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Non technical summary

The environmental report has been written in plain English and avoids the use of jargon wherever possible. However a non-technical summary is always useful and aims to make the consultation process more accessible.

All Councils are required to produce a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) to show how they will contribute to the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy, specifically in relation to the priorities identified.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) must be carried out whilst developing the LIP to ensure that environmental impacts are taken into account and to encourage consideration of environmental factors when developing LIP proposals.

The first stages of the SEA, which culminated in the scoping report, involved agreeing which areas the LIP is likely to have a significant impact on. These were:

- Cultural heritage;
- Human health;
- Landscape and townscape; and
- Air quality and climatic factors

Other elements that were considered are outlined below.

Biodiversity, flora and fauna were considered in particular context of large scale developments (such as the Exhibition Road project) and smaller projects such as carrying out environmental enhancements at the Westway Travellers Site. Due consideration is given to biodiversity through the planning process and as such the LIP in itself is unlikely to have a significant impact. However there are indirect impacts of transportation on biodiversity through soil, air and water pollution and these should not be forgotten.

Soil and water quality might be affected by some larger developments within the LIP. Full environmental assessments are carried out on such developmental works and as such the LIP is unlikely to have a significant impact.

Light pollution is a problem throughout London and the Council minimises this by continuing to introduce white light throughout the borough. These lights are housed such that most of the useful light is directed down onto the footway and roadway to limit light pollution and sky glow. In addition, white lighting provides clearer CCTV images and enhances security and safety. Whilst not directly relevant to light pollution, but with ramifications for energy usage and carbon dioxide emissions, the Council uses renewable energy for all its electricity supplies. The LIP is unlikely to have a significant impact on light pollution.

With regards to material assets, the Council choose quality materials with a view to durability and long term sustainability. Indeed, the Council currently reuses a large proportion of the aggregates resulting from highways and construction operations. The LIP is unlikely to have a significant impact on material assets directly.

The following areas are covered in more detail in this report.
Cultural heritage and townscape are closely linked as any enhancements carried out (for example with the Sloane Square project) need to include preservation measures for Conservation Areas and particular sites of interest such as listed buildings.

Health of residents, workers and visitors to the borough is of paramount importance and there are proposals to increase people’s safety, for example through workshops in schools; to encourage people to walk and bicycle, for example by providing additional cycle stands; and to improve accessibility, for example by carrying out works on tube stations. Reducing noise stress is also important for quality of life and the Council contributes to this by using quiet asphalt on all principal roads.

Air quality is important due to its links with climate change and human health. Transportation accounts for about one quarter of carbon dioxide emissions in the borough and so encouraging people to use private transport less is an important step.

The first stages also involved summarising the environmental baseline, identifying potential problems, developing alternative methods of achieving the mayoral priorities and deciding objectives.

This report outlines the proposals contained within the LIP, describes how they contribute to the Mayor’s priorities and considers measures alternative to those adopted.

It outlines specific objectives and provides potential indicators as to how success might be measured.

This report notes environmental risks and opportunities that exist within the LIP, describes measures in place to mitigate potential problems and invites comments on any aspect of its content.
1. **Introduction**

1.1 **SEA and the Regulations**

1.1.1 A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a mandatory requirement under the EU Directive 2001/42/EC (implemented in England by Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633) that must accompany the Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

1.1.2 Its purpose is to ensure that environmental impacts are taken into account when developing and preparing project plans and proposals for the LIP.

1.1.3 The stated objectives of the Directive are to:

   - provide for a high level of protection of the environment; and
   - contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development.

1.1.4 An SEA considers more than the traditional environmental issues. This is demonstrated by the list of topics below as addressed in the scoping report:

   - Biodiversity, flora and fauna
   - Population and human health
   - Soil
   - Water
   - Air quality
   - Noise and light pollution
   - Climatic factors
   - Material assets
   - Cultural heritage, including archaeological and architectural heritage
   - Landscape and townscape

1.2 **SEA process and stages completed to date**

1.2.1 There are three key outputs for the SEA of the LIP as outlined in figure 1.

1.2.2 The *scoping report* defines which, out of all the possible environmental impacts of the LIP, are considered to be significant and indicates the level of information that will be included at the next stage. It is advised that the “SEA requires that efforts should concentrate on the significant environmental effects of the LIP [and] it is important to use the scoping stage to focus limited Borough resources on understanding and mitigating those significant effects.”\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Page 2, *Advice on Strategic Environmental Assessment for Local Implementation Plans (UPR/SE/088/04)*
### Figure 1: Contributory work, outputs and consultation on the SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA stage</th>
<th>What’s involved</th>
<th>SEA outputs</th>
<th>Consultation (see Appendix B)</th>
<th>LIP version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Setting the context, establishing the environmental baseline, identifying problems and deciding objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three statutory environmental bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage) and others to be decided locally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Deciding the scope of the SEA, developing alternatives and consulting with the environmental bodies.</td>
<td>Scoping report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Producing and consulting on the environmental report.</td>
<td>Environmental report</td>
<td>Various statutory bodies (MPS, TfL, ADKC, neighbouring boroughs) and others to be decided locally.</td>
<td>Draft LIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Deciding what needs to be monitored and monitoring the significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan.</td>
<td>Environmental statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final LIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.3 Officers from various Council departments have contributed to the SEA thus far. This included input from: the Environmental Quality Unit, the Ecology Service, Policy and Transportation, Highways and Construction and the Strategy and Service Development team within Transport, Environment and Leisure Services.

1.2.4 A wide range of individuals and organisations were contacted about the scoping report (see appendix B). It was noted in the report that, aside from statutory consultees, if recipients did not tell us they wished to be included in future consultation, they would not be contacted. As such the second round of consultation is much smaller. Four responses were received including one from Natural England, one of the statutory consultees. These comments have been taken into account where possible as summarised in appendix C.

1.2.5 The environmental report (this document) accompanies the draft LIP and explains the likely significant environmental impacts, the alternatives considered and the mitigation measures proposed. Its purpose is to encourage active and transparent consultation on the draft LIP and to demonstrate compliance with the SEA regulations.

1.2.6 The environmental statement accompanies the final LIP and takes into account feedback from the previous consultative stage.

1.3 The environmental report

1.3.1 In the scoping report it was proposed that the following areas would be significantly impacted upon by the LIP:

- Cultural heritage
- Population and human health
- Landscape and townscape
- Air quality

1.3.2 The following areas were identified as those that would not be significantly impacted upon:

- Biodiversity, flora and fauna
- Soil
- Water
- Material assets
- Noise and light pollution
- Climatic factors

1.3.3 Following consultation and further internal consideration, these areas have changed slightly. We have included climatic factors with air quality as the two topics are inextricably linked. We have included noise within the human health area due to its impact on quality of life.

1.3.4 As such, the following areas are discussed further in this report:

- Cultural heritage
1.3.5 Overall it is felt that, with appropriate consideration given in feasibility studies for larger projects, the LIP will have a positive impact on biodiversity, flora and fauna. As such, the environmental report will note where biodiversity, flora and fauna might be impacted upon but will not discuss it in great depth.

1.3.6 Given the Council’s involvement in planning applications and the ongoing assessments of potentially contaminated land, it is not foreseen that the LIP in itself will have any significant impact on soil quality.

1.3.7 The Environment Agency’s advice is sought on planning applications that might impact upon flood defence or water quality. No planning permission was granted that was contrary to this advice during 2004/05 and 2005/06. We do not anticipate that the LIP will have a significant impact on water in the borough.

1.3.8 With regards to materials used in and on the borough’s streets and highways, the Council selects materials with due consideration to future maintenance, sustainability of supply and recyclable content. The LIP is unlikely to have a significant impact on material assets directly.

1.3.9 The Council continues to introduce ceramic discharge lighting (white light) around the borough. Light pollution is considered by the Council on an ongoing basis. It is anticipated that the LIP will have a small but positive impact on light pollution.

1.3.10 For further information on any of the above topics, please refer to the scoping report.

2. Local Implementation Plan

2.1 LIP outline

2.1.1 The Greater London Authority Act (GLAA) 1999 requires London boroughs to prepare LIPs containing their policies and proposals for the implementation of the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy (MTS) within the areas for which they are responsible. LIPs are statutory documents and have to be submitted to the Mayor of London for approval.

2.1.2 Transport for London (TfL) published guidance on preparing LIPs in July 2004. The guidance covers the layout and content of LIPs and includes a matrix of policies and proposals that each borough is required to address. These are divided into policies and proposals that boroughs ‘must’ address to the Mayor of London’s satisfaction in order for their LIP to gain Mayoral approval and those that boroughs ‘are encouraged to’ address. The Royal
Borough’s LIP aims to address all the policies and proposals identified in TfL LIP Guidance.

2.1.3 LIPs also contain details of the schemes, proposals and the funding required to implement the MTS in a borough between 2005/2006 and 2008/2009. Borough progress and revisions to their TfL funding requirements are submitted to TfL each summer through the LIP Annual Progress Report (previously the LIP Reporting and Funding document).

2.1.4 The draft LIP is currently out to consultation and is made up of the following chapters:

- Local socio-economic and demographic context
- Local transport context
- Borough Policy Statement
- Equality Impact Assessment
- LIP proposals for Mayor of London’s transport priority areas
- Road safety plan
- Parking and enforcement plan
- School travel plan strategy
- Performance measures
- Core capacity
- Funding implications
- Common statements
- Proposal forms (F1s)
- Cross cutting goals
- Acronyms

2.1.5 The consultation draft is available on the Council’s website and in libraries. Some hard copies have been sent out, but this has been kept to a minimum due to the size of the document.

