets unless there are obvious safety issues. Admittedly this would require considerable funding and the works would need to be carried out over a long period but plans could be put in place now. When setting aside space for cycle lanes, road engineers need to give due consideration to the road surface. Too often the edges of the road that are used by cyclists are in extremely poor condition and pose a real safety risk.

### **Support in Full Fifty-Four**

These small changes would help provide extra routes for cyclists away from some of the main routes. I have been cycling all over London for many years and my experience tells me that RBKC is the inner London borough that is most hostile to cyclist in terms of lack of usable cycle routes and the way that road layouts and messaging make motor vehicle drivers feel that they always have priority, regardless of the rules. It's a dangerous place to cycle, but these changes would move things a little bit in the right direction.

### **No Opinion**

[No comment supplied]

## **Appendix 2: Responses received for proposals at Gilston Road**

### **Objection One**

The road is too narrow for both cars and cyclists, there is not enough room for both. But the danger is at the junctions of Milborne Grove and Priory Walk. Cars coming from those streets only look left, not right, because GR is a one way street, and cyclists are always on that side of the road which makes it very easy to collide with cars nudging out on GS to see if cars are coming from the left.

### **Objection Two**

Whilst I generally support the creation of cycle lanes, I do not support the proposals for the following reasons.

- 1) As I understand the plans, the creation of the cycle lane will remove an important stretch of residents parking in the already narrow Gilston Road. There is already considerable pressure on residents parking in the roads in the vicinity including Redcliffe Road, and the removal of residents parking will substantially increase the risk of overload in the surrounding roads which will make it harder for residents to find residents parking. This is a particular concern because many of the residents comprise families and elderly persons and close by residents parking is an important amenity.
- 2) Gilston Road is not a busy road. On the face of it it would be irrational to create a two-way cycle path in what is generally a relatively quiet road. Cyclists can already cycle down the road safely and, so far as I am aware, there are no reports of any incidents, thankfully, involving cyclists in Gilston Road. Just because a cyclist goes up or is permitted to cycle up and down the road does not necessarily entail that there must be a cycle path created for that purpose.
- 3) If, however, the plan is confined to permitting a cyclist to travel in both directions along the road, and does not involve the creation of a cycle path which would remove the residence parking, then I am not against the plan.

### **Objection Three**

I am a very long-standing resident of Gilston Road, and am writing to express my strong objections to the proposed traffic order referred to above.

In my view, permitting two-way pedal cycle riders down the entirety of Gilston Road would be profoundly dangerous. It would be just a matter of time before a rider was killed/seriously injured by cars/lorries proceeding south to north up Gilston Road. Such traffic travels fast and there is no space for a dedicated contra-flow cycle lane from Priory Walk to the Fulham Road. The east side of Gilston Road between Priory Walk and Milborne Grove is a complete run of RPBS, and the run from Milborne Grove to the Fulham Road is mostly PAYG bays.

Accordingly, riders from the north to south of Gilston Road would be heading straight into cars/lorries coming the other way. At the present time virtually all the contractors' vehicles involved in 'basement digs' in the Boltons Conservation Area proceed (under their CTMP 'ingress route') up Gilston Road.

Not only is the proposed traffic order patently dangerous, but in my view it is totally unnecessary. Riders can easily access the Fulham Road via the contra-flow from the north of Gilston Road into Priory Walk, Drayton Gardens etc. Alternatively, such riders can proceed down Priory Walk then go into Harley Gardens and turn right into Milborne Grove, dismount at the corner with Gilston Road and push their bicycle just under 100 yards down Gilston Road into the Fulham Road. Additionally, if riders coming through The Boltons wish, for example, to visit Chelsea & Westminster Hospital they can turn into Tregunter Road and proceed via Hollywood Road etc.

Local residents have made multiple reports to Planning Enforcement about poor CTMP compliance concerning 'basement digs' in Gilston Road/Priory Walk/Harley Gardens etc. It seems positively perverse that the proposed traffic order will direct riders straight into the path of such contractors' vehicles.

Lastly, the proposed traffic order refers to 'pedal bikes'. Has anyone given thought to what will happen regarding Zapp e-bikes (these have pedals)? Already, such bikes are a menace coming the 'wrong way' down Gilston Road - they are also using Thistle Grove (contrary to 'no bicycles' signage). There is an almost total lack of Enforcement action regarding bicycles/Zapp riders coming the 'wrong way' down Gilston Road. If the proposed traffic order comes into effect it will result in a most unwelcome, dangerous free for all'.

I should be grateful if my views could be brought to the attention of the relevant committee when this application is considered in due course.

#### **Objection Four**

Very bad idea to have cyclists going down the full stretch of Gilston road. Even the top part is super dangerous. I am very careful because I know to expect them, but it is not safe. Sooner or later we will have an accident.

