

## Appendix A - Potential alternative cycle schemes (See Option 3 paragraph 3.3)

### Suggestions that may not require significant changes to existing kerblines or the central reservation

Suggestion	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><b>Narrower cycle lanes</b></p> <p>Lanes were 2.5m wide, leaving c.4m traffic lane in central section. Most people did not specify how wide they should be, though one suggested 1m (for a painted lane).</p> <p>Minimum width for a wand-separated lane would be c1.8m – 2m.</p>	<p>Leave more space for remaining traffic lane</p>	<p>Prevent safe overtaking</p> <p>Remove access for mechanical sweepers and waste collection.</p> <p>Would not provide enough extra space to provide additional lane.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles may be less able to park at kerbside.</p> <p>Limited capacity benefits unless narrowing enough to allow additional lane at junctions</p>
<p><b>Remove wands only</b></p> <p>Cycle lanes would be denoted by painted white line.</p>	<p>Still provides separate space for cycling.</p> <p>Allows traffic to pull over to permit emergency vehicles to pass.</p>	<p>Provides less actual and perceived protection from incursion by traffic.</p> <p>Does not meet DfT guidance (2020) requiring light segregation where flows are heavy.</p> <p>Would not mitigate congestion concerns except in relation to emergency vehicles</p> <p>Increased likelihood of parking and loading activity blocking cycle lane.</p> <p>May require substantial CCTV enforcement to keep bike lane clear</p>
<p><b>Increase spacing between wands</b></p> <p>Wands were generally 4m apart except at junctions and bus stops. In some places 8m gaps were created.</p>	<p>Helps drivers pull over to permit emergency vehicles to pass.</p>	<p>Increased likelihood of parking and loading activity blocking cycle lane</p>

<p><b>Part-time cycle lanes</b></p> <p>NB would require full-time removal of wands</p> <p>Various periods suggested, typically weekday AM and PM peaks but could also apply at weekends.</p>	<p>As per wand removal option</p> <p>Increased traffic capacity outside hours of operation.</p> <p>More opportunities for legal loading.</p> <p>Potentially less illegal loading during peak hours.</p> <p>More opportunities for dropping-off and picking up taxi passengers outside hours of operation.</p>	<p>As per wand removal option</p> <p>No protection for cycling outside controlled hours</p> <p>Would provide limited mitigation of congestion concerns (ie outside peak hours).</p>
<p><b>Alternative routes 1</b></p> <p><b>Segregated route on A4 Cromwell Road (TfL road)</b> using Queen's Gate or Exhibition Road to link to Kensington Gardens/Hyde Park</p>	<p>May still provide strategic connection between west and central London</p> <p>Potentially less conflict in relation to loading</p> <p>Road is very wide, west of Earl's Ct Road.</p>	<p>Does not connect so well to existing routes to the west</p> <p>Potential for bigger traffic displacement impacts, as A4 is the busiest corridor to the west</p>
<p><b>Alternative routes 2</b></p> <p><b>Local side streets</b></p> <p>The only route specified was north of KHS and parallel to it, specifically Phillimore Walk.</p> <p>Some also suggested removing motor traffic from some side streets.</p> <p>Some suggestion of using Holland Park</p>	<p>Addresses most of the concerns about segregated cycle lanes on High Street</p> <p>Easy access for eastbound movement from Kensington High St at Earl's Ct Road junction.</p>	<p>No route west of Holland Walk/Earl's Ct Road unless via Holland Park</p> <p>More difficult access for westbound cycle movement</p> <p>Drayson Mews between Phillimore Walk and Holland St may not be suitable for heavy cycle flows</p> <p>Pedestrian-only section between east of Kensington Church St</p> <p>May need protection from residual traffic – impact on loading.</p>

**Suggestions that would require significant changes to existing kerblines or the central reservation**

Suggestion	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><b>Lane in centre of road</b></p> <p>This would require major changes to kerb alignments – not feasible as an emergency scheme</p>	<p>More opportunities for legal loading and passenger drop-offs/pick-ups</p> <p>No interaction with bus stops.</p> <p>Would require less existing carriageway space to be removed from general traffic use.</p>	<p>More difficult to join or leave the lane at side roads – may require additional signal stages and loss of traffic capacity</p> <p>Might feel more like a through route than a means of bringing people into the high street.</p> <p>Might require removal of trees from existing central reservation</p>
<p><b>Bi-directional track on one side of road</b></p> <p>This would require major changes to kerb alignments – not feasible as an emergency scheme</p>	<p>Might require less existing carriageway space, depending on loading provision.</p> <p>More opportunities for loading on one side of the road.</p>	<p>Potential impacts on loading / passenger drop-off on one side of the road, unless lane protected by substantial buffer strip</p> <p>Would require all bus stops in one direction to be floated.</p> <p>Pedestrians would need to be aware of two-way cycle flows when crossing.</p> <p>Poorer access to side roads on one side of the road.</p>
<p><b>Tidal lane on one side of road</b></p> <p>This would require major changes to kerb alignments – not feasible as an emergency scheme</p>	<p>As per bi-directional track</p>	<p>Safety risks associated with potential compliance issues</p> <p>No provision for the less dominant flow at any given time.</p>
<p><b>Narrow pavements to provide more space</b></p> <p>This would require major changes to kerb alignments – not feasible as an emergency scheme</p>	<p>Could potentially provide space for cycle lanes while maintaining traffic capacity, at least in some sections of the High Street.</p>	<p>Any reduction in pavement width would be to the detriment of pedestrians; some parts of the High Street are already quite crowded.</p>

		Would mean less opportunity for seating, including outdoor dining.
<p><b>Bus lanes</b></p> <p>Some respondents believed there were already bus lanes on Kensington High Street</p> <p>Some specified that bikes should share a bus lane with taxis &amp; buses.</p> <p>It is not clear whether there would be enough space to provide a bus lane in central section.</p>	<p>Similar to wand removal but with wider lane.</p> <p>Benefits for cycling would be determined by type and number of motor vehicles allowed in the lane, and by whether the bus lane was full-time or part-time.</p>	<p>Similar to wand removal option but would not exclude all motor vehicles.</p> <p>Disbenefits for cycling would be determined by type and number of motor vehicles allowed in the lane, and by whether the bus lane was full-time or part-time.</p>