2.2 LIP objectives

2.2.1 The LIP objectives are closely tied to the Mayor’s priorities, namely to:

- Improve road safety
- Improve bus journey times and reliability
- Relieve traffic congestion and improve journey time reliability
- Improve the working of parking and loading arrangements
- Improve accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network
- Encourage walking
- Encourage cycling
- Bring transport infrastructure to a state of good repair

2.2.2 More specifically, within the Council’s Unitary Development Plan (UDP), the objectives below have been set for transport. The LIP proposals contribute to achieving these objectives.
- To locate high trip-generating activity in areas well served by public transport
- To improve access to all land uses, especially for those with special mobility needs through the efficient use of the transport network
- To reduce the need to travel and, in particular, the number and length of motor vehicle trips by ensuring that development is located appropriately
- To promote measures to reduce the need to travel
- To reduce overall levels of road traffic in the borough
- To reduce air pollution from road traffic and the noise nuisance caused by transport
- To increase the proportion of journeys made on foot and by bicycle
- To improve public transport so it is more convenient and reliable to use, is better able to meet demand and is attractive as an alternative to the private car
- To reduce the number and severity of road accident causalities
- To minimise the adverse effects of traffic in the borough, particularly on the environment of residential areas and shopping centres
- To ensure that development does not add to on-street parking stress, in particular where demand is already saturated
- To ensure that changes to the transport infrastructure improve the borough’s townscape

2.3 **LIP proposals**

2.3.1 Table 1 shows a summary of the LIP proposals. Further detail can be found in Appendix 2 of the [draft Local Implementation Plan](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/TransportandStreets/general/lip.asp).
### Table 1: Summary of LIP proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (where applicable)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Principal Road Renewal</strong></td>
<td>TfL annual funding to renew principal road carriageways with a UKPMS condition indicator of 70 and over and some of those rated 50 to 70. The main components are carriageway resurfacing, antiskid treatment and footway maintenance in line with Hammersmith and Fulham’s condition survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Bus Stop Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>The Council will work with TfL and operators to identify which bus stops present the greatest problems to disabled people, older people, people with prams and so on. The Council will prioritise stops on roads with high bus flows and stops close to hospitals or health centres. The Council will seek to improve six to eight bus stops a year at various locations in the Royal Borough between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Programme: Parallel Initiatives** | Ladbroke Grove: Development to include: accident remedial measures such as the conversion of zebra crossings to pelican crossings; introducing Local Bus Priority Measures such as new signals at Cambridge Gardens and improved signalled timings along the whole of Ladbroke Grove to reduce bus journey times; increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; improving the walking environment such as improved streetscape (public realm) and street lighting; improving bicycle parking facilities; improving cycle direction signing for LCN+; reviewing waiting and loading restrictions to minimise the impact of freight.  
Fulham Rd: Development to include: increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; reviewing waiting and loading restrictions to minimise the impact of freight.  
Earl’s Court One-way System: Reviewing the working of the ECOWS to see if the system can revert to two-way working following the introduction of the proposed extension of the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme.  
Improved Pedestrian Facilities along the TLRN: Funding to develop proposals to improve pedestrian facilities at almost 60 traffic signal junctions/pedestrian crossings along the TLRN following the introduction of the extension of the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme.  
King’s Road: In 2000, the Council completed an extensive pedestrian and environmental improvement scheme along the King’s Road. The scheme included measures to improve conditions for pedestrians such as wider footways, streetscape enhancements and measures to help disabled people. This proposal seeks to build on the success of this corridor approach. It has the following components: increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; reviewing safety of side entry treatments and new street lighting; repairing, improving or removing side entry treatments (where appropriate) to enhance the walking environment and streetscape; improving street lighting; reviewing waiting and loading restrictions to minimise the impact of freight; removing clutter - rationalising existing street furniture, such as combining traffic signals with lamp columns; improving signalled pedestrian crossings. Implementation will start in 2007/08.  
Holland Park Avenue: Development to include: increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; making minor modifications to pelican crossings, and streetscape improvements (public realm); implementing traffic signal improvements; reviewing waiting and |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (where applicable)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Park Road</td>
<td>Development to include: increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; reviewing safety of kerb build-outs and pedestrian islands; repairing, improving or removing (where appropriate) kerb build-outs and island treatments to enhance the walking environment and streetscape (public realm); improving footway paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembridge Rd/Pembridge Villas</td>
<td>Development to include: increasing bus stop accessibility by improving bus stops identified by operators where buses have problems pulling close to the kerb; improve street lighting; improving zebra crossings; improving footway paving at the Westbourne Grove end; reviewing waiting and loading restrictions to minimise the impact of freight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programme: Bridge Strengthening and Assessment**

- **Albert Bridge (Painting)**: An eight-yearly scheduled repaint of the bridge is programmed to start in 2008. The proposal involves the repainting exposed steel work surfaces of the bridge, undertaking essential maintenance works and (where necessary) improving the lighting.

- **Albert Bridge (Strengthening)**: The steel girders of Albert Bridge are suffering from corrosion. At present there is a two tonne weight restriction and seven foot width restriction on the bridge. The two tonne weight restriction is below the lowest legal level of three tonnes. This proposal will strengthen the bridge to the minimum three tonne weight limit. Works will include repairing the steel girders and strengthening the bridge to take three tonne vehicles.

- **Albert Bridge (Interim measures)**: In reference to above proposal: The Council, however, needs to install appropriate interim measures to reduce the traffic load on the bridge, before repairs/strengthening are made.

- **Stanley Bridge (Painting)**: The proposal seeks to prevent the bridge corroding thus preserving the strength and integrity of the bridge. The exposed steel surface of the whole bridge will be repainted. If defects in the bridge (over or adjacent to the rail tracks) are detected during repainting they will be repaired.

**Programme: Local Safety Scheme**

- **Proposal Implementation**: Local Safety Schemes will result from the following types of study: Route Studies; Mass Action Plans – such as anti skid treatment; Cell Studies; Hot Spots/Cluster Locations. Detailed proposals will be identified once ‘collision’ analysis and modelling works are complete.

**Programme: 20mph Zone**

- **Golborne Road**: The project seeks to tackle road safety in the area. Components of the scheme may include: The introduction of a 20mph speed limit to reflect existing average daytime speeds; Physical measures to reinforce the 20mph limit to encourage motorists to drive with caution; New compact, easy to store market stalls; Physical measures to tackle barriers to walking, such as new or improved pedestrian crossings and wider footways; Improved accessibility for disabled people; Improved street lighting; Improved pedestrian wayfinding; Revised waiting and loading arrangements; Changes to traffic signal and timings.

**Programme: Education, Training and Publicity**

- **Theatre in Education**: Annual theatre performances for secondary school pupils, e.g. Years 8 and 9: Productions explore road safety issues such as the importance of using seatbelts, how to behave as a passenger and general road safety issues. Years 10 and over: A pre-driver education programme promoting safe driving.

- **Practical Pedestrian Skills**: A proposal to introduce a pedestrian training post to deliver on-going practical pedestrian skills for pupils aged...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (where applicable)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>6 and 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Powered Two-wheeler Casualty Reduction</strong></td>
<td>Work-based Initiatives: The Council will work with companies (with premises in the Royal Borough) employing motorcycle couriers. It will seek to improve road safety by, for example, persuading companies to set realistic delivery times; the Council will work with other companies to reduce motorcycle casualties as part of workplace travel plans. Motorcycle riders in the Royal Borough: residents applying for a parking permit - both drivers and riders – are sent leaflets about motorcycling with their permit; motorbikes and mopeds parked in the Royal Borough will be leafleted once a month with a safety message (such as advanced training, conspicuity, and motorcycle parking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Town Centres</strong></td>
<td>Notting Hill Gate: Development to include: introducing physical measures to tackle barriers to walking, such as improving the location and layout of pedestrian crossings, widening footways, introducing streetscape improvements (public realm) such as improved paving, reduced street clutter, tree planting, and seating and improving street lighting; improving on-street provisions for disabled people, particularly at pedestrian crossings; improving the interchange between the underground station and bus stops; relocating bus stops to more suitable locations; introducing a central reservation to allow bicycle parking; reviewing waiting and loading and enforcement levels to minimise the impact of freight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Streets for People</strong></td>
<td>Streetscape Improvements on Principal and Local Shopping Streets: Developing proposals to make streetscape improvements at 17 shopping centre (principal or local as identified in the Council’s UDP). Components include: Streetscape improvements such as improving paving; reducing street clutter, such as combining street lighting with traffic signals or removing unnecessary guard railing; planting trees; introducing seating; improving street lighting.; removing physical barriers to walking, such as improving the location and layout of pedestrian crossings; improving on-street provisions for disabled people, particularly at pedestrian crossings; improving the interchange between the underground station and bus stops and by foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane Square</td>
<td>The Mayor of London has identified Sloane Square as an area for improvement and one of the ten pilot projects in the Mayor of London’s ‘100 Open Spaces’ initiative and is a ‘World Squares For All’ project. Components could include: introducing physical measures to tackle barriers to walking, such as improving the location and layout of pedestrian crossings; providing wider footways; implementing streetscape improvements such as changes in surface arrangements, improved paving, tree planting, water features, and seating; improving street lighting; reviewing waiting and loading, including relocating taxi ranks within the Square; introducing traffic signals incorporating pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Road</td>
<td>Works to include enhancing the pedestrian tunnel; making streetscape improvements; changing the traffic management in the South Kensington area to the north of the underground station and Queen’s Gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kensington Traffic Management Proposal</td>
<td>The Council is investigating simplifying the one-way system in South Kensington. The proposal has the following components: either reducing the number of slip roads or ‘unravelling’ the one-way system and restoring two-way working; introducing physical measures to tackle barriers to walking, such as new and improved pedestrian crossings; widening footways; introducing streetscape improvements such as high quality paving and other street furniture, planting trees, and public art; improving street lighting; reducing street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal (where applicable)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clutter; improving wayfinding; providing new and relocated bus stops and improved accessibility to them; providing more direct bus routes; new and improved cycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Development and Monitoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Rd/Stanhope Gdns/Harrington Gdns</td>
<td>Improving the pedestrian environment at the junction of Gloucester Road/Stanhope Gardens and Harrington Gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme: Station Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTBOURNE PARK STATION</td>
<td>Introducing a new Station access and improving approaches to the Station including: cleaning and painting the underside of the Westway flyover along Acklam Road to Portobello Market; improving lighting; repainting and improving lighting of the bridge over the railway; implementing streetscape improvements to the areas immediately to the north and south of the station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADBROKE GROVE STATION</td>
<td>Cleaning and painting the underside of the Westway flyover along Thorpe Close, Ladbroke Grove and Portobello Market; improving lighting along Thorpe Close, Ladbroke Grove Station and Portobello Market; repainting of Ladbroke Grove Rail Bridge; introducing anti-pigeon treatment; making improvements to lighting; mounting weather resistant prints to the side elevation of the bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHTSBRIDGE STATION – HANS CRESCENT</td>
<td>Replacing the old paving and carriageway with natural stone paving over the full width and length of Hans Crescent (about 80 metres in length).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIMER ROAD</td>
<td>Introducing traffic measures to improve safety; improving footways and paving, including within the estates; improving lighting, including within the estates; improving lighting under railway bridges, and cleaning of external brickwork railway bridges; upgrading existing pedestrian crossings; removing unnecessary street clutter; using trees, plants and street art.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme: Walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVED PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES</td>
<td>Developing and implementing proposals to improve pedestrian facilities at about 90 traffic signal junctions or pedestrian crossings on Royal Borough Roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRINGTON ROAD</td>
<td>Development to include: improving paving; reducing street clutter, such as removing unnecessary guard railing; introducing physical measures to tackle barriers to walking, such as improving the location and layout of pedestrian crossings; improving on-street provisions for disabled people, particularly at pedestrian crossings, bus stops etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVED STREET CLEANING</td>
<td>Improving the walking environment through better street cleaning, for example, by removing bubble gum from footway paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET CLUTTER REMOVAL</td>
<td>Improving the walking environment by reducing street clutter. The proposal is to combine traffic signs with traffic signals at various locations in the Royal Borough between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYFINDING</td>
<td>Implementing wayfinding measures in the Royal Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAMES PATH</td>
<td>Implementing improvements to the Thames Path, part of London’s Strategic Walks network. The proposal includes: improving route finding; improving lighting to help reduce crime and the fear of crime; introducing physical improvements to tackle barriers to walking and bicycling; providing bicycle parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN MONITORING</td>
<td>Installing and maintaining permanent automatic pedestrian monitoring systems at strategic locations on the Royal Borough’s principal shopping streets (such as Kensington High Street, Knightsbridge and the King's...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal (where applicable)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White City Bridge</td>
<td>Constructing a new bridge between the Royal Borough and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, across the Central Underground line, the West London Line and (possibly) the elevated section of the Earl’s Court One-way System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Street Lighting</td>
<td>Continuing the introduction of ‘white light’ throughout the Royal Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westway (West)</td>
<td>Painting the Westway, improving lighting and streetscape improvements, improving pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programme: London Cycle Network**

