

# Executive Decision Report

<b>Decision maker(s) at each authority and date of Cabinet meeting, Cabinet Member meeting or (in the case of individual Cabinet Member decisions) the earliest date the decision will be taken</b>	<p>Cllr Tim Coleridge,</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Transport and Arts</p> <p>Date of report: 14 July 2016</p> <p>Date entered on Forward Plan: 16 May 2016</p> <p>Forward Plan reference: 04825/16/P/A</p>	 <p>THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA</p>
<b>Report title (decision subject)</b>	<p>CYCLING QUIETWAYS: REPORT OF CONSULTATION ON ROUTES FROM MITRE WAY TO LEDBURY ROAD AND HARRINGTON GARDENS TO BAYSWATER ROAD</p>	
<b>Reporting officer</b>	<p>Director for Transport and Highways</p>	
<b>Key decision</b>	<p>Yes</p>	
<b>Access to information classification</b>	<p>Public</p>	

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the public consultation responses to two Quietway cycling routes proposed in the Royal Borough, gives officers' comments on those responses, including some modifications to the designs and alignments, and seeks your approval to implement both routes.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) You note the officer response to the consultation comments, in Appendix B.
- b) You approve construction of the route from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road, as shown in the designs in Appendix C, subject to statutory consultation procedures described in Appendix F.
- c) You approve construction of a route from Harrington Gardens to Kensington High Street, as shown in the designs in Appendix D.

- d) You approve construction of a new Toucan crossing on Bayswater Road, as shown in the designs in Appendix E.
- e) You note the traffic management order changes described in Appendix F.

### **3. REASONS FOR DECISION**

- 3.1 Having considered representations made during the consultation, I have set out officer comments on them, and in some cases proposed modifications to the designs. I believe it is appropriate to construct both new Quietway routes.

### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1. In Spring 2013, the Mayor of London published his Cycling Vision, of which a key feature was the Central London Cycling Grid (“the Grid”). This will be a network of connected cycling routes, comprising both Superhighways and Quietways. Quietways are designed primarily for people who have considered getting on a bike, but been off by the idea of sharing busy roads with lorries and buses. They will also appeal to some of the growing numbers of people who already cycle and who will appreciate being able to use clear, direct routes along quiet side streets. Work is complete or underway on four routes in addition to the two that are the subject of this report.
- 4.2. Design and construction of the Quietway routes will be funded entirely by TfL.
- 4.3. In January 2016, the Council consulted on the detailed designs of a Quietway route from Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road. In May and June 2016 it consulted on a Quietway route from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road. Under plans being developed by Westminster City Council, the two routes would be connected through a link along Hereford Road.
- 4.4. Officers wrote to residents’ and community associations along the two routes, and to Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists. We also wrote to some commercial frontagers. We received 16 responses from individuals, residents’ associations and Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists in relation to the Mitre Way to Ledbury Road route. The route from Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road attracted 15 responses, the majority of which related to Kensington Palace Gardens.
- 4.5. This report describes the comments received during this consultation. The consultation material covered the physical interventions proposed along the routes, but did not cover the wayfinding (signs and carriageway markings) that would be added after completion of the physical works. The use of signs will be kept to a minimum, but will assist cyclists at decision points.

### **5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

- 5.1 Details of the comments made about both routes are included in Appendix B, along with officer responses to each. However, I have highlighted the main issues below.