#### **Objection Five**

I object to the proposal as a resident of Gilston Road. The street is meant to be a low traffic / quiet street. Rather than adding more traffic on this road through this proposal, I would strongly advocate the opposite namely restricted traffic to local residents like in other areas of the borough and other boroughs. This specific proposal will make the enjoyment of my property less, will add to nuisance on a main road which is meant to be a primary high conservation value road in the borough. This is not in keeping with the character of the street. Specifically on the Fulham entry, this is already incredibly busy and a huge nuisance to go through to access my property especially in early evening times with cars parked on both side of a narrow road. Adding a bicycle lane there is practically impossible, will add to accident risk and will further create traffic congestion and reduce my ability to access and enjoy my property.

### **Objection Six**

Gilston Road is simply too narrow to extend the cycle Lane. There are already cyclists coming down to the southern end instead of turning left into Priory Walk. As such either the cyclist or the motorist has to stop to let the other pass and you can guarantee that neither is reluctant to do so. Cyclists have been seen to go onto the pavement to get past. Furthermore the junction of Gilston Road and Fulham Road is a busy one, particularly with construction lorries entering in connection with the numerous building projects going on in Gilston Road, Tregunter Road etc. If vehicles will have to wait to let a cyclist out from Gilston Road there will be a traffic buildup on the Fulham Road irrespective of the proposed widening of the pavement. The only way this proposes scheme would work would be to remove all parking on the eastern side of Gilston Road. This is a dangerous proposal, particularly with the number of construction lorries currently using Gilston Road.

### **Objection Seven**

This is a very narrow stretch of road, with parking both sides and vans unloading to deliver to shops on the Fulham Rd. It will be narrowed further by an additional cycle lane. I see no point to this proposal, other than to cause expense to Council Tax payers and inconvenience during construction. These lanes are dangerous to pedestrians who are unaware of their existence. What is the point of it? Surely cyclists can use all the other southbound roads that converge with the Fulham Rd. This part of the Fulham Rd is dug up at least once a month, for various repairs, cabling etc. Surely the residents deserve some peace from the incessant roadworks, which cause traffic jams and pollution.

### **Objection Eight**

I am writing to you to share my concerns about the proposed two-way cycling on Gilston Road. I have been a resident on Gilston Road for many years, and have recently seen a marked increase in cyclists coming down north to south and ignoring the one way system after Priory Walk. I feel that enabling two-way cycling would be extremely dangerous for the following reasons:

- a) Cars turning right out of Milborne Grove onto Gilston Road are looking to the left for oncoming cars, and not to the right for cyclists ( I have seen several near misses) as cyclists do not slow down at this junction. Also, at this junction the view to the right for drivers looking north up Gilston Road is partially obscured by the parked cars on right side of Gilston Road.
- b) Cars parked on the east side of Gilston Road are unable to see cyclists coming down when they pull out (as driver steering wheel on the RHS). Again I have observed several near misses, as cyclists who are currently not observing the rules come down Gilston Road way too fast.

I am a big supporter of cycling in London, but I feel that on a one-way street such as Gilston Road, it would be extraordinarily dangerous for the reasons stated above, and implementing two-way cycling would sadly result in accidents. I believe the current set-up where cyclists coming down Gilston Road

from the north are obliged to turn left onto Priory Walk, to be the safest option, and it is not necessary for them to continue all the way down. Albeit, there needs to be much more visible signage as this is frequently currently ignored by cyclists. I hope you take my comments into serious consideration, and perhaps take the time to come to have a look as a driver to understand the situation, as I feel this will avoid a serious accident.

#### **Objection Nine**

The street is already very narrow with cars parked on both sides of the road, and with cyclists coming up from Priory Walk towards Fulham Road it would be dangerous for the cyclist as there is not enough room for drivers to give them ample space to pass particularly if they have a larger car. The most likely scenario is that cars coming from Fulham Road onto Gilston Road (which can be quite busy during the day) would have to come to a full stop for safety and thus cause additional congestion.

#### **Objection Ten**

I believe this was trialled a few years ago and proved to be very very dangerous, mostly to the cyclists. Gilston Road has since become even busier with development traffic and is now dangerous to everyone. It is very narrow and large flatbed lorries come at speed from the Fulham Road with no regard for pedestrians, let alone cyclists. At the junction of Priory Walk and Gilston Road, it is an obligatory right turn for vehicles and it is a blind corner due to the traffic and the parked cars so drivers have to edge slowly out into Gilston Road, (having already ascertained that no bike is coming South up Gilston Road) at which moment a bike comes flying down at speed from the Boltons, mostly not looking at the cars, and there were many near misses in the previous scheme. At the moment, cyclists still go illegally up Gilston Road to Fulham Road and if they see an approaching vehicle, they mount the pavement, and I have been nearly knocked down with the dog on many occasions. An accident waiting to happen....let alone the emerging bikes on to Fulham Road. A Death Trap. Please think again.