| LCN+                | Proposals may include physical improvements to tackle barriers to bicycling on LCN+ routes, providing essential facilities and improving route finding. Street audits tools and monitoring will be used to consider the acceptability and success of proposals. |

**Programme: Bicycling**

| Grand Union Canal Towpath | This proposal will further develop this green corridor by improving the towpath (and access to it) and by tackling barriers to bicycling, walking, and for people with mobility impairment. |
| Bicycle Parking          | Installing small numbers of cycle stands at various locations in the Royal Borough. |
| Bicyclists Training      | Providing effective and accessible bicyclist training for children and adults living, working, studying or attending schools in the Royal Borough. |
| ‘Bikes for Business’     | Providing cycle facilities, e.g. showers, parking, storage at existing business premises that are located in the Royal Borough. |

**Programme: Freight**

| Review of ‘On-street’ Waiting and Loading | Carrying out a survey of on-street parking supply and demand and carrying our geographical analyses. |

**Programme: Regeneration**

| Westway Travellers’ Site | Developing and implementing environmental and access improvements to the Westway Travellers’ Site, including Stable Way. |

**Programme: Environment**

<p>| Electric Charging Points  | Reviewing electric charging point technology to identify possible sites for installing points in South and West London. |
| Graduated Permits         | Introducing a graduated charge for resident parking permits in the Royal Borough. |
| Air Quality Monitoring    | Buying and maintaining air quality monitoring equipment. The equipment will record NOx levels on Earl’s Court Road (south of the station). The equipment will monitor changes in air quality in Earl’s Court resulting from the proposed westward extension to the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme. |
| Noise Mapping             | Purchasing a noise-mapping suite (such as ‘NoiseMap SE’ produced by WS Atkins) so that the Council can model noise levels throughout the Royal Borough. |
| Bio Diesel Production     | The Council is undertaking a feasibility study into the production of Bio-diesel in or near to Holland Park. If the outcome of the study is positive, the Council will collect cooking oils from catering businesses based in or near the park, process it, store it and use in its own fleet or its contractor’s vehicles. The fuel is blended with ordinary diesel at anything from 5% to 20%. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (where applicable)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Driving Guide and Green Fleet Toolkit</td>
<td>Producing a ‘Green Driving Guide and Green Fleet Toolkit’. This will be used to encourage fuel-efficient driving practice in the Royal Borough, and offer advice and guidance to other organisations in the Royal Borough about making their vehicle fleet, driving practices, maintenance and procurement less polluting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programme: CPZ**

| Motorcycle Parking | Improving ‘on-street’ motorcycle parking in the Royal Borough. |
| CCS Review of Visitor Parking | Reviewing the supply and demand of on-street visitor parking in the Royal Borough – pay and display bays and the like; reviewing supply and demand of visitor parking at Kensington Town Hall car park; proposing alternative uses of underused visitor parking spaces identified by the study. |

**Programme: Accessible Transport**

| Scooter Loan Project | Consulting with, promoting to, and involving the wider community with particular attention to the inclusion of younger disabled people and visitors to The Royal Borough who have mobility impairments. |
| Travel Assistance Training | Providing travel assistance to people with a physical impairment, visual impairment or learning difficulties, to older people or mental health service users and victims of crime. A core benefit of this proposal will be that individuals will be encouraged and assisted to use the existing transport provision therefore lessening their demand on statutory and/or voluntary sector provision of door-to-door transport services. |
| Dropped Kerb Programme | Introducing dropped kerbs along main pedestrian routes, public buildings access points or pedestrian crossings throughout the Royal Borough. |
| Chelsea and Westminster Hospital | In 2007/08 the Council will undertake a study of access to the hospital (the Fulham Road between Limerston Street and Edith Grove). The study will seek to improve accessibility, particularly for older or disabled people. In 2008/09 the Council will implement measures to improve accessibility of the area. |
| West Brompton Underground Station | Funding in 2007/08 is for a study of the practicalities and costs of installing a lift on the southbound platform, and outlining ways to take the proposal forward. Funding between 2008 and 2011 will be determined by the outcome of this study. |

**Programme: School Travel Plans**

| Award Ceremony | An annual ceremony to reward schools with an approved School Travel Plan, a reviewed School Travel Plan or schools taking part in sustainable travel and road safety initiatives. |
| Implementing School Travel Plans | Implementing practical and cost effective engineering measures identified through School Travel Plans. |
| Assistance with Developing School Travel Plans | Helping and supporting schools to develop School Travel Plans. It covers costs such as supply cover, printing, and events to consult and involve parents. |
| Promoting School Travel Plans | Funds cover the cost of producing a newsletter sent to all schools in the Royal Borough, each term. |
| School Travel Plan Coordinator | Funds to cover a part-time School Travel Plan Coordinator - a consultant who helps schools develop travel plans. |

**Programme: Workplace Travel Plans**

<p>| Promotion of Workplace Travel Plans | The Council will promote the benefits of work place travel plans with business in the Royal Borough. |
| Developing Work Travel Plans | The Council will work with local employers to develop and monitor work travel plans and, if necessary, provide appropriate resources to do so. |
| Walk to Work Week | Funding to promote this event held in May. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (where applicable)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Travel Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to School Weeks</td>
<td>Funding to support the national ‘Walk to School Weeks’ held in May and October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Once a Week</td>
<td>Funding for an on-going initiative that rewards pupils who regularly walk to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Community Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Car Project</td>
<td>Funding to support a Westway Community Transport service for mobility-impaired, disabled or older people who find it difficult or impossible to use public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Transport and Driver Training</td>
<td>Ensuring the continuation of the Westway Community Transport (WCT), an organisation that provides essential, accessible and affordable transport to local organisations, groups and individual people - particularly disabled or elderly residents and under five year old children. They are one of the largest community transport organisations in London. Measures might include covering the cost of replacing obsolete vehicles that are not currently exempt from the CC; providing driver training, first aid training; teaching disability awareness and passenger assistance techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme: Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel Plan</td>
<td>Developing a staff travel plan to bring together all the actions in place to encourage staff to use more sustainable modes of transport such as season ticket loans, travelcard allowances, bicycle loan and lease schemes, participation in Walk to Work Week and providing pool bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Maintenance</td>
<td>Maintaining carriageways and footways on minor and local roads; street cleansing; maintaining streetlighting etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Schemes</td>
<td>Carrying out traffic management schemes resulting from traffic, parking and other studies. Schemes could include: junction modifications, providing traffic islands, pedestrian crossings, mini-roundabouts etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Reviewing streetscape in accordance with the Council’s streetscape guidance; rationalising signs and road markings; reducing street clutter and providing Yorkstone pavements where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education</td>
<td>Providing road safety education training and publicity in schools and across the wider community; working with schools and local businesses to encourage the development of school and workplace travel plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World’s End Place</td>
<td>The aim is to transform the area into a high-class public open space that people will want to use by: designing out the opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour by upgrading the lighting, removing the overhead walkway and opening up sight-lines across the square; renewing the dull and worn brick and concrete surfaces with high quality natural stone paving that will introduce colour and contrast into the area; repositioning and renewing lamp posts, benches and litter bins to give the square a more open, contemporary feel; planting ornamental trees to bring colour and shade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Relationship of LIP to other plans and programmes

2.4.1 The Council's UDP has been a key document in developing the LIP. Its overall aim is "to maintain and enhance the character and function of the borough as a residential area and to ensure its continuing role within the metropolitan area as an attractive place in which to live and work". In terms of transport the principal strategic policy is "to seek a safe, efficient and environmentally acceptable transport system for the metropolitan area, whilst protecting the residential character, amenity and quality of the Royal Borough". The UDP aims to contribute to the development of a transport system for the Royal Borough which is:

- safe;
- efficient;
- environmentally acceptable; and
- provides for walking, cycling and use of the river.