## **i) Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road route**

### **Kensington Palace Gardens**

- 5.2 The great majority of comments received about this route were made by, or on behalf of, residents and institutions based in Kensington Palace Gardens. This is a private road that is owned and managed by The Crown Estate. Officers had understood from TfL that there had been initial discussions with the Crown Estate about this. However, when officers approached the Crown Estate last year, the Crown Estate officials had no knowledge of the route proposal. They expressed concerns about the proposals and advised officers that they would consult occupiers of the road. The Council did not propose any interventions, including signs or carriageway markings, on Kensington Palace Gardens. The consultation material published online included a map that showed a broken line on Kensington Palace Gardens, connecting to solid lines that represented the route to the north and south.
- 5.3 Although it is a private road, with rising traffic control barriers at either end of the road, cyclists have for many years enjoyed access to the road. Surveys undertaken by the Council in March this year suggest that just over 400 cycles a day enter the road from the Bayswater Road or Kensington High Street junctions.
- 5.4 Following discussions with Council officers in Autumn 2015, the Crown Estate wrote to residents and properties on Kensington Palace Gardens in late January, drawing attention to the Council's consultation on its proposals.
- 5.5 Subsequently, the Council received a number of letters and emails from residents and others with an interest in Kensington Palace Gardens. Subsequently, The Crown Estate passed redacted versions of all correspondence that they had received, to the Council. All of the correspondence raised concerns or objections to any changes in Kensington Palace Gardens. Many of these were based on the premise that the private road would be designated as being part of the Quietway, while others feared that more cyclists would use the private road.
- 5.6 Importantly, none of the comments related directly to the changes proposed by the Council on Bayswater Road or Kensington High Street. The Crown Estate has confirmed that it has no objection to the Council implementing these changes, which will make it easier for cyclists (and on Bayswater Road, also pedestrians) to cross two busy roads. I propose to install temporary rubber traffic islands in the first instance, so that officers can monitor their effectiveness and if necessary make amendments to the design, prior to constructing permanent traffic islands.
- 5.7 In response to the comments that we have received in relation to Kensington Palace Gardens, and by agreement with TfL, **I now propose that, for wayfinding purposes, there will be no single Quietway route running from Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road.** Rather, the route from Harrington Gardens will terminate at the junction of Kensington High Street and the western

arm of Kensington Court. North of Kensington Palace Gardens, there would be a separate route running from Bayswater Road north on Palace Court in the City of Westminster (northbound) and Ossington Street (southbound). This will be reflected in the wayfinding strategy for the two routes, which will *not* direct cyclists into Kensington Palace Gardens at either end. The relevant drawings in Appendix D and Appendix E have been updated to reflect this.

## **ii) Mitre Way to Ledbury Road route**

- 5.8 The most commonly made comment was that North Pole Road is congested, and that the Quietway proposals could make this worse, though no respondents singled out particular elements of the scheme. At a meeting of the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum, the concerns about the congestion on North Pole Road formed the main theme of comments from the floor. Officers believe that the proposal for a Tiger crossing would provide a valuable crossing facility for cyclists in what is currently a fairly hostile environment for them. Furthermore there is no reason to think that an unsignalised crossing such as this would have an appreciable impact on the existing levels of congestion.
- 5.9 However, officers agreed with the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum to consider an alternative alignment which would take the route across North Pole Road at its junction with Highlever Road. Following a site visit with TfL and Council officers, our design consultants Sustrans undertook an assessment of the Highlever Road option.
- 5.10 Sustrans identified three potential options, all of them involving cyclists using that eastern arm of the gyratory, in both directions. The options were:
- i. banning through traffic in the eastern arm of the roundabout and making it a single surface space which would only be used by cycles and cars accessing frontages, and making the other two arms two-way for all traffic;
  - ii. a two-way cycle track on the west side of the eastern arm of the gyratory, and four “Tiger” crossings between St Quintin Avenue and Barlby Road;
  - iii. a two-way cycle track on the east side of the eastern arm of the roundabout, with a Tiger crossing of Barlby Road.
- 5.11 All of these options would involve cyclists travelling an extra 250m compared to the Latimer Road-Bracewell Road alignment, such that some cyclists would most likely take that more direct route, without the benefit of any facilities to assist them to cross North Pole Road. Observations show that some cyclists use the existing zebra crossing, with some risk of conflict with pedestrians.
- 5.12 The alternative options would all require cyclists to cross more roads and make more turning movements. In addition, the Highlever Road alignment would not pass so close to the shops on N Pole Road.

- 5.13 All of these options would require traffic modelling in order to provide assurance that they would not increase traffic congestion. Initial estimates indicate that all of these options would be more expensive, and they would certainly take longer to implement, assuming that modelling showed they were viable.
- 5.14 Bearing in mind that the primary concern about the original proposal was the existing traffic congestion, it is worth noting that Council and TfL officers are concerned about the risk that all of the alternative proposals would be likely to add some delays on North Pole Road.
- 5.15 As the funder of the Quietway programme, TfL advised officers that the alternative alignment would need to be significantly better for cyclists in order for TfL to approve it, given that it is satisfied with the original route and design. TfL has subsequently confirmed that it would not support the Highlever Road route.
- 5.16 **Taking into account all of the above, and on the basis that officers consider the original proposal is sound, I propose that the Quietway route should use the Bracewell Road and Latimer Road alignment.**