#### **Objection Eleven**

I would suggest that the southern end of Gilston Road is far too narrow for vehicles and cyclists to pass safely particularly with number of construction lorries in the area. This will force cyclists onto the pavement as well as cause issues with vehicles entering Gilston Road from Fulham Road. Also, the trouble is that if bicycles cycle on their lefthand side, so it is very dangerous when cars are coming from Milborne grove, because they look to their left and not to their right.

#### **Objection Twelve**

Dangerous for many reasons. Predominantly road too narrow at Fulham Road end for parked cars either side of road, bicycle and cars. Cars coming out of both side roads (Milbourne and Priory only look left knowing it's a one way road. Bikes would be coming from the right.)

### **Objection Thirteen**

After having lived on this road for over 5 years, I feel that this will be an unnecessary and dangerous addition to the street. I often witness cyclists heading towards on-coming traffic in order to turn onto Fulham Road, and because of the narrow entrance, there are often nearly collisions. Another issue is that Gilston Road quickly fills up with parked cars, either side of the street, especially after 6:30 PM - this is caused by footfall from the many restaurants nearby, the karate school and less occasionally, the Chelsea football matches. Lastly, it is often the case that larger HGV's or bin lorries have trouble passing through the road when cars are parked either side - this will become even more troublesome when you have to account for cyclists.

### **Objection Fourteen**

The proposal for Gilston Road is dangerous. It is already dangerous because so many cyclists go down Gilston ignoring the sign to turn left into Priory Walk and there is not enough space for a car and a cycle to pass in between the parked cars on both sides of the road. There are bound to be collisions because many cyclists do not like giving way to cars. There have already been incidents at the junction of Priory Walk and Gilston caused by cyclists not turning into Priory Walk as instructed and carrying straight on, neglecting the fact that motorists exiting from Priory Walk are not looking to their right (because nothing on wheels is meant to come from the direction towards Fulham Road) but are looking to their left for cars and bikes coming the correct way up Gilston. I urge you not to change the status quo, even though it's largely flouted by cyclists. If you implement your proposal, you'll essentially be legitimising anti-social and illegal behaviour.

### **Objection Fifteen**

- 1) please note that due to numerous current major renovation projects and also foreign owners you may well get very few replies from those owners in Gilston Road.
- 2) the road is very narrow, particularly between Fulham Road & Milborne Grove. There really isn't room for oncoming cyclists.
- 3) because of (2) above and also new confusing signs that will be required, this suggestion would be most dangerous and would almost certainly lead to accidents with cyclists.

### **Objection Sixteen**

Background: I am a local resident and frequently travel along Gilston Road. I am very familiar with the layout of the road and with the typical volume of motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians. From experience, I assess that the narrowness of the full length of Gilston Road, combined with the space taken in

the road by parked vehicles (those of residents, visitors, deliveries and other services including heavy construction) and the volume of moving traffic on the road make the introduction of Two-Way Cycling seriously dangerous. I have taken careful note of the modifications that are proposed to Gilston Road, however, I do not believe that these changes will be sufficient to ensure the safety of cyclists and other road users in Gilston Road, a narrow, one-way London street. I therefore submit grounds of objection.

#### **Objection Seventeen**

Gilston Road is a narrow road to have cyclists travelling both ways safely. The turning from Priory Walk into Gilston Road currently requires care because of poor sight lines and I think it would be very dangerous to have cyclists going straight across the junction. I have observed several near misses of cars turning right and cyclists turning left at speed into Priory Walk from Gilston Road because they have not expected to find a car in Priory Walk at the junction.

#### **Objection Eighteen**

This proposal is dangerous & will 100% result in accidents

- 1) Cars parked on the east side of GR, facing north have the driver on the pavement side. Cyclists coming the wrong way up GR typically cycle on the left. As a driver pulls out you simply cannot see them. I have had several near misses like this over the years.
- 2) Cars turning onto GR from Milborne Grove are always looking left for oncoming traffic. Visibility is poor already due to parked vans on the pav & display. As you edge out on to GR the last thing you want to be looking out for is cyclists coming the wrong way. This is dangerous
- 3) There are currently 19 construction sites operating between Gilston Rd / Priory Walk / Harley Gardens & Tregunter Road. ALL of these sites are sending HGVs down GR all day long. As many as 50 per day. GR is simply not wide enough to accommodate these huge HGVs and cyclists going the wrong way. Cyclists will be forced to pull over OR more likely they will use the pavement, making it dangerous for pedestrians

#### *Follow up email*

It's just come to my attention that RBKC is considering allowing 2 way cycling on Gilston Road. I have submitted my views to the online consultation. I'm supportive of getting people to cycle more in London. But this proposal is a really BAD idea. As a resident of Gilston for last 12 years please let me explain why:

1. Cars parked on the east side of GR, facing north, have the driver on the pavement side. Cyclists typically cycle up GR on the left side of the road. If you are trying to pull out into the road, and there are parked cars in front of you (let's face it – there always are) - you have NO way of being able to see the cyclists coming. I have had several near misses like this over the years. Accidents are going to happen. I invite you to come around & try it for yourself in my car – you can't see cyclists coming

2. Cars turning right onto GR from Milborne Grove need to pay careful attention to the traffic coming down GR. Visibility is already poor because on the left of that junction are pay & display bays – they are ALWAYS full of vans – so it is really hard to see. So as you are edging out of Milborne, carefully trying to spot traffic come to the left, its really hard to see cyclists also coming from the right. I do this turn EVERY week day after the school run. I know what im talking about.