2.4.2 The LIP has a wide scope and the review of other programmes showed a high degree of crossover. There are relationships with many other policies and strategies as listed below. Most of the links will be self-evident, e.g. relevance of the Borough's Air Quality Action Plan; these are clarified in the appropriate areas of section 3.

2.4.2 Where appropriate, indicators and targets have been taken from existing strategies and plans to contribute towards the SEA objectives.

*International and national Acts and strategies*
- Disability Discrimination Act (1995)
- Road Traffic Reduction Act (1997)
- National Road Safety Strategy (2000)
- EU Birds Directive 79/409/EC
- EU Habitats Directive 92/43/EC
- Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change (1997)
- Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport

*Mayor of London’s strategies*
- The Mayor’s Transport Strategy (July 2001)
- Cleaning London’s air: The Mayor’s Air Quality Strategy (September 2002)
- The Mayor’s Transport and Air Quality Strategy Revisions: London Low Emission Zone. Revised following consultation (July 2006)
- Connecting with London’s nature: The Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy (July 2002)
- Sounder City: The Mayor’s Ambient Noise Strategy (March 2004)
- The London Plan: The Mayor’s Spatial Development Strategy (February 2004)
3. **State of the environment**

3.1 **The study area**

3.1.2 The geographical area that this SEA covers is the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The borough extends from Chelsea Embankment in the south, through Kensington, Notting Hill and Ladbroke Grove up to Kensal Green in the north. It is bounded by Kensington Gardens to the east and by the West London Railway Line to the west (see map 1).
3.1.2 The Royal Borough is bounded by four other boroughs: Hammersmith and Fulham, Westminster, Brent and, across the river, Wandsworth (see map 2).
3.2 The environmental baseline

3.2.1 Environmental baseline information on areas that are not covered in this environmental report can be found in the scoping report⁴.

Cultural heritage

3.2.2 There are currently 36 Conservation Areas in the borough, covering about 72 per cent of its area. Preserving and enhancing these areas of special architectural or historic interest is very important and there are policies within the UDP intended to ensure the provision of an environment which can satisfy the needs of modern life, whilst maintaining its quality, and to allow change in a sensitive way so that social and economic well-being is maintained.

3.2.3 There are four overall objectives for conservation and development within the UDP:

- To protect and enhance areas of character throughout the Borough, both in terms of use and the physical environment.
- To ensure that all development respects local character, is of a high standard of design, takes into account people with special mobility needs and does not adversely affect residential amenity.
- To preserve and enhance the Borough’s Conservation Areas and listed buildings.
- To protect and enhance the natural environment and to preserve the archaeology of the Borough.

3.2.3 The character and perception of any area is complex and depends not only on the fabric of existing buildings, but also on the ambience created by trees and gardens, walls and railings, external features and materials. It is

⁴ www.rbkc.gov.uk/EnvironmentalServices/General/stage1_scoping_report.pdf
therefore important to pay regard to how these factors interlink and to look at the area as a whole when considering works.

3.2.4 Chapter 4 of the **UDP**\(^5\) goes into great detail as to the Borough’s policies on Conservation Area protection and outlines that full planning applications are required in Conservation Areas where a proposal is likely to affect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. To this end the Council has Conservation Area Proposals Statements for specific areas (see map 3).

**Map 3: Conservation Areas in the Royal Borough**

![Conservation Areas Map](crowncopyright.png)

1. Oxford Gardens
2. Norland
3. Ladbroke
4. Pembridge
5. Holland Park
6. Kensington
7. Kensington Palace
8. Edwards Square, Scandale & Ablington
9A. Kensington Square
9B. Kensington Court
9C. De Vere
9D. Cornwall
10. Queensgate
11A. Earl’s Court Village
11B. Courtfield
11C. Earl’s Court Square
11D. Nevern Square
12. The Boltons
13A. Thurloe/Smith’s Charity
13B. Brompton
14A. Hans Town
14B. Sloane Square
15. The Billings
16. Sloane/Stanley
17. Chelsea Park/Carlyle
18. Chelsea
19. Cheyne
20. Royal Hospital
21. Thames
22. Kensal Green Cemetery
23. Brompton Cemetery
24. Avondale Park Gardens
25. The College of St. Mark & St. John
26. Philbeach
27. Lexham Gardens

Crown Copyright All Rights Reserved. Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea No 100021668 (2007)

\(^5\) [www.rbkc.gov.uk/Planning/UnitaryDevelopmentPlan/default.asp](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/Planning/UnitaryDevelopmentPlan/default.asp)
3.2.5 Any plans and proposals within the LIP give due consideration to the Council’s objectives as outlined above.

3.2.6 Given the imminent demise of the UDP and the current drafting of the replacement Local Development Framework, this offers an ideal opportunity to ensure Conservation Area preservation and enhancement is embedded within the LIP.

3.2.7 There are also over 4,000 buildings, widely dispersed within the Royal Borough, which are included in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. There are 16 Grade I, 240 Grade II* and 3,764 Grade II listed buildings in the borough (see map 4) and 20 per cent of planning applications relate to these buildings. The Council considers that their preservation and protection are of great importance.

Map 4: Listed buildings in the Royal Borough.
3.2.8 The borough has four sites of Archaeological Importance and these are identified in the Council Unitary Development Plan.

3.2.9 The borough also contains two Scheduled Ancient Monuments: the Brick Kiln in Walmer Road and Kensington Palace.

3.2.10 From a more contemporary perspective, Kensington and Chelsea also has many public art projects which further enhance the cultural heritage of the borough.

3.2.11 The Albert Bridge, dating from the 1870s, is an iconic landmark in London. There are specific proposals to strengthen and paint the Albert Bridge to contribute to the preservation of this cultural attraction.

**Human health** (activity, safety and security, accessibility, other)

3.2.12 With an estimated population of 184,100\(^6\) the Royal Borough is the most densely populated borough in London. The reported population has been increasing since 1981, when it was recorded as 140,000\(^7\), and is projected to continue to do so.

3.2.13 A large number of people commute into the borough increasing the daytime population, and tourism increases this further. Census 2001 estimated the daytime population (defined as those people, aged 16 to 74, who live and work in the area (or do not work) and those people who live outside the area and work inside the area as 151,042. Just less than one quarter (22 per cent) of the borough’s workforce also lives in the borough.

3.2.14 Human health (activity): The Council has an opportunity through the LIP to encourage increased activity in the resident population and with those who come to the borough to work and visit.

3.2.15 The pedestrian environment is extremely important to those who live in, work in or visit London. Walking is the most environmentally sustainable mode of transport and for many people it is the most convenient and pleasant way of getting around. It also constitutes part of virtually every trip made by other transport modes. The Council recognises this in its excellent track record of high standards of footway maintenance and provision for pedestrians.

3.2.16 The borough’s major roads and some of its minor ones can create significant barriers to pedestrian movement. The heavy flows of traffic and the width of many roads can require pedestrians to divert from their most direct route to use crossing facilities or may even deter them from crossing at all. Many of the footways in the borough are also narrow and in busy areas, such as some shopping streets, the large numbers of pedestrians sometimes make it difficult to walk unimpeded. Illegally parked cars, street

---


\(^7\) Census, 1981, Office of National Statistics
furniture and high kerbs add to the problems that pedestrians can face, particularly those with special mobility needs.

3.2.17 The Council’s established streetscape policy of using high quality materials and removing street clutter goes a long way to improving conditions for pedestrians as exemplified by the Kensington High Street Improvements.

3.2.18 The Council recognises that all road users are at times pedestrians and that one of the main barriers to encouraging more people to walk more often is an environment that is perceived to be threatening and dominated by motorised road users.

3.2.19 The Council also recognises that for many pedestrians the street environment can be particularly daunting, especially for older people, those whose mobility is impaired such as wheelchair users or those for whom walking is either permanently or temporarily restricted, those with young children including those with pushchairs or buggies, those who are visually or hearing impaired or people with learning difficulties.

3.2.20 For all these people an uncluttered street environment that is easy to read is important. The Council’s approach to streetscape addresses these issues. Major improvement schemes aim to provide a barrier-free environment with minimal guard railing and straight across crossings to facilitate pedestrian movements and autonomy.

3.2.21 In addition to reducing clutter caused by street furniture, the Council controls the location of tables and chairs on the pavement via the issuing of licences. This is to ensure that a sufficient pavement width is maintained for pedestrians. The Council also ensures that advertising "A" boards, rubbish sacks being left out on non-collection days and other obstacles do not block pavements. The Council recognises that for households with minimal or no space outside to store it that a build up of rubbish could be a problem. Therefore, the Council is one of the few in the country to have twice weekly refuse collections to avoid the storing of rubbish on the street.

3.2.22 Many proposals are aimed at encouraging walking such as improving pedestrian facilities through streetscape developments and enhanced street cleaning. Other initiatives include the Walk to School and Walk to Work Weeks and assisting and encouraging local businesses to adopt travel plans.

3.2.23 Detailed descriptions of proposals which are envisaged to have a positive impact on walking can be found in paragraph 5.7 of the draft LIP. A summary follows:

- the School Travel Plan programme
- work place travel plans
- travel awareness programmes such as Walk to Work Week, Walk to School Weeks and Walk Once a Week
- area based schemes such as Sloane Square and Exhibition Road town centre schemes and various station access schemes
• long term parallel initiatives that include improving the public realm
• local safety schemes to reduce the number of pedestrian casualties
• road safety education and training schemes, such as practical pedestrian skills training to improve safety for vulnerable road users
• walking schemes to improve the pedestrian environment
• provision of new pedestrian and bicycle bridges at White City and over the Thames between Sands End and Battersea
• improved street lighting
• effective street cleaning and removal of graffiti so improving the perception of personal safety
• improved pedestrian crossing facilities

3.2.24 The Council’s UDP contains the following walking related policies:

• to maintain, improve and provide safe and convenient crossing facilities for pedestrians on all roads, particularly at intersections and at regular intervals on major roads
• to maintain and improve footways to provide a safe and attractive environment for pedestrians
• to protect existing footpaths and encourage provision of new direct pedestrian routes and accesses when assessing all development proposals

3.2.25 Cycling is a convenient, low cost and non-polluting form of transport. It improves health and fitness and is often quicker than alternative means of transport - especially in congested urban areas. With most journeys being fewer than five miles, provision for cycling plays an important part in attempting to reduce motorised road traffic levels.