## 6 OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

- 6.1 Having considered all of the comments made during the original consultation, officers advise that the designs proposed for the Mitre Way to Ledbury Road route are appropriate and fit for purpose and all the proposed designs have been approved by TfL.
- 6.2 Officers advise that the route between Harrington Gardens and Bayswater Road should now run from Harrington Gardens to Kensington High Street, with the proposed Toucan crossing on Bayswater Road to be implemented as the start of a second route running north through the City of Westminster. The designs that were put to consultation are fit for purpose and approved by TfL.
- 6.3 Should you agree my recommendations, officers will write to respondents to notify them of the outcome of the two consultations.
- 6.4 The proposals are fully funded from the Cycling Grid budget. If you approve the construction of the route we would aim to start work in Quarter 2 on the route between Harrington Gardens and Kensington High Street. Construction on the route from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road would begin in Quarter 3.

The options presented to you are:

- i) To approve implementation of the full Quietway routes from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road and from Harrington Gardens to Kensington High Street, and of the Toucan crossing on Bayswater Road, all subject to the outcome of any further consultation as set out in Section 7. This is the option I recommend.
- ii) To request further changes before implementing any part of either routes. I do not recommend this option.

## 7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The report describes the public consultation undertaken into the Quietway routes. Ward members have also been consulted. In addition, we will need to carry out statutory consultation on traffic order changes to support the implementation of the route from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road. These changes are set out in Appendix F. We will report back with any objections we receive to the statutory consultations for all these measures. The statutory consultation for the TRO changes required for the Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road route has already been undertaken and we received no objections.

## 8 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 I consider that there are no equality implications arising from the modest changes to the street layout that are proposed in this report.

## 9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Council has the power to implement the aforementioned changes under Part V of the Highways Act 1980. Any changes to traffic signs will be made in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. The Council will need to enter into an agreement with Westminster City Council under Section 8 of the Highways Act 1980 to allow our contractors to work on the northern footway of Bayswater Road, to implement the Toucan crossing there.

## 10 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The estimated cost of implementing the Quietway route from Mitre Way to Ledbury Road is £235,000. The cost of the Quietway route from Harrington Gardens to Kensington High Street is £25,000. The cost of the Quietway route across Bayswater Road is £100,000. TfL has already allocated sufficient funds to cover the cost of this work. These comments were completed by Mark Jones, Director for Finance TTS, telephone number 020 8753 6700.

Mahmood Siddiqi  
**DIRECTOR FOR TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS**

Cleared by Finance (officer's initials)	MJ
Cleared by Legal (officer's initials)	LLM

**Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) – Background papers used in the preparation of this report** None

**Contact officer(s):** Mark Chetwynd, Chief Transport Policy Officer, Kensington and Chelsea, [mark.chetwynd@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:mark.chetwynd@rbkc.gov.uk) 020 7361 3747

***Other Implications***

1. *Business Plan*
2. *Risk Management*
3. *Health and Wellbeing, including Health and Safety Implications*
4. *Crime and Disorder*
5. *Staffing*
6. *Human Rights*
7. *Impact on the Environment*

The Quietways will help to achieve the Council's policy of encouraging higher levels of cycling, with associated benefits in terms of air quality and climate change. These impacts are too small to predict with any degree of certainty.