3. As you know, much to my frustration, there are currently 19 construction sites operating between Gilston / Priory Walk / Harley Gardens & Tregunter Road. 11 of these sites are basements. ALL of these sites are sending HGVs down GR all day long. As many as 50 per day (source = approved CTMPs). These are not small trucks – they are Soli grabber rucks / Concrete supply & pumping trucks, 40m flat beds etc. GR is simply not wide enough for these trucks as it is (as you know they are regularly getting stuck at the pinch point opposite the Budowkai) – but there simply isn't enough room for these trucks & cyclists coming the other way. So the cyclists will either get hit, OR have to pull over OR more likely they will mount the pavement, creating danger to pedestrians. NB 33 GR have just extended their work program from Dec 22 to Aug 23 completion. No 20 GR have a further 100 weeks left on theirs. This problem isn't going away soon.

4. The proposal includes creating a cycle lane at the top of GR and a 5m double yellow line section. This is where all the delivery vans for Bayley & Sage park to unload. This is all day long, six days a week. They often park on BOTH sides of the road – creating a bottleneck – see picture from last week. So looking at the picture, 1) how is a cyclist going to get through this ??? 2) If you make the top section of GR double Yellow lines – where are the vans on the left going to unload ? The answer to 1) is they will use the pavement. The answer to 2) is they will park on the Fulham Road OR just ignore the markings and park in the cycle lane anyway. 100% going to happen.

I'm not being a NIMBY, nor am I adverse to change – BUT this proposal is dangerous & unnecessary. It is far safer to direct cyclists from GR onto Priory Walk & then on to Drayton Gardens – as is the current setup. Both those roads are 2 way roads & perfectly capable of accommodating cyclists.

#### *Follow up Email*

On Saturday morning I witnessed a near collision involving a JCB and a Babboe bicycle on Gilston Road. The Babboe had 2 very young children (without helmets) and a dog in the front (see below). They were cycling on the left hand side of GR up the one way street. Coming down GR was a JCB with a Front Loader on it, loaded with additional buckets (see below).

As the two approached, the JCB did not slow down or pull over. As they met, the cyclist swerved as close as he could to parked cars. They crossed with quite literally INCHES between them. I watched in complete horror. I'm not making this up. This actually happened. As I said previously, there simply isn't enough room on GR for heavy trucks & construction equipment & bicycles – especially ones like in the picture. Someone is going to get very badly hurt – or worse. It won't be the driver of the JCB / HGV .....

### **Objection Nineteen**

This is a major route for walkers commuting their children to school. Bicyclists already use the road in both directions and in prior observations do not tend to follow the Highway Code.

#### **Support in Full One**

I strongly support the proposals to further accommodate cycling in the Borough. I would regularly cycle on the two-way scheme on Gilston Road. I have one suggestion for these proposals: add signs that on-coming cyclists have priority. Rule H1 of the Highway Code was added earlier this year creates a hierarchy of road users. Part of this rule states "... those in charge of vehicles that can cause the greatest harm in the event of a collision bear the greatest responsibility to take care and reduce the danger they pose to others. This principle applies most strongly to drivers of large goods and passenger vehicles, vans/minibuses, cars/taxis and motorcycles." .

My experience has been that there is a minority of drivers of motor vehicles disregard on-coming cyclists using one-way streets that allow two-way cycling, forcing the cyclist to take evasive action. This is dangerous, inconsistent with the driver's responsibility to other road users, and undermines the benefits of the Borough's objective of enabling more cycling. Much of the benefits of increased cycling journeys will be achieved when cycling is perceived as a safe alternative. Adding signs that give on-coming cyclists priority would place a formal onus on drivers to ensure they drive responsibly in these situations.

#### **Support in Full Two**

[No comment supplied]

#### **Support in Full Three**

I am strongly in favour of the Gilston Road proposal, as well as the others listed. We should be doing everything we can to encourage more cycling, and to make it easier for cyclists to navigate the residential side streets, of the main roads.

#### **Support in Full Four**

[No comment supplied]

#### **Support in Full Five**

Comments re. two way cycle scheme Gilston Road:- Removing the buildout (increasing the carriageway width) without vertical/physical deflection may increase vehicle entry speeds. Narrow carriageway width may lead to cycle v[s] vehicle collisions as both vehicles compete for the same road space.

#### **Comments from the Metropolitan Police**

Removing the buildout (increasing the carriageway width) without vertical/physical deflection may increase vehicle entry speeds. Narrow carriageway width may lead to cycle vs vehicle collisions as both vehicles compete for the same road space.

### **Appendix 3: Responses received for proposals at Holland Street**

#### **Objection One**

Holland Street is a quiet narrow street with families walking to the church and school. The street should not create two way cyclist paths. It would be far too dangerous. Best to move the two way paths north to one of the wider roads like Campden Grove.

#### **Objection Two**

I live on Gordon Place and Holland Street. Holland St's lack of pavement in one section plus the narrowness of the street plus the fact that pedestrians are required to cross the street makes it dangerous as is. It's already too dangerous as is, and I suggest not letting bikes go both ways as is.

#### **Objection Three**

Thank you for inviting me to set out my reasons for opposing the proposed cycle lane in Holland Street. I do wonder if the proposal was prepared from a street map. Holland Street is already a very narrow, congested street which just does not have the capacity for a cycle lane.

There is parking on one side of the street which makes any vehicle driving along it to go slowly and cautiously. If a lorry is that vehicle passing, then a cyclist has to dismount their cycle and wait on the narrow pavement for the lorry to pass.

Additionally, there are school children walking along, to and from the street from St Marys Abbots School at the end of Kensington Church Walk. The distance from the end of the resident car parking bay at the bottom of Kensington Church Walk/Holland Street is precisely 2 metres 60 inches. There is the concern that a child going to/coming from school with a parent is unable to see a cyclist approaching, especially if that cyclist is at speed.

Further down Holland Street at the junction of Carmel Court the pavement width measures 18 inches, which is already very tight. There is no site line at this junction and is easy to get hit by a cyclist. A cycle lane just adds to this danger.

The width of Holland Street - 5 houses to the left of mine - from the opposite pavement to the outside of a parked car is only 29 inches - often not enough width for a lorry to get through without difficulty.

I am all in favour of cyclists and am, in fact, one myself. However, Holland Street is not the street to bring in a cycle lane, especially due to the lack of width to the street, parked cars on one side, nearby school, elderly pedestrians/residents etc. For exactly these reasons, it will bring about huge concern with the danger of accidents waiting to happen.

I would suggest the Council considers Campden Hill Grove (two streets up from Holland Street) and would surely be a better street to allow a cycle lane given the width of it.

Furthermore, there is already a problem with cyclists at the end of Holland Street crossing Kensington Church Street in order to enter the Park. The police are having huge difficulty ensuring that cyclists dismount their bicycles in order to cross Kensington Church Street and Millionaires Row to enter the park. The Park is now having to close around 6pm because the police cannot control the behaviour of cyclists. A cycle lane would only encourage those cyclists to continue with this kind of irresponsible and dangerous behaviour which is not in line with the Royal Parks rules.

Therefore, I oppose this proposal as I believe it will increase the danger to human life.

#### **Objection Four**

The part of Holland Street which is already open to 2-way cycling is already hazardous and has been imposed despite common sense. There is already hardly any space to drive through given that parking spaces have been maintained despite the narrowness of the street. I drive through Holland Street almost every day and very often argue with cyclist coming the other way and that leaves everybody unhappy. Extending this poor setup to the remaining part of Holland street would only create more chaos, slow down traffic and increase emissions which is completely counterproductive. Investment should go towards more underground parking spaces at reasonable prices and including EV charging which would release more space above ground for cycling lanes.

#### **Objection Five**

Parts of the pavement down Holland Street are exceptionally narrow, which means people are often stepping into the road to get past each other. Even with one-way cycling, the cyclists are often going so fast and are so quiet, I've nearly been knocked over several times and making it two-way, will only make this worse.

#### **Objection Six**

It's an absolute ridiculous idea Holland Street is very busy there are cars parked on one side of the road there were deliveries and it would be an absolute disaster. I don't know why you're helping out bikes all the time the bike lane cause so much upset and trouble thank God you took them away. You need to sort out parking you need to sort out traffic in general but why are you keep helping bikes I do not know.

#### **Objection Seven**

I have seen several near accidents due to cyclists riding against the one-way traffic, and have nearly come a cropper myself. This is too dangerous.

#### **Objection Eight**

I have a gallery with large window on Holland Street and only today there were two terrible altercations with cyclists and cars. The road is so narrow in many parts of Holland Street, you cannot get a car and a bike passing each other, but the drivers and cyclists do not seem to get this. There are constant battle and arguments, it is incredibly dangerous at times on this street, and I particularly worry when I see the young kids on their bikes. This street is a disaster waiting to happen, actually in the past when I have been walking I have nearly been hit by cars and also cyclists. I am sorry to say that there going to be a nasty ending to this unhappy marriage of cars and bikes on this narrow street.

#### **Objection Nine**

[No comment supplied]

#### **Support in Part One**

Please rest assured that if I ever have an injury or hear of anyone having an injury coming out of Carmel Court onto Holland Street (ie the alley way from Dukes Lane onto Holland street) I will make it my personal mission to sue RBKC for the maximum possible. I've had near misses and I know in the past of two nasty accidents. I've reported this multiple times, so I suspect you won't have a leg to stand on. I only assume everyone is too lazy to put in the effort to walk a couple of hundred yards from your building to the point in question. As you come onto Holland Street its a complete blind spot and the pavement is maximum 18 -24 inches. It needs a barrier going a short distance out to prevent cyclist riding right against the pavement (due to possible car traffic in other direction). I'd like a name of person dealing with this so I know who to report when accident happens and who would be in the firing line as I know it will

#### **Support in Part Two**

In support of all two way cycling proposals in RBKC. For Holland Street, I think that the junctions at both ends of the proposed section would really benefit from zebra crossings to allow for better pedestrian safety as the Campden Hill Road side in particular would end up being a very complicated junction to cross. I also think that cyclists should have priority over traffic turning right into Holland Street from Campden Hill Road rather than the proposed layout which makes them give way.

**Support in Part Three**

It is a difficult left turn into Holland Street and it is vital that any cyclists coming the other way are easily visible, and keeping to the left of the road as they come up it.

**Support in Full One**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Two**

As I understand it, this won't affect the car traffic/parking in the street, but will just make it possible for cyclists to use this section of the street in both directions. This would be a great development and has my full support.

## **Appendix 4: Responses received for proposals at Powis Terrace**

<b>Objection One</b> <p>This one way road already experiences cyclist coming down in the wrong direction as well as motorcycles and cars. This proposal will not make cyclist any safer not on this street</p>	<b>Support in Part One</b> <p>Making cycling safer and easier is the best way to solve this city's traffic problems and I am supporting the idea of more two-way cycling streets. I have to say though that most of the proposed streets are less than 100m long, don't connect to any other roads and therefore make cycling not easier but harder. Cycling is safe and fast if you're going straight ahead but every time you have to slow down and turn you're running the risk of being over looked by a car and it is exhausting to pick up speed again. The only way of making cycling a viable alternative to cars are the cycle super highways that have been introduced about 10 years ago and have been actively prevented by the council of Westminster and Chelsea.</p>	<b>Support in Full One</b> <p>The proposal will formalise what some cyclists mistakenly think are already in operation. The proposal add some protection for pedestrians subject to cyclists and other road users following the Highway Code, do not cycle on pavements and cross junctions and join roads in a safe manner. If you are adding to the cycle network will there be new procedures put in place to stop cyclists and those using powered scooters from repeating offences and if need be confiscating their bike or stopping them renting a machine etc?</p>	<b>Support in Full Two</b> <p>So long as the parking space is not reduced, I agree with this proposal. Cyclists often come down the street the wrong way anyway. (There is a terrible parking problem at the moment since the Tabernacle opened again.)</p>	<b>Comment from the Metropolitan Police</b> <p>Junction with Talbot Road - without vertical/physical deflection vehicles may use all available road width when entering Powis Terrace, which could lead to collisions with cycles waiting to exit/approaching the junction.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

## **Appendix 5: Responses received for proposals at Queen's Gate Gardens**

### **Objection One**

I strongly object to the proposal to allow cyclists to ride the wrong way on one way streets. In general this will result in cyclists riding the wrong way on all one way streets. As the Council is aware many cyclists do not follow the basic rules of the road such as stopping for pedestrians on zebra crossings, stopping at traffic lights and riding on the pavements (just to name a few). This proposal will endanger the safety of pedestrians and children crossing Queen's Gate Gardens. WHEN WILL PEDESTRIANS BE A PRIORITY FOR THE COUNCIL!

### **Objection Two**

As it's a square the cyclists will be in danger from cars not being able to see them. There are lots of small children utilising the gardens daily including schools. Having further cyclists going in both directions will put their lives in danger. Since the change in laws cyclists are running over more pedestrians as they have further rights.

### **Objection Three**

I have been a long standing resident of Queens Gate Gardens and I wish to object of the above system. Parking has become extra difficult as it stands with the removal of restrictions on Saturday at 1.30pm and Sunday. As is, cycles and sometime even motorbikes come in the opposite direction right in the centre of the road making junctions quite dangerous. The above will not help the square in the above mentioned, making parking even more troublesome.

### **Objection Four**

Pedestrians are used to looking one way and cycles are silent so not always obvious and there have been a couple of almost accidents that I've witnessed. Also, despite new Highway Code rules, cyclists act like they have a right of way ahead of pedestrians. Also, cycling around the square as per other road users is not a big inconvenience.

### **Objection Five**

The borough should stop promoting cycling as it only makes the traffic worse and causes many accidents. I am already fed up with cyclists behaving like the road is theirs as they don't follow any rules whatsoever, drive on the pavements and do not get fined. I have collided with cyclists as a pedestrian on numerous occasions and so have majority of my neighbours. I object to our square becoming a bicycle thoroughfare as I want to be able to walk in peace without having to look behind my shoulder. In any case, the only thing that you have achieved with promoting cycling is increase in pollution due to traffic

queues caused by installation of mostly unused bike lanes. You should be focusing your efforts and money on sorting out rubbish collection and keeping our streets clean which is a disgrace!

#### **Objection Six**

It will be too dangerous for pedestrians in crossing the road. Cyclists already pose a risk on pedestrians as they often do not respect the rules.

#### **Support in Part One**

Thank you for the opportunity of expressing an opinion on the neighbourhood in which I have lived for many years. Of course I am in favour of reducing motorised traffic and associated congestion.  
I spent some time in Queen's Gate Gardens. Your proposed ruling will legalize that which is already widely occurring, i.e. cyclists are already riding in both directions!

I believe the following comments apply generally to the general practice of 2-way cycling on current one-way routes:

1. We should not detract from the tranquillity of Garden Squares, a unique feature of London. If all become 'rat-runs' for delivery boys on electric bikes nothing positive will have been achieved.
2. Electric bikes need tough regulation: they are now quite intimidating, frequently ridden without regard to pedestrians.
3. Where cycle lanes are introduced, parking should be removed from one or other side of the road. Indeed, I believe this is a better solution than the one-way / 2-way system you are proposing.

#### **Comment from the Metropolitan Police**

Narrow carriageway widths at the junction with Gloucester Road may lead to cyclist vs vehicle collisions as both will be competing for the same road space.

## **Appendix 6: Responses received for proposals at Victoria Grove**

### **Objection One**

I wish strongly to object to the proposal for Two-way cycling paths in Victoria Road, Kensington, W.8, on the grounds that:

1. Such a scheme may be good for wider roads but this is a very narrow road
2. Cyclists invariably make use of roads less safe, in the case of narrow roads this is more so the case
3. Two-way cycling paths will make it more dangerous for not only pedestrians but motorists and cyclists too

### **Objection Two**

I am writing to object to the above proposed order. The notice was torn down immediately, I assume by a cyclist to make sure no one could object.

The Borough should spend their time looking for ways to enforce laws regarding cyclists riding on pavements and in areas where they are forbidden. As a pedestrian, I am frequently frightened by cyclists riding fast in areas they are not allowed.

With regard to the above order, I do not understand why the Borough would waste their time on the matter as cyclists use the two-way system as they wish regardless of the law.

### **Objection Three**

There is no need to introduce 2 way cycling on Victoria Grove. Access to Gloucester Road is easily obtained from Launceston Place via Kynance Mews and Cornwall Gardens. Victoria Grove is a narrow Street and there will be increased danger from cyclists travelling at pace against the traffic.

### **Objection Four**

When we come out of our house it is on to a very narrow footpath, so we have to be particular careful. It is relatively easy to see along Victoria Grove towards Gloucester Road and thus anticipate any traffic. It is much harder to see towards Launceston Place. We already get pretty regular verbal abuse from cyclists cutting through from Launceston Place shouting at us/our dogs/children for not looking properly, never mind the speed at which the cyclists are often travelling makes it particularly hard to see them in time.

Encouraging the flow of cyclists simply exacerbates the threat to our family. As a long time cyclist, familiar with the back routes one uses to stay off main roads, there are quite a lot of other, better, safer routes on wider, still quiet streets - e.g. Cornwall Gardens - if somebody is cycling east. This proposal undermines the safety of Victoria Grove residents. Accordingly I object to this proposal.

#### **Objection Five**

Victoria Grove is a narrow street. As there is very little parking facilities on the street, cars have to stop on the yellow lines to let passengers out, make deliveries, or householders load and unload. This causes congestion on the small street. Taking away what little road space is available would cause even more congestion and be a disservice to the residents living there.

Even more of a concern though is the safety of the cyclists and the drivers. It is a sharp turn into Victoria Grove coming south from Gloucester Road as Victoria Road bends north at the entrance. It would put both cyclists and drivers at risk if a car was turning into Victoria Grove at the same time as a cyclist was turning from Victoria Grove to go north on Gloucester Road.

There are 3 other options for cyclists wishing to exit Launceston Place on Kyance Place, Kyance Mews and Cornwall Gardens... all within 1 block ... It serves no purpose to add another route when so many are available in such short distance. Not only a waste of taxpayers money but more importantly a hazardous situation easily avoided.

It would seem you are encouraging cyclists to leave the designated cycle route of Launceston Place to use Gloucester Road instead. It makes no sense whatsoever.