3.2.26 The London Cycling Strategy sets targets to double cycle use by 2002 and to double it again by 2012. There are also targets for employers to provide facilities at the workplace for at least ten per cent of their employees to cycle to work by 2012, and that provision for customers by retailers and service providers should be similar. Such provision should include the convenient storage of cycles at home, work and main destinations, introducing convenient routes, and where appropriate traffic management schemes.

3.2.27 The busy, historic road network that the Council has inherited consists largely of narrow, mainly residential streets. More than 70 per cent of these roads are designated as Conservation Areas and all suffer a very heavy demand on road space, particularly for kerbside parking.

3.2.28 Therefore, specific cycling measures that are appropriate in larger outer London boroughs with less demand on the available road space are not always practical in central London. Not only are there streetscape implications, for instance green surfacing on cycle lanes, but existing road safety measures, bus facilities, the need for regular bus stops and resident and visitor parking bays all often preclude dedicated on-street cycle routes and lanes. A combination of extremely busy footways and the potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, particularly older people, has led the Council to only consider shared-use as a last resort. It is therefore
generally limited to routes across open spaces for which the Council is responsible such as the route across Holland Park and on small areas of the footway around toucan crossings.

3.2.29 The main contributions that the Council makes to assist cyclists is to provide a smooth, debris-free running surface through its high quality street maintenance and cleansing regimes, the provision of abundant, appropriately located high quality cycle parking and its well established cycle training programme.

3.2.30 Detailed information on cycling-related proposals can be found in paragraph 5.8 of the draft LIP. A summary follows:

- distributing TfL cycling guides and other cycling literature
- promoting cycling particularly with respect to school travel
- providing pool bikes for Council staff
- providing various bike travel allowances to employees for work-related trips
- providing interest-free loans for staff to purchase bikes for the journey to work
- install secure bicycle parking in the Town Hall car park
- providing free cycle training to all who work in the Royal Borough as well as residents and schoolchildren
- providing high quality cycle parking is a part of all major schemes
- encouraging developers to provide access for cyclists
- improving facilities and access for cyclists and pedestrians along the Paddington Branch of the Grand Union Canal through the north of the borough
- responding to requests from residents, visitors and businesses for increased cycle parking facilities
- assisting businesses to develop Work Travel Plans

3.2.31 The UDP contains the following policies on cycling:

- to improve and introduce cycle facilities in the borough, particularly on roads that form part of the borough’s Local Cycle Network, or part of the London Cycle Network
- to review the operation of major junctions which can present a significant barrier to cycle movement, and introduce appropriate measures to help cyclists
- to co-operate with TfL in the provision of measures to assist cyclists on or across priority routes
- when considering proposals for development, to ensure that cycle routes are provided where necessary to improve accessibility through the site and/or to connect it with the existing cycle networks
- where appropriate, to require the provision of cycle parking facilities in residential and commercial developments and at other suitable locations

3.2.32 In line with two of the Mayor’s priorities, the LIP has specific aims to encourage walking and cycling. It is anticipated that the LIP will have a beneficial impact on human health (activity).
3.2.33 Human health (safety and security): Safety and security are paramount to an effective transportation infrastructure.

3.2.34 The Council has put forward proposals for traditional methods of raising awareness and improving safety and security, such as holding educational performances about road safety in schools and improving lighting at tube stations.

3.2.35 Other initiatives include working with local businesses that employ motorcycle couriers to encourage them to set realistic delivery times to help reduce speed-related incidents and leafleting motorcycles parked in the borough with safety messages (such as advanced training, conspicuousness and motorcycle parking).

3.2.36 The Council has a comprehensive Road Safety Plan, which is included as chapter 6 in the draft LIP. It outlines the Council’s policies and objectives, referencing Local Safety Schemes and describing how road safety considerations are integral to the design and development of all traffic schemes.

3.2.37 It is envisaged that the LIP will have a positive impact on human health (safety and security).

3.2.38 Human health (accessibility): The Council is fortunate in its links with Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea (ADKC), a local charity and support group which offers informed comments on any streetscape developments as well as accessibility issues in general.

3.2.39 Many improvements suggested to take wheelchair users into account also benefit other user groups, such as people with pushchairs and older people. Examples include improving bus stop accessibility for these groups at high usage stops.

3.2.40 The Council analyses Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) to identify areas with high or low public transport provision. Based on this information, the Council recommends route changes to TfL.

3.2.41 The Council works closely with TfL and London Buses to promote accessible bus services, including the bus stop accessibility programme. The Council supports the introduction of step-free access to all London Underground and national rail stations and is currently liaising with London Underground over providing step-free access at South Kensington Underground Station.

3.2.42 The Council works closely with Westway Community Transport (WCT), providing annual funding (£198,217 for 2007/08) for local community transport and accessible transport services, seeking to fill gaps in public transport provision.

3.2.43 The Council spends over £6m a year providing subsidised transport services to certain groups of residents. It does this in two main ways. Firstly by meeting part or all of the cost of residents’ travel on public
transport and by taxi and secondly by providing transport through contractors to and from places such as day care centres.

3.2.44 The Council provides transport to schools, nearly all outside of the borough, for children with special educational needs. It offers London Transport travelcards or bus passes to Royal Borough children living further than a specified distance from their school. The Council also charters vehicles to transport children to and from play and youth centres, and for some excursions during school holidays.

3.2.45 The Council provides transport to day care centres within the borough for clients who could not otherwise attend these centres. It also allocates transport-related grants to voluntary organisations providing services that meet social services objectives as well as providing ad hoc transport, typically taxis for non-routine trips by Social Services clients. WCT operates group transport services to over 600 voluntary and community groups in the borough. It is able to offer minibuses for hire at affordable rates to organisations that are enabling members of the community to access a more independent lifestyle. Particular attention is given to those organisations working in deprived areas.

3.2.46 The Council paid £4,330,000 to TfL via London Councils towards Concessionary Fares (Freedom Pass) in 2006/07. The projected figure for 2007/08 is £4,700,000.

3.2.47 The Council responds positively wherever practical to individual requests for minor improvements such as the provision of new dropped kerbs and changes to local parking layouts to improve accessibility.

3.2.48 The Council’s specifications for door to door services require contractors to train their drivers in disability awareness and in assisting clients where appropriate. WCT ensure that its drivers are all trained to MiDAS (Minibus Driver Assessment Scheme) standard and also offer them additional training such as Emergency First Aid, Disability Awareness and Manual Handling.

3.2.49 The Council has considered the outcome of the CAT pilots and will continue to engage with London Councils' work with TfL on its review of door to door services. The Council is keen to ensure that any proposed changes resulting from the review are of benefit to its clients.

3.2.50 Additional plans include a commitment to complete an access audit of each of the Council’s parks and open spaces and develop priorities for improvement in consultation with local disability organisations by March 2007. The Council also aims to introduce an audio description within Holland Park for visually impaired visitors by April 2008.

3.2.51 ADKC is the main focus for consulting with disabled people in the Royal Borough. On larger area schemes, the Council engages with disability groups including ADKC and the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association throughout the design process to ensure that any issues that may arise are considered at an early stage. The Council’s Public Transport Advisory Group
is also a focus for consultation, particularly for elderly public transport users, and for liaison with TfL and public transport providers

3.2.52 The Council’s Out and About scheme was set up in 2005/06 to provide an electric scooter loan service to individuals living and working in the Royal Borough. The scheme provides powered scooters in different areas of the borough on different days and was the first of its kind in central London. WCT manages this project and TfL grant match funded the cost of the service in 2006/07.

3.2.53 The project is currently primarily targeted at older people. The Council would like to extend and promote the scheme to the wider community over the coming years with particular attention to the inclusion of younger disabled people and visitors to the borough who have mobility impairments. One of the current sites is Kensington Gardens which gives users the opportunity to access Hyde Park and the South Kensington museums and institutions. By expanding the service, users will have greater access to shops, parks and other sites not currently accessible to them.

3.2.54 The WCT user forum has identified Out and About as a priority development project as it already has the transport infrastructure and experience to further develop the scheme.

3.2.55 The Council aims to make all its streets accessible through the provision of appropriately designed dropped kerbs, step-free routes and the associated enforcement necessary to keep routes clear.

3.2.56 It is envisaged that LIP will have a positive impact on accessibility.

3.2.57 Human health (other): As with other central London boroughs, noise – including that from traffic – can become a serious problem for residents and compromise their quality of life. The Council offers a comprehensive noise and nuisance service dealing with approximately 10,000 complaints per annum.

3.2.58 The noise and nuisance service in the Royal Borough was subject to an internal review during 2005/06 which resulted in a service improvement plan being drawn up. The full report is available online.

3.2.59 In October 2002, consultation showed that road traffic was the second most bothersome type of noise for residents; more than three quarters of respondents stated that they found that they were disturbed to some extent by noise from this source.

3.2.60 The Royal Borough’s UDP contains a strategy to support measures to reduce noise nuisance caused by transport. It is difficult to predict the impact on noise that the extended CCZ will have, however this will be monitored closely.

3.2.61  To reduce noise intrusion associated with lorries, particularly at night when roads are generally less busy, the Council supports the effective London-wide control of night time and weekend lorry movement. This includes noise nuisance associated with large lorries servicing the increasing number of small and medium sized supermarket developments from the highway in residential areas.

3.2.62  The Council carried out trials using quiet asphalt seven years ago which showed dramatic reductions in levels of traffic noise. Since then, quiet asphalt has been used as standard for resurfacing on all principal borough roads. The whole of what is now the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) was also resurfaced in quiet asphalt before TfL took over as the highway authority and who continue to use it as standard.

3.2.63  Noise impact assessments are carried out when developing major schemes such as the proposals for Sloane Square.

3.2.64  The Council has taken up powers to require drivers of stationary vehicles to switch off "idling" engines.

3.2.65  The Council is currently working closely with TfL and London Buses to try and reduce the impact of noise nuisance associated with their newly introduced Volvo buses following complaints from residents.

3.2.66  Disturbance from aircraft noise from Heathrow airport, particularly at night and in the early morning seriously affects residents in the south of the borough who live under the flight path to the northern runway. The Council is therefore concerned that there should be no development at Heathrow that leads to an increase in taking off and landing movements.

3.2.67  The Council is concerned that helicopters flying over the borough lead to an increased nuisance from noise and will therefore resist the development of helicopter facilities which would result in increased noise over the borough and increased pressure on the transport networks within the borough.

3.2.68  Overall it is projected that the LIP will have a significant positive impact on human health through the areas described above.

Landscape and townscape

3.2.69  Although the borough has less open space than any other part of London except the City of London, the borough has numerous small parks and open spaces – some open to the public and some for the use of private residents. These help to provide the peaceful and almost ‘village’ like feel that sets Kensington and Chelsea apart from many inner London areas.

3.2.70  The borough possesses superb pedestrian environments such as Portobello Road and the award winning Kensington High Street. There are proposals to add further improvements to the public realm in areas such as Exhibition Road and Sloane Square.
3.2.71 The Royal Borough has two schemes included in the first phase of the Mayor of London’s 100 Open Spaces initiative - Sloane Square and Exhibition Road.

3.2.72 Other proposals include those for the area around South Kensington Underground Station and the junction of Gloucester Road/Stanhope Gardens/Harrington Gardens.

3.2.73 The Council has always exemplified high standards of street construction and maintenance. It recognises that the management and design of its streets and public space is a vital part of improving and maintaining the streetscape of the Royal Borough. The Council published its Streetscape Guide in July 2004 under the strapline "to protect and enhance for future generations".

3.2.74 The Council’s main principles for streetscape design are:

- preservation of the historic fabric of the Royal Borough
- respecting and enhancing local character
- considered yet innovative design
- experimentation – a willingness to see what works
- reduction of clutter
- high quality materials
- simple, clean designs
- coordination of design and colour
- equal and inclusive access for all road users
- maintaining the existing and improved environment

3.2.75 These design principles were developed during the design and implementation of the Kensington High Street improvements. They are now incorporated into the development of all traffic and environmental improvement schemes including the proposals for Sloane Square and Exhibition Road.

3.2.76 The Council works closely with TfL on streetscape design, particularly at locations where TfL’s work on the TLRN has a direct impact on borough roads or on the streetscape in general.

3.2.77 The Council has two rolling programmes of streetscape initiatives, the ward-by-ward Streetscape Review and the Streetscape Improvements on Principal and Local Shopping Streets programme. Other specific proposals include those for Notting Hill Gate and Hans Crescent.

3.2.78 Implementation of the LIP should have a significant positive impact on the townscape of the Royal Borough.

**Air quality and climatic factors**

3.2.79 There are seven pollutants assessed by the Borough through the local air quality management process: carbon monoxide; benzene; 1,3-butadiene;
lead, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and particulate matter. The Council also provides information on the hydrocarbon benzo(a)pyrene (b(a)p).

3.2.80 The borough was declared an Air Quality Management Area in 2000 and, whilst the resultant Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) continues to be implemented effectively, levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and, to a lesser extent, particulate matter (PM₁₀) still exceed the objective levels set by the government. As would be expected, pollution levels are highest around main roads in the borough.

3.2.81 Exceedences of the ozone (O₃) objective are as much a concern as the exceedences of the NO₂ and PM₁₀ objectives. However because of the transboundary nature of O₃, action is required at a national and European level to reduce the pollution episodes caused by O₃. Therefore there is little further that an individual local authority can do to improve the situation. However we continue to monitor and disseminate the data collected.

3.2.82 The main sources of NO₂ in the borough have been identified as gas, road transport and rail. Emissions are usually stated as nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) because most of the NO₂ is emitted as nitric oxide (NO). It is important to bear in mind that different emission sources may contribute to concentrations in the air to a varying degree. A significant contribution of this pollutant is from sources outside of the borough.

Figure 2: Estimated NOₓ emissions for 2003 within the Royal Borough⁹

3.2.83 The main sources of PM₁₀ are also gas, road transport and rail but in varying proportions. A significant proportion of PM₁₀ is from sources outside of the borough.

---

⁹ Figures do not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding.
3.2.84 Our latest monitoring of nitrogen dioxide shows only a slight decline at urban background sites\textsuperscript{10} (North Kensington and West London). The remaining sites show no clear overall trend.

3.2.85 PM\textsubscript{10} is also monitored in the borough. The chart below shows the available data for the past ten years though not all sites have operated throughout.

\textsuperscript{10} Urban background sites are urban locations distanced from sources and broadly representative of city-wide background concentrations, e.g. elevated locations, parks and urban residential areas.
the entire period. There has been an overall decline since monitoring began in 1995 at the urban background site though this has recently stabilised. Again, there is no clear trend at the other sites.

**Figure 5: Annual mean levels of particulate matter (PM$_{10}$)**

![Graph showing annual mean levels of particulate matter from 1995 to 2005 for different sites.]

- **Cromwell Road 2**
- **North Kensington**
- **Earls Court Road**

3.2.86 Generally the Council has made good progress with the majority of the 25 actions within the AQAP. Some of the actions have been completed, many however are ongoing projects aimed at continual improvement. For example, the Council has adopted powers to require drivers of stationary vehicles to switch off ‘idling’ engines – during 2005/06 we received 17 complaints and six warnings were given. In some instances the emphasis of the action has shifted, e.g. the Council, whilst continuing to encourage residents to compost rather than burning waste in bonfires, is now offering a green waste collection service.

3.2.87 Despite the progress in implementing the AQAP, air quality concentrations of the pollutants of most concern have not improved significantly. Although a number of actions within the plan seek to reduce traffic volumes, which in turn should result in a reduction in emissions from vehicles, a reduction in emissions does not give a proportional reduction in pollution concentrations. Whilst some actions, as we know, will have only a limited impact on air quality in the borough there are good reasons for undertaking them such as leading by example. Although they will also reduce the impact of the Council’s activities, the effect on their own is not directly measurable. Others are designed to encourage visitors, other organisations and businesses to reduce their impact on air quality.

3.2.88 It is difficult to predict the impact on air quality that the extension of the congestion charging zone in February 2007 will have. Some areas of the borough, such as the Earl’s Court one-way system, might see an adverse impact due to increased traffic flow as they are outside of the extended
zone. The Council will continue to monitor air quality stringently and attempt to ameliorate any negative effects of the scheme.

3.2.89 For further information on air quality monitoring and action, please refer to the Council’s relevant air quality webpage.\(^{11}\)

3.2.90 The consultation about the proposed Low Emission Zone (LEZ) showed that it would bring air quality benefits forward by about five years. This might be impressive if, in those five years, air quality were expected to undergo a major improvement. In practice, the additional improvement offered by the LEZ, over and above what is predicted to happen by TfL anyway in 2010 (without the LEZ), is slight and makes it impossible to justify the significant costs to vehicle operators.

3.2.91 Significant improvements in emissions of pollutants from vehicles are expected, however there are a number of uncertainties regarding the impact this will have on atmospheric concentrations. In addition a significant proportion of PM\(_{10}\) is secondary in nature, much of which arises from sources outside of the borough.

3.2.92 Air quality has a high profile nationally and this is reflected locally; in October 2002 residents told us that “traffic exhaust fumes and urban smog” was the environmental problem that concerned them the most.

3.2.93 The Council is dedicated to improving air quality in the borough through direct and indirect methods. An effective modal shift from private vehicles to bicycles and walking will, of course, have an indirect impact on air quality and as such some examples are included in the summary of the Council’s recent achievements below:

- carried out vehicle emission testing campaigns
- taken up powers to require drivers of stationary vehicles to switch off "idling" engines with associated publicity and appropriate enforcement action
- continued to monitor and model air quality across the borough
- required Council contractors to choose the Best Practicable Environmental Option for their vehicle fleet
- worked to establish fuelling points for alternative fuels including a recent commitment to install six electric vehicle charging points in the Town Hall’s Hornton Street public car park
- appointed a Travel Plan Coordinator to further develop the Council’s own travel plan and lead on encouraging and assisting local schools and businesses to produce their own travel plans
- ensured that over 70 per cent of the Council’s vehicle fleet runs on alternative fuels
- helped local organisations to adopt greener fleets
- agreed to expand the operation of car clubs in the borough
- considered the introduction of graduated controlled parking zone permits to encourage the take up of less polluting vehicles

\(^{11}\) www.rbkc.gov.uk/EnvironmentalServices/AirQuality/default.asp
ensured that charges for on-street visitor parking spaces continue to be effective in managing demand
• supported and encouraged appropriate permit-free and car and permit-free development in planning applications
• continued to reduce the need to travel and, in particular, the number and length of motor vehicle trips by ensuring that development is located appropriately through its planning policies
• worked with the relevant authorities on improving public transport throughout the Royal Borough including a Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) on improving bus reliability
• set high standards of streetscape design and street cleansing to encourage walking as an attractive option
• encouraged responsible cycling through the provision of well maintained and cleansed road surfaces, abundant cycle parking, cycle training, pool bikes for council staff and, where appropriate, traffic management
• opposed the expansion of Heathrow Airport
• committed to waste transport options that minimise emissions by maximising the use of existing waterway and rail networks
• continued to implement schemes such as the Kensington High Street Improvements and develop schemes such as the proposals for Sloane Square, Exhibition Road and Notting Hill Gate to encourage walking
• implemented local streetscape initiatives to reduce street clutter and licensed the placing of tables and chairs and other street furniture on the highway to improve conditions for pedestrians

3.2.94 Climatic factors have been grouped with air quality for the purposes of this report. This is due to the proportionally large impact of CO₂ on climate change (see figure 6).

Figure 6: Relative warming effect of current emissions on greenhouse gases over the next 100 years.

![Figure 6: Relative warming effect of current emissions on greenhouse gases over the next 100 years.](image)

3.2.95 We feel that the LIP is likely to have a significant impact on air quality. Whilst its direct impact on climate change will be reasonably impossible to measure, it is important to note the contribution of greener transport policies to the climate change agenda.
3.3 Impact of LIP proposals and consideration of alternatives

3.3.1 When considering the impact of LIP proposals, the comparative effect of implementing the LIP in relation to a “do nothing” approach was considered. The methodology was largely qualitative as is generally accepted as good practice by the SEA directive. Table 2 outlines the perceived impacts of the LIP in relation to the Mayoral priority areas.

3.3.2 Some proposals might have an immediate negative impact on biodiversity, flora and fauna that would otherwise not occur. Specifically this is relevant to big developmental or construction projects. To mitigate any impacts, full environmental assessments are carried out with due reference to internal and national guidelines, particularly those within the Local Biodiversity Action Plan. Other proposals provide the opportunity to enhance biodiversity such as developing the green corridor. In a “do nothing” scenario, these improvements would not occur.

3.3.3 It is difficult to accurately predict what the effect on human health would be without implementing the LIP due to natural trends and variation in areas such as accident statistics. It cannot realistically be hoped, for example, that LIP proposals can prevent all accidents. However the proposals seek to build on previous successes to enhance safety and security. Developments including streetscape proposals have proven effective at reducing accidents. At worst, then, the “do nothing” scenario would be a status quo. Many proposals aim to encourage a modal shift to walking and bicycling which will have a positive impact on activity and health. Projects such as Walk to School Week, Walk Once a Week and assisting businesses to develop travel plans are all effective in encouraging activity. Without the LIP, the developments to ensure attractive and safe environments for walkers and bicyclists would not occur. This would be likely to have a negative impact on human health. Without the LIP, accessibility improvements to bus stops, stations and shopping areas would not occur. Whilst accessibility would not worsen, neither would it improve.

3.3.4 Soil and water quality are unlikely to be affected by the LIP apart from those proposal that require significant construction. To mitigate any negative impacts, environmental assessments are carried out on development proposals.

3.3.5 Air quality in the borough is not completely within the Council’s control, although we can do our best to slow deterioration and reverse any negative effects. For example, a significant proportion of PM$_{10}$ is secondary in nature, much of which arises from sources outside of the borough. It is difficult to predict the impact on air quality that the extension of the congestion charging zone in February 2007 will have. Some areas of the borough, such as the Earl’s Court one-way system, might see an adverse impact due to increased traffic flow as they are outside of the extended zone. The Council will continue to monitor air quality stringently and attempt to ameliorate any negative effects of the scheme. Encouraging a modal shift and continuing to investigate introducing a graduated parking permit scheme can only have a positive impact. Working to increase car free and permit free developments.
and seeking to reduce emissions from vehicles accessing construction sites are also important areas of focus.

3.3.6 Given that the majority of the borough is designated as a Conservation Area, there is a risk that some developments might impact negatively. Arguably, streetscape improvements such as those in Kensington High Street are creating their own legacy and so the overall net effect is likely to be positive.

3.3.7 Table 2 also outlines alternative approaches considered to achieve the Mayor’s priorities. These were also assessed in relation to each of the environmental areas to ensure the best possible and practicable solutions were being proposed.

3.3.8 Some alternatives were rejected as, whilst they would be beneficial for a particular priority, the overall effect would be negative. For example, widening roads or removing pedestrian crossings might relieve traffic congestion, but would impact negatively on human health (increased accidents and decreased pedestrian space) and townscape.
Table 2: LIP proposals and alternatives with regard to environmental impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Example proposal(s)</th>
<th>Environmental factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Improving road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing speed of motor vehicles</td>
<td>20 mph zone</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety education</td>
<td>Local safety schemes; Education, training and publicity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative approaches</td>
<td>Segregating vulnerable road users</td>
<td>More pedestrian barriers; more off-road cycle paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Improving bus journey times and reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving bus priority</td>
<td>Parallel initiatives</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving bus stop accessibility</td>
<td>Bus stop accessibility</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative approaches</td>
<td>Faster bus speeds</td>
<td>Higher speed limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer bus stops</td>
<td>Introducing express buses on popular routes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase road segregation</td>
<td>Increase the number of bus lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Relieving traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving alternative modes to reduce vehicle traffic</td>
<td>LCN+; Streets for People schemes; town centre streetscape improvements</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving alternative modes to reduce necessity of car ownership</td>
<td>Expansion of car club scheme</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Example proposal(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative approaches

### Increasing capacity for motor vehicles

- Widening roads or removing pedestrian crossings

### Reducing motor vehicles by restraint

- Congestion charging

### IV. Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements

| Parking management | Freight; controlled parking zone; parallel initiatives | + | + | + | + |
| Supporting developments | Increasing the number of permit-free and car-free developments | + | + | + |

### V. Improving accessibility and social inclusion

| Access to public transport | Station access improvements; bus stop accessibility; regeneration proposals; dropped kerb programme | + | + | + | + |
| Access to personal transport | Scooter loan project; travel assistance training; community car project; car club scheme | + |

### VI. Encouraging walking

<p>| Improving street conditions | Streets for people schemes; dropped kerb programme; improved street lighting; improved pedestrian facilities | + | + | + | + |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Example proposal(s)</th>
<th>Environmental factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity, flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Material assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>townscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel awareness**  
Walk to school and work weeks

**VII. Encouraging cycling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved routes</th>
<th>LCN; Grand Union Canal towpath</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Bicycle training for residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative approaches**

**Increasing segregated cycle paths**

|                  | + | + | - | - |

**VIII. Improving transport infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route maintenance</th>
<th>Principal road renewal; parallel initiatives</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic management</td>
<td>Amongst others, South Kensington; Gloucester Road; Stanhope Gardens schemes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative approaches**

**Introduce further weight restrictions**

**Introduce bollards to protect pavements**

**Increase provision of on-street electric charging points**

? | ? | ?
4. **Existing environmental problems and opportunities**

4.0.1 There are many opportunities within the specific LIP proposals to undertake sustainable developments, for example the Exhibition Road project, the South Kensington traffic management proposal and the pedestrian and bicycle bridge in White City.

4.0.2 There are wider opportunities within the scope of the LIP too, namely:

- Encouraging use of greener transportation
- Enhancing biodiversity
- Developing the green corridor
- Revisit and improve historic traffic management schemes in light of modal shift

4.0.3 Various plans and strategies are currently being or will soon be revised and this is an ideal opportunity to forge closer links between the transportation department and other departments. For example, in re-writing the Council’s Air Quality Action Plan this could refer to the LIP and its priorities and co-develop ideas to improve air quality. Other examples include the new Local Biodiversity Action Plan and the Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy.

4.0.4 As the Environment Strategy is revisited annually and the action plan revised, this is another opportunity to work cross-departmentally.

4.0.5 The Council is currently writing its Local Development Framework (LDF) suite of documents to replace the UDP. There is a potential risk in that at the time of writing the environmental report, it is not yet clear which policies will continue from the UDP to the LDF. To mitigate negative effects as far as possible, the LDF is being developed in close consultation with officers across the Council including those from the Transportation and Policy team and the Environmental Coordinator within the Strategy and Service Development team.

4.0.6 In August 2006, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham made a joint appointment to the position managing transport, traffic and parking services in both Councils. This is a pilot appointment that will allow us to explore the relative strengths and weaknesses of the different working arrangements in the two neighbouring authorities. Opportunities include potential shared operations and joint procurement arrangements.

4.0.7 Whilst we envisage the LIP will have a positive overall effect on the environment, specific schemes may have negative effects on a short- or long-term basis. Mitigation measures will be designed into each project to offset such negative effects following appropriate planning guidance.

5. **Monitoring**

5.0.1 Table 3 outlines the objectives of the SEA and provisional targets and indicators. These have not yet been approved by the Council and may be amended following consultation.
### Table 3: SEA objectives and performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links to existing aims</th>
<th>Existing and potential* PIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity, flora and fauna: Protect and enhance local biodiversity and habitats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensively monitor species within the borough ES EB(^{(Ia)})</td>
<td>Indicators of actual biodiversity agreed and integrated into habitat surveys; regular reporting on species monitoring as part of the LBAP ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase protection of the borough’s undesignated habitats and green spaces ES EB(^{(Eb)})</td>
<td>New SNCIs included in the LDF ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To resist development proposals that would result in unnecessary damage or loss of trees UDP CD(^{80})</td>
<td>*Environmental impact assessments and appropriate consultation to be carried out as part of all major development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage the planting of trees, particularly in new development UDP CD(^{81})</td>
<td>*Area covered by SNCIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To resist the loss of trees unless they are dead, dying or potentially a public danger, causing an actionable nuisance or, exceptionally, when removal is required in a replanting programme UDP CD(^{82})</td>
<td>Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including: change in priority habitats and species (by type); change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional, sub-regional or local significance UDP INDICATOR 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To require where practicable an appropriate replacement for any tree that is felled UDP CD(^{83})</td>
<td>*Number of trees removed due to LIP projects and not replaced elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure adequate protection of trees on sites in the course of development UDP CD(^{84})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human health (activity): Encourage a modal shift to bicycling and walking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the proportion of journeys made on foot and by bicycle UDP</td>
<td>Number and rate per person of walking trips per annum; number and rate per person of cycling trips per annum LIP T(^{12}), T(^{13})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote walking and to improve the pedestrian environment UDP STRAT 25</td>
<td>Ensure travel plans are implemented in all 79 borough schools by December 2009 LPI 6202, ES T(^{(Ib)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote cycling and to provide comprehensively for cyclists UDP STRAT 26</td>
<td>*Indicator to be developed, possibly measuring cyclist training take-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links to existing aims</strong></td>
<td><em><em>Existing and potential</em> PIs</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human health (safety and security): Improve safety on transportation networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the number and severity of road accident casualties</td>
<td>Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic collisions on all roads in the Borough BVPI 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve targets set for the reduction in the number and severity of road accident casualties in the Borough through traffic safety schemes, education and training initiatives, as well as promoting enforcement initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that residents are, and feel, secure in their homes and daily lives</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of street lights in residential areas with white light LPI 6201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human health (accessibility): Reduce community severance due to transportation barriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve access to all land uses, especially for those with special mobility needs through the efficient use of the transport network</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people BVPI 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support and encourage the improvement of the public transport network for the metropolitan area, including meeting the needs of the disabled</td>
<td>Percentage of accessible bus stops LIP T4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human health (other): Minimise the negative impacts of noise on residents’ quality of life</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the noise nuisance caused by transport</td>
<td>* Number of areas where there is a transport-related complaint from more than one person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* proportion of borough roads surfaced with noise-reducing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil: Protect soil quality within the borough</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | *Proportion of sites identified which may have the potential to be polluted by virtue of a previous industrial use relating to transportation where remediation (or inspection) has been completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links to existing aims</th>
<th>Existing and potential* PIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water: Protect the water environment and reduce the risk of flooding</strong></td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality UDP chap 10 indicator 3 / government indicator 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control development in ways which reduce or minimise pollution and its impact on the environment, particularly with respect to water, air and land quality UDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air and climatic factors: Reduce the contribution of transportation to pollution and greenhouse gas emissions</strong></td>
<td>Annual assessments of air quality carried out including consultation LPI4204, annual progress report on the Air Quality Action Plan produced LPI4205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure comprehensive management and reporting on air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the environmental impact of travel by Council staff further ES T(Ia)</td>
<td>*Indicator to be developed, possibly based on the staff travel survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure travel plans are implemented in all 79 borough schools by December 2009 ES T(Ib)</td>
<td>Number of travel plans implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the environmental impact of travel by borough residents ES T(Ea)</td>
<td>*Indicator to be developed, possibly based on residents’ panel travel behaviour results; data from the residents’ parking permit database; or the number of members registered in the car club scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the environmental impact of transportation by borough businesses ES T(Eb)</td>
<td>*Indicator to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material assets: Optimise the use of sustainable materials in borough developments</strong></td>
<td>Evidentiary support to show all opportunities for sustainable development are considered in regard to all major borough development proposals with a particular emphasis on road materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the planning scrutiny process maximise opportunity for including sustainable features in development ES DC(Ia)</td>
<td>Sustainable Procurement Policy and Green Development Guide produced; Sustainable Design and Construction Policy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embed a ‘green is good’ ethic to development and construction in Council and partners ES DC(Ib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce and support the statutory requirements for sustainability in development ES DC(Ic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to existing aims</td>
<td>Existing and potential* PIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural heritage: Protect and enhance the borough’s residential and historic character</strong></td>
<td>*Number of listed buildings at risk from transportation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Number of Conservation Areas at risk from transportation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape and townscape: Create and maintain the highest quality street scene</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure good quality road surfaces in the borough</td>
<td>Condition of principal roads BVPI 223; condition of non-principal and unclassified roads BVPI 224; condition of surface footway BVPI 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that changes to the transport infrastructure improve the borough’s townscape UDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **What happens next?**

6.1 **Current consultation**

6.1.1 Following the consultation on the scoping report, we now invite your comments on this environmental report. Particular elements to consider are whether the indicators are appropriate, whether the impact judgements are reasonable and whether there are any gaps in the environmental problems and opportunities section.

6.1.2 Due to a very strict programme, the deadline for comments is **26 March 2007** to coincide with the end of the draft LIP consultation period. We apologise for the short timescale.

6.1.3 All comments will be considered in the development of the environmental statement to accompany the draft final LIP.

6.1.4 All feedback from this and prior consultation will be forwarded to the LIP authors.

6.2 **Future timescale**

6.2.1 The draft final LIP and environmental statement will be submitted to TfL at the end of April 2007.

6.3 **Contact details**

Please send any feedback, comments or queries to:

Sarah Jilks  
Research and Information Officer  
Council Offices  
37 Pembroke Road  
LONDON  
W8 6PW

[sarah.jilks@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.jilks@rbkc.gov.uk)

Tel: 020 7341 5180  
Fax: 020 7341 5145

Please note that the above email address will not be active after the end of March. Any queries thereafter should be addressed to: [environment@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:environment@rbkc.gov.uk)
## Appendix A: Glossary of abbreviations and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADKC</td>
<td>Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQAP</td>
<td>Air Quality Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Congestion Charging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCZ</td>
<td>Congestion Charging Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWS</td>
<td>Earl’s Court One-Way System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQU</td>
<td>Environmental Quality Unit (Council department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Environment Strategy (<a href="#">internal</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAA</td>
<td>Greater London Authority Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHASC</td>
<td>Housing, Health and Adult Social Care (Council Business Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCP</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBAP</td>
<td>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCN</td>
<td>London Cycle Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIP</td>
<td>Local Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Nitric Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;C</td>
<td>Planning and Conservation (Council Business Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCI</td>
<td>Sites of Nature Conservation Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
<td>Strategy and Service Development (Council team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTRANS</td>
<td><a href="#">a sustainable transport charity</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWELTRAC</td>
<td>South and West London Transport Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELS</td>
<td>Transport, Environment and Leisure Services (Council Business Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>Transport for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>Unitary Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCT</td>
<td>Westway Community Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: List of consultees

At the SEA scoping stage, as well as the three statutory consultees, Boroughs were advised to consult with “organisations known to be concerned with the environment and/or transport in the Borough or the region, and should include NGOs”\(^{12}\). The organisations below were contacted.

**Statutory consultees**

Natural England (in lieu of English Nature and the Countryside Agency)
English Heritage
Environment Agency

**Other external consultees**

60 plus
ADKC
Age Concern
British Waterways Association
Climate Concern
Conservation Foundation
Environment Round Table
Groundwork West London
Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists
Kensington and Chelsea Partnership
Kensington and Chelsea with Westminster Friends of the Earth
London Wildlife Trust
Norland Conservation Society
North Kensington Environment Forum
River Thames Society
Soil Association
South and West London Transport Conference
SUSTRANS
Women's Environmental Network

\(^{12}\) Page 3, Scoping Report Template (UPR SE/114/04)
Appendix C: Summary of scoping report consultation

The scoping report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) was consulted upon during January 2007.

In addition to the three statutory consultees (Environment Agency, English Heritage, and Natural England – in lieu of English Nature and the Countryside Agency), the report was sent to a range of other organisations representing, amongst others, disabled people within the borough; older people within the borough and local environmental groups (see indicative list above). The report was also available on the Council’s website.

Four responses were received from Natural England, SUSTRANS, the Environment Round Table and the Norland Conservation Society. Their responses are summarised below.

All comments have been forwarded to appropriate departments and where they have not yet been taken into account, will be addressed as part of the environmental statement.

Natural England

Welcomed and supported:
- clear links with the Mayor’s Transport Strategy;
- clear links with the Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy;
- inclusion of links to the Borough’s Biodiversity Action Plan, Parks Strategy and Tree Strategy;
- information on Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and habitat surveys;
- reference to waterways and water habitats;
- recognition of the “ongoing indirect effects of transport can have on biodiversity, flora and fauna through air, soil and water pollution”; the support and encouragement of walking and cycling;
- recognition of the impact and importance of climate change and climatic factors;
- the inclusion of Environmental Impact Assessments being undertaken for all major developments;
- identifying the opportunity to encourage the use of greener transportation;
- identifying the opportunity to enhance biodiversity; and
- identifying the opportunity to develop the green corridor.

Queried:
- the lack of reference to Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport; and
- the lack of reference to the Thames Path National Trail.

Suggested:
- that contractors selected for development proposals have a suitable Constructors Environmental Management manual when tendering.

SUSTRANS

Agreed that:
- cycling and walking have a role to play in reducing CO₂ emissions; and
- the means described to encourage cycling and walking were positive.

Queried:
- the lack of acknowledgement of the significant impact that walking and cycling has on reducing CO₂ emissions.

Noted that:
- green spaces and corridors can provide convenient, pleasant and health routes for pedestrians and cyclists;
- these spaces are particularly beneficial for new and returning cyclists to gain confidence;
- provision of cycle parking, training and subsidised purchasing can also encourage cycling; and
- the impact of the extended CCZ might change demand on alternative modes

Suggested that:
- the Council should strongly promote traffic-free routes; and
- the contribution of transport policies at a local level is critical and the impact of them should be covered in depth in the environmental report.

Environment Round Table

Noted that:
- traffic stress, especially noise, should be covered in the human health section;
- noise should be included in the ‘significant impacts’ column;
- the impact of the CCZ on noise and stress should be included;
- changes in vehicle usage and traffic patterns could create opportunities to change historic traffic management schemes;
- other traffic management schemes should be considered along with impacts on air quality and noise;
- more emphasis should be placed on climatic factors and this should be included as significant impact;
- planting of street trees should be include as well as their contribution to reducing heat sink;
- policies that encourage environmentally friendly travel to work should be included;
- elements of parking controls should be included;
- a breakdown of the contributory vehicles to the CO₂ emissions would be useful;
- a useful indicator would be the proportion of borough roads surfaced with noise-reducing materials;
- regular survey figures for short car journeys would be useful; and
- reducing the trend to encourage people into inner London would lessen the environmental impact of traffic.

Norland Conservation Society

Highlighted concerns about:
- vulnerability of Conservation Areas to through, and rat-run, traffic; invasion of residents’ parking during uncontrolled hours; inadequate planning controls over non-listed buildings; and alterations to the streetscape;
- the relevance of the 85th percentile speed criterion;
- the impact of White City in relation to traffic and residents’ parking during uncontrolled hours;
- the impact of shoppers, pub and restaurant visitors, opera and concert goers and worshippers at specific times;
- the inappropriate focus on Listed Buildings in the cultural heritage section rather than Conservation Areas overall; and
- inadequate planning controls in Conservation Areas.