8. *Energy measure issues*
9. *Sustainability*
10. *Communications*

## Comments on specific sections of the routes

## i) Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road

Comment	Officer response
<p><b>1. General comment</b></p> <p>A resident of SW7 wrote to oppose new cycling routes on the basis of danger to pedestrians, loss of parking, and a negative impact on traffic flow. In particular, this resident felt that the cycling routes would render residential streets no longer quiet, or safe.</p>	<p>It is not clear whether the resident was thinking specifically of the Quietway route from Harrington Gardens to Bayswater Road, or of cycling routes more generally. It is the case that Cycling Superhighways have reduced traffic capacity significantly in some places. However, the proposals for this particular Quietway route involved minimal loss of overnight parking, minimal impact on traffic capacity, and a benefit for pedestrians through the provision of a new Toucan crossing on Bayswater Road.</p>
<p><b>2. Mini roundabouts at Ashburn Place and Cornwall Gardens</b> (Drawings CIRC-006, -008, -009)</p> <p>The London Cycle Campaign (LCC) criticised the retention of two mini-roundabouts along this route.</p>	<p>The London Cycle Design Standards document recommends avoiding mini-roundabouts where possible, if there is more than one entry lane or if the angle between entry and exit arms approaches 180 degrees. The approaches are single lane but the entry and exit arms are at 180 degrees. At the Harrington Gardens/Ashburn Place junction, officers consider that the existing layout is the best design to support the right turn movement by cyclists at this junction of two Quietway routes.</p> <p>Sightlines are good at all three mini-roundabouts, and they are the best method of control for the junctions. Replacing the roundabouts with priority junctions would probably lead to higher speeds on the priority routes through the junction and more queuing on the side road approaches.. Any change of priority carries some risks and would need a clear justification.</p>
<p><b>3. Kensington Court paved area</b> (CIRC -001)</p> <p>The Kensington Court Residents' Association repeated concerns first raised during TfL's original engagement exercise on the Quietway routes – namely that a) Kensington High Street is very busy at this point and to cross, and b) that allowing</p>	<p>Kensington High Street presents a major barrier to north-south movement for cyclists, but officers consider that a straight-across crossing movement is preferable to a staggered crossing that requires cyclists to ride <i>along</i> the High Street for more than a few metres, and a difficult right turn across four lanes of traffic. TfL would insist on some form of segregation</p>

<p>cyclists to ride over the paved area of Kensington Court presented a risk to pedestrians. The KCRA noted that it had proposed an alternative alignment that ran along Kensington High Street between the eastern arm of Kensington Court, and Palace Avenue.</p>	<p>on such a busy road. Unfortunately, the alternative alignment proposed by KCRA would not be viable.</p> <p>The very wide traffic islands proposed in the centre of Kensington High Street at the junction with Kensington Court will allow cyclists to cross from one side of the road to the other in two stages, waiting in a protected space if necessary. The pelican crossing to the west of the junction will create frequent gaps in the eastbound traffic. The introduction of at any time waiting and loading restrictions on the southern kerblines will greatly improve visibility for, and of, cyclists emerging from Kensington Court.</p> <p>Officers consider the paved area of Kensington Court is wide enough to allow successful sharing of the space by pedestrians and cyclists. Video surveys carried out prior to the consultation found that while some cyclists rode illegally over the paved area, there were: i) no incidents of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, and ii) very many more pedestrians than cyclists (often by a factor of 20). While we would expect cyclist numbers to increase, they would still tend to be greatly outnumbered by pedestrians, so there is no reason to think that cyclists' behaviour would change as a result of the proposal.</p>
<p><b>3. Kensington High Street (CIRC-001)</b></p> <p>The LCC felt that the islands on Kensington High Street would not provide sufficient protection for less confident cyclists. It noted that no traffic signals were proposed at this junction.</p>	<p>See above regarding the benefits to cyclists of the 2.4m wide traffic islands. Signalisation was ruled out because of the likely increases to congestion on an already congested road, and because it would have required restrictions on turning movements from Kensington Court and Kensington Palace Gardens.</p>
<p><b>4. Bayswater Road (BAYS-001)</b></p> <p>The LCC criticised the Toucan crossing scheme for requiring cyclists to share footway space with pedestrians, where, in its view, footfall was fairly high.</p>	<p>The northern footway (within Westminster) is effectively split into two sections by a line of trees and street furniture running parallel to the kerb. The natural pedestrian desire line runs to the north of this barrier. Cyclists would be directed towards the southern section of pavement, closest to the kerb. Officers' observations suggest that footfall is not especially high on either side of Bayswater Road.</p>
<p><b>5. Kensington Palace Gardens (1): the road is private</b></p> <p>Several residents made this point, and some believed that the Council was not</p>	<p>The Council and TfL knew that Kensington Palace Gardens (KPG) is a private road. For this reason it did</p>

<p>aware of this, or that there was a proposal to designate the road as a Quietway.</p>	<p>not propose any changes to the layout, design or signage on KPG itself. Rather, the Council consulted on proposals to make it easier and safer to cycle across Kensington High Street and Bayswater Road.</p> <p>Although there was no proposal to change the status of KPG it self, the working assumption had been that wayfinding for the route would have suggested to people using the Quietway that they continue north or south along the private road, which some already do. A single route (Q15) would have been signed both to the north and south of KPG.</p> <p>In response to the concerns raised by residents, the proposal now is to sign one route from Harrington Gardens ending at Kensington High Street and another that would run north from Bayswater Road. Previously, there would have been a continuous route with its own unique number (Q15) that would have linked the roads either side of Kensington Palace Gardens. Now we propose two separate routes, which will not be KPG.</p>
<p><b>Kensington Palace Gardens (2): costs</b></p> <p>Related to the fact that Kensington Palace Gardens is a private road, maintained through a service charge, several residents objected to any increase in costs arising from the proposals. They did not set out how those costs would arise.</p>	<p>The Council and TfL do not believe that the Quietway proposals will lead to any extra costs for TCE or for residents of the road.</p>
<p><b>Kensington Palace Gardens (3): Residential amenity</b></p> <p>A number of responses raised concerns that the proposals would be detrimental to the tranquillity of the road.</p>	<p>This concern seems to be related to a view that the numbers of bikes on the road would increase quite substantially. The Quietway programme should lead to an increase in cycling across London, particularly by those groups who have traditionally been nervous of cycling in traffic. However, unlike cycle superhighways, Quietways are not intended or designed for high cycling volumes. Indeed, cycling lobby groups have criticised Quietways precisely because they do not believe they will lead to a large increase in cycling.</p> <p>Surveys undertaken immediately outside the northern and southern gates on KPG show that current flows</p>

	<p>are not high – officers consider there is considerable headroom before a growth in numbers would be noticed by residents and other users of KPG. Now that we are ending the routes short of the entrances to KPG, the increase in cycle traffic is likely to be smaller than it might otherwise have been. Of course, cycles are largely silent.</p>
<p><b>Kensington Palace Gardens (4) Security</b></p> <p>Several respondents referred to the Quietway proposal posing security risks, unspecified.</p>	<p>The Council and TfL recognise the unusual, if not unique, security characteristics of many of the properties on KPG. We have spoken informally to officers from the Police’s diplomatic protection team and would continue to do so. As now, anyone entering the road by bicycle would still need to pass a barrier, and the security staff working at the gates would still be able to refuse entry. The road is sometimes closed completely to all road users when there are specific security issues. As noted above, now that we propose to terminate the routes short of the entrances to KPG, the increase in cycle traffic is likely to be smaller than it might otherwise have been and cyclists that do choose to ride along the road will need to accept any security measures in force.</p>
<p><b>Kensington Palace Gardens (5): Safety</b></p> <p>Some respondents felt that the proposals would give rise to safety issues, though in most cases these were not specified.</p>	<p>KPG has lower levels of street lighting than borough roads, but it is not darker than many parks or canal towpaths. In any case, it is no longer proposed to direct cyclists onto KPG.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above about the likely volume of cycling, and because the road is wide, officers are satisfied that the proposals do not pose a risk to pedestrian safety.</p>
<p><b>Kensington Palace Gardens (6): Alternative route</b></p> <p>The Crown Estate, and a couple of residents, asked whether the Quietway route could take a different alignment, well away from Kensington Palace Gardens.</p>	<p>The only route with low levels of motor traffic would be the Broad Walk through Kensington Gardens. While this is a useful facility, it is closed at night. Moreover, having looked at how the Broad Walk connects to Bayswater Road and Kensington Road, officers are concerned that, in order to reach the Broad Walk, one would have to ride along very busy roads: a significant stretch of Bayswater Road to the north, and either Kensington Road or Palace Gate to the south. These are not the sort of roads that are appropriate for Quietway cycling</p>

## ii) Mitre Way to Ledbury Road

Comment	Officer response
<p><b>1. General comment</b> The London Cycle Campaign (LCC) and the K&amp;C Cyclists felt that 20mph limits and filtered permeability (road closures) should be used extensively on Quietways.</p>	<p>There is no requirement by the Mayor or TfL that Quietways have a 20mph limit. TfL's London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS) states that "where possible, 20mph should be the maximum speed limit on roads forming part of designated cycling routes off main roads..." but the document is concerned more with the actual speed of traffic rather than the legal limits. Its system for scoring the quality of cycling routes considers whether the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is below 30mph, 25mph or 20mph. The key public document used in the Mayor's consultation (<i>Central London Grid: Changing the culture of cycling in London</i>) does not refer to 20 mph limits but does note that on Quietways, traffic will be slower than on main roads. On the majority of roads on Quietway routes in the borough, vehicle speeds tend to be quite low already, because of the nature of the road design. Where speeds are higher, we identified measures in the consultation designs to reduce these</p> <p>Similarly, there is no expectation by the Mayor or TfL that Quietway roads should be closed to through traffic, though again this sort of intervention is included in the LCDS. The abovementioned Central London Grid report notes that restrictions on through traffic might be useful on secondary roads with particularly high cycling demand.</p>
<p><b>2. General comment</b> One resident felt that any proposal that aimed to improve conditions for less confident cyclists would also benefit "selfish" and "reckless" cyclists</p>	<p>There is no doubt that the behaviour of some cyclists weakens support for schemes that improve conditions for cycling. Conversely, it is rare to see pedestrian improvement schemes criticised on the basis that some pedestrians sometimes behave recklessly.</p>
<p><b>3. General comment</b> The same resident questioned the principle of providing quieter roads for new or less confident cyclists, fearing that this might lead them into a false sense of security if they then rode off the Quietway network.</p>	<p>Noted, and it is accepted that there will always be very busy roads on which some people would not feel safe to cycle. But by providing a network of Quietway routes, we can help new cyclists either negotiate or avoid the busiest roads and junctions; and at the ends of their journeys new cyclists should find that most residential borough roads are already comfortable to ride on.</p>
<p><b>4. General comment</b> A respondent supported the proposals but warned against "diluting" them as they were already the minimum</p>	<p>A recurring theme in Quietway consultations has been an unfavourable comparison with the higher levels of intervention included in cycle superhighways. The</p>

<p>necessary to make the route work</p> <p>Another expressed disappointment that the scheme seemed to involve little more than new carriageway markings.</p>	<p>principle of the Quietway programme is to link roads that already offer good conditions for cycling, by addressing barriers at key locations – usually where routes cross major junctions.</p>
<p><b>5. General comment</b></p> <p>A respondent criticised the impact on journey times for motor traffic of under used cycle ways and suggested that cycle routes make more use of towpaths and parks.</p>	<p>There should be no discernible impact on general traffic journey times, arising from the Quietway. It is possible the respondent is referring to cycling superhighways.</p>
<p><b>6. Bracewell Rd/Dalgarno Gdns (Drawing Q2-001)</b></p> <p>A resident felt that this junction was dangerous, with traffic coming round the bend too quickly.</p>	<p>This is not supported by officer observations on site and there is no record of any personal injury collisions at the junction in our latest three years of collision data.</p>
<p><b>7. Bracewell Road (Q2-002)</b></p> <p>A resident complained of rat-running traffic on this road during peak periods and suggested that it be a play-street with the road closed to through traffic during the day.</p> <p>The same resident also asked whether the cycle hire scheme could be extended to this area.</p>	<p>Initial designs for the Tiger crossing included options which introduced restrictions on traffic exiting Bracewell Road. However, refinements to the design meant that no restrictions were necessary from a design point of view. Traffic counts found levels of traffic on Bracewell Road that were much lower than many other Quietway roads – around 400 vehicles over 12 hours passing through the street.</p> <p>Any closure or restriction, including a play street, would force drivers to find an alternative route, and most would probably use the adjacent Brewster Gardens, where flows are already comparable in size.</p> <p>The Council supports the extension of the cycle hire scheme across the whole of the borough, but this is a decision for the Mayor of London.</p>
<p><b>8. North Pole Road (Q2-003)</b></p> <p>Some residents expressed concern that this road is already congested and that any changes here would make this problem worse, and could not be justified for the benefit of “a few cyclists”.</p> <p>Another felt that it was wrong to bring cyclists into such a congested road and suggested an alternative alignment</p>	<p>Officers are aware of longstanding concerns about congestion in North Pole Road; indeed, the volume of traffic passing along the road is one of the factors that led to a fairly high level of design intervention. Cyclists would not have to ride along North Pole Road itself. Whilst North Pole Road would not itself be appropriate as a Quietway, it is reasonable to provide for cyclists, as well as pedestrians, to cross it safely.</p> <p>Sustrans carried out an initial assessment of</p>

<p>using Highlever Road. This was also suggested by the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum after a meeting of its members.</p> <p>The LCC raised concerns that cyclists would need to turn across traffic to access the proposed Tiger crossing and suggested “filtering” Latimer Road (ie traffic restrictions)</p>	<p>Highlever Road as an alternative alignment and concluded that it would not provide a better route than the originally proposed alignment via Bracewell Road.</p> <p>The design provides for cyclists to rejoin the carriageway safely after using the Tiger crossing and shared footway. Flows are low on Bracewell Road, where southbound cyclists would have to move from the left side of the road to the right.</p>
<p><b>9. Westway Sports Centre land (Q2-008)</b></p> <p>The Westway Trust submitted a formal response supporting the proposals but noting that future redevelopment proposals might require changes to the alignment of the route.</p> <p>The LCC felt that the area beneath the Westway was uninviting and that better lighting was needed, along with improved wayfinding.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed. Any planning application that came forward would need to respect the right of way for pedestrians and cyclists through the site.</p> <p>Having ridden the site at night, officers are content that lighting levels are sufficient, following improvements made by the Council in 2014. The path through the site is wide with reasonable sightlines. Wayfinding designs are still to be finalised but markings will make the route under the A40 clear.</p>
<p><b>10. Bramley Road (Q2-011)</b></p> <p>A respondent felt that Bramley Road is dangerous for cyclists, with the risk of cyclists being squeezed between motor traffic and the central islands. Extending the island would therefore increase the risk.</p> <p>The LCC also felt the crossing of Bramley Road would not achieve appropriate levels of service for cyclists of all ages. It did not specify any proposals.</p>	<p>The LCDS recommends that where islands are used, the carriageway should be either 4m wide or wider, or below 3.2m. The widths here conform to this guidance</p> <p>Site observations show that there are sufficient gaps in traffic on Bramley Road for cyclists to cross it in one go, without having to wait in the centre of the road.</p>
<p><b>11. Silchester Road (Q2-013)</b></p> <p>The Lancaster West Residents Association, and parents at the Kensington Aldridge Academy, wrote in support of the proposals relating to the zebra crossing.</p> <p>The LCC was concerned that this looked like a road with high HGV flows, and suggested that this road be filtered.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The Kensington Aldridge Academy had expressed concerns about the speed of general traffic rather than high flows of lorries. The design proposal responds to that concern. We cannot prevent access to large vehicles as coaches need to access Kensington Leisure Centre from Silchester Road.</p>

<p><b>12. Lancaster Road/St Mark's Road (Q2-015)</b></p> <p>The LCC felt that traffic calming was required here and suggested a raised table over the whole junction.</p>	<p>The entry treatment on St Mark's Road, the traffic islands on both arms of Lancaster Road, and the visual narrowing created by the zebra crossing zig zags, already provide traffic calming.</p>
<p><b>13. St Mark's Road (Q2-016)</b></p> <p>A respondent felt that traffic on St Mark's Road is too congested to be safe for cycling unless parking is removed.</p> <p>The LCC also felt traffic flows appeared high, and questioned whether the pedestrian refuge left a dangerous lane width.</p>	<p>This was not identified as an issue when designers, council officers and TfL rode the route, nor in subsequent visits. Removing parking bays could have the unwelcome consequence of increasing speeds.</p> <p>TfL's LCDS recommends that the carriageway width by islands should either be wide enough for both a car and cyclists to pass together (4m+) or be narrow enough to prevent a car from trying to overtake a cyclist (less than 3.2m). The island in St Mark's Road complies with the latter.</p>
<p><b>14. Ladbroke Grove/Blenheim Crescent (Q2-017)</b></p> <p>A respondent was concerned that cyclists would not be given enough assistance to cross the busy Ladbroke Grove, and suggested a Tiger crossing.</p> <p>The LCC also criticised this junction, and Blenheim Crescent's junctions with Portobello Road and Kensington Park Road.</p>	<p>There are sufficient gaps to allow cyclists to cross Ladbroke Grove in one movement and the existing layout minimises the distance that cyclists need to cross. It would not be possible to widen the central islands on Ladbroke Grove to provide a safe space in which to wait, without removing the kerb buildouts, and also without some loss of residents' parking. In any case TfL prefers that cyclists cross in one manoeuvre wherever possible. Officers believe that a Tiger crossing here would introduce hazardous conflict movements as cyclists crossed against turning traffic.</p> <p>There is already a raised table at the Portobello Road junction, and at Kensington Park Road, the junction does not have a collision record that suggests the mini-roundabout is dangerous for cyclists. However, we will increase the radius of the central island.</p>