#### **Objection Six**

We are the freehold owner of the whole of Albert Mews (it's a private mews comprising several houses, flats, garages, shops etc.) We feel exiting the mews is already dangerous enough with poor visibility coming out of the mews onto the road therefore the proposal makes this situation worse. As the proposal has a much bigger impact on the whole of our mews than anyone else, we feel our views need to be given serious consideration. Thank you.

#### **Objection Seven**

I am very concerned because of the danger to cyclists and cars. This is a one way street, quite narrow and often has cars and vans parked on it near the entrance from Gloucester Road. Rounding the corner from Gloucester Road by car it is often a tight squeeze to get passed them and if a cyclist is coming the other way (on a one way street) I fear for everyone's safety. The road is just not wide enough. This is an important entry road to residents of Launceston Place so is frequently used by cars.

#### **Objection Eight**

I would like to object to the proposed signage – the proposal is to “Remove hoop stand and uplighters and install a new post with sign”. All signage needs to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the De Vere Conservation Area. The current no entry sign does just that. There is sufficient room beneath the that sign - see attached photo – to accommodate the “Except cycles” sign.

The redesign of the one-way exit into this junction from the west will require a more sensitive sign – see second attachment – it is extremely tall and dominant.

As part of a Conservation Area Management Plan for the De Vere Conservation Area we will want a complete review of signage in the area. We have already managed to remove 90% of the parking sign posts. We need a more sensitive solution whenever the opportunity presents itself. This is just one such opportunity – we don’t need to go backwards.

#### **Objection Nine**

The site states ‘If you have any queries, require a paper copy of the background information or require assistance in other languages, please contact the Sustainable Travel team using the contact details in the ‘Contact’ section of this page’. I could find no ‘contact’ on that page other than cycling@rbkc.gov.uk Your email seems to infer that this is the incorrect email address, although I have also copied them in to this email. Could you please let me the correct email address to whom I should write. Could you also please forward this email to the correct email address at the RBKC and confirm that you have done so.

My comments and submissions are as below:

Victoria Grove is a narrow street. At the entry point to the roundabout where cars exit from Victoria Grove to the Launceston Place Roundabout the street is only 4m wide.

Allowing for the turning circle of a vehicle, such as a Sainsbury/Tesco delivery van and the narrowness of the road around the roundabout a van must take up/block the whole of Victoria Grove in order to make the turn. It is impossible for a bicycle to enter Victoria Grove, from the opposite direction, when a van emerging from Victoria Grove – and dangerous for any bicycle attempting to do so.

Sometimes large lorries use Victoria Grove. They already have difficulty exiting Victoria Grove onto the roundabout at the end of Victoria Grove with the narrow roadway available. It is absolutely impossible – and dangerous - for a large lorry to exit Victoria Grove and for a bicycle to use Victoria Grove, in the opposite direction, at the same time.

At a wider point Victoria Grove is still only 4.15m wide. It should be noted however that cars are permitted to park in Victoria Grove at certain times, where the road widens. When cars are parked in this street it is difficult for a car, or especially a van/lorry, to manoeuvre past a parked vehicle. It would be quite impossible for a bicycle to pass at the same time as a car or van was passing a parked car in Victoria Grove. The road is just not wide enough to two vehicles and a bicycle going in the opposite direction.

Albert Mews has a very narrow exit onto Victoria Grove. To clear the pillars at the Victoria Grove end of Albert Mews vehicles need to allow a turning circle which with any longer car takes up virtually the whole street. When vehicle emerges from Albert Mews it would leave no room for a bicycle to safely travel from the opposite direction.

My house, 18 Victoria Grove, has a very narrow entranceway into my driveway where I am permitted to park two cars (customarily only one car is parked there). This necessitates reversing into the drive. My cars has a fairly long wheelbase and. Allowing for the turning circle it takes up the whole width of the street to get through the narrow space into the drive. It would be dangerous for a bicycle to attempt to enter Victoria Grove – from the opposite direction - whilst I was reversing into my driveway as there is no space whatsoever for them to cycle. The RBKC has objected to any change to the frontage of my house such as widening the entrance way.

When a van, such as even a small Sainsbury/Tesco delivery van, parks in Victoria Grove it is very difficult for a car to get past. This has already caused frequent friction between drivers trying to get past such a van. It would be impossible, and dangerous for a cyclist to also get through coming from the opposite direction.

It is correct that on some occasions bicycles commit a traffic offence by going down this one-way street the wrong way. This has caused near accidents and verbal unpleasantness. Changing the traffic laws to ‘regularise’ traffic offences merely encourages cyclists to commit similar traffic offences elsewhere. I oppose this change.

#### **Support in Full One**

This will provide a useful way for cyclists to avoid the busier Kensington Road/Gore. Some attention should be paid to forcing Westbound cyclists to go round the traffic island at the top of Launceston Place.

#### **Support in Full Two**

The proposal makes sense. I have been using this Road on a bicycle for many years in the “wrong” way.

#### **Support in Full Three**

[No comment supplied]











