

Executive Decision Report

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	<p>Councillor Tim Coleridge,</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Transport and Arts</p> <p>Date of report: 19 June 2015</p> <p>Date first entered on the Forward Plan: 22 May 2015</p> <p>Forward Plan reference: 04563/15/P/A</p>	 <p>THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA</p>
Report title (decision subject)	<p>CYCLING QUIETWAY: REPORT OF CONSULTATION</p>	
Reporting officer	<p>Bi-Borough Director for Transport and Highways</p>	
Key decision	<p>Yes</p>	
Access to information classification	<p>Public</p>	

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the public consultation responses to the first of the Quietway cycling routes proposed in the Royal Borough, gives officers' comments on those responses, and seeks your approval to implement the Oakley Street to Holbein Place route. The implementation of the Quietway route from Albert Bridge to to Harrington Road route will be the subject of a separate key Decision report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) You approve construction of the route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place, as shown in the designs in Appendix D.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1 Having considered representations made during the consultation, I have set out officer comments on them, and believe it is appropriate to proceed to construct the Quietway route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place.

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 though 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.
- 4.2. The Royal Borough is one of eight boroughs working with Transport for London (TfL) to deliver the Grid, along with the City of London, the Royal Parks and the Canal and River Trust. All partners are represented on the Grid Board. In the winter of 2013/14, (TfL) published the proposed Grid network for public comment. Following this exercise, the Grid Board agreed which routes should be prioritised for delivery by the end of 2016, with more routes to follow in subsequent years. Design and construction of the Quietway routes will be funded entirely by TfL.
- 4.3. In March 2015, the Council consulted on the detailed designs of the first two routes to be delivered in the Royal Borough. These were an east-west between Oakley Street and Holbein Place, and a north-south route from Albert Bridge to Harrington Road. Officers wrote to all residents’ associations along the two routes, and to Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists. We also advertised the consultation, including a public exhibition in Chelsea Old Town Hall, using the Council’s weekly Planning Bulletin. In addition to representations made at the exhibition, we received comments a total of 29 responses, from individuals, residents’ associations and Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists. A plan of the two routes is shown at Appendix C.
- 4.4. This report describes the comments received during this consultation.

5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 5.1. Details of the comments made about the Oakley Street to Holbein Place route are included in Appendix B. Detailed comments about the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route will be included in a separate Key Decision Report.
- 5.2. A minority of the responses expressed unqualified support; the majority were divided between those who welcomed the Quietways in general but wished to see design changes made, and those who simply opposed the Quietways. A small number of respondents commented that the plans presented on our webpage did not provide sufficient detail of the proposed changes.
- 5.3. Critical comments about the proposals fell into two main types:
 - those from people who disagreed with the principle of the Quietways, or who felt that it was not appropriate to encourage more cyclists onto some of the roads along the routes; and

- those from existing cyclists who felt that the proposals would not provide the levels of protection and comfort required to be regarded as a Quietway.
- 5.4. We received no comments from ward councillors about any of the proposals. Most of the responses from individuals and local residents associations commented on the specific features of the two Quietway routes, but the Chelsea Society took a more strategic position on the value of the Quietways and the Central London Cycling Grid.
- 5.5. Its response drew attention to the dangers to cyclists of injury and of undertaking strenuous activity in polluted air. It was also concerned that in large numbers, cyclists pose a threat to the safety of pedestrians and motorists. Perhaps anticipating the response that the Quietways are not designed to carry very high volumes of cyclists (as the superhighways are), the Society's statement concluded that if that were the case, there would be no justification for spending public money on the Quietway routes. Finally, the Society rejected the need for the Quietways as a wayfinding tool, noting that cyclists can easily consult maps to find their own way without the need for street signs.

General observations

- 5.6. In addition to the location-specific comments that are described below, several respondents made some general observations.
- 5.7. In particular some of them felt that all Quietways should have a 20mph limit as a matter of course and it was suggested that more should be done to reduce volumes of traffic on Quietways, for example by filtering (that is, closing roads off at one end). There was also a comment that more parking should be removed, to reduce the risk of "dooring" injuries to cyclists. Some respondents noted that Quietways on busy main roads should include full segregation between cyclists and motor traffic.

Officer response

- 5.8. 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 85th percentile speed is below 30mph, 25mph or 20mph. The key public document used in the Mayor's consultation (*Central London Grid: Changing the culture of cycling in London*) 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 – these measures include speed tables, changing the geometry of junctions, and removing centre line markings

- 5.9. 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 Central London Grid report mentioned above notes that restrictions on through traffic might be useful on secondary roads with particularly high cycling demand. The same document stated that large-scale removal of parking would seldom be needed.

Two-way cycling in one-way streets

- 5.10. Of all the proposals that were included in the consultation document, the one which attracted most comment was two-way cycling in one-way streets. I shall respond to this criticism in the report on the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route, as there are no such proposals in the Oakley Street to Holbein Place route.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

- 6.1. Having considered all of the comments made during the consultation, officers remain of the opinion that the designs proposed for the Oakley Street to Holbein Place route are appropriate. We will report on, and respond to, the detailed comments made about the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road report in a separate Key Decision report. Although we will consider amending the designs at a few locations along the route from Albert Bridge to Harrington Road, we do not need to complete this work before consulting on changes to the traffic management orders that are needed in order to change waiting and loading restrictions, or to allow two-way cycling in one-way streets.
- 6.2. I therefore propose to go ahead with the statutory consultation necessary for these traffic order changes, and we will report to you any representations that we receive. This will also give residents and others an opportunity to comment again on the principle of allowing two-way cycling, and of the changes to parking arrangements, before I submit the final scheme for your approval. The traffic management order changes are described in Appendix E.
- 6.3. The consultation raised no significant issues about the proposals for the route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place. The Police have raised no objections and the proposals for this route have been safety audited by TfL in design terms; they are also now fully funded from the Cycling Grid budget. If you approve the construction of the route we would aim to start work in Quarter 2 to meet TfL's completion deadline of December 2016. We will carry out statutory consultation in June on the one traffic order change relating to this route: the conversion of single yellow lines to double yellow lines at the Oakley Street end of Phene Street.

6.4. The options presented to you are:

- i) To approve construction of the Quietway route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place; or,
- ii) Ask officers to carry out further work on the design of the Oakley Street to Holbein Place route.

7. CONSULTATION

7.1. The report describes the public consultation undertaken into the Quietway routes. Ward members in the relevant wards have also been consulted.

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

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The estimated cost of implementing the Quietway route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place is £60,000. 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
Bi-Borough Director of Transport and Highways

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

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 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 route
from Oakley Street to Holbein Place**

Phene Street

1. Respondents noted that at its junction with Oakley Street, the south side of Phene Street has a section of single yellow line. Vehicles parking here, legally and illegally, reduce this part of Phene Street, which is a two-way road, to a single running lane very close to the junction.
2. A second concern was that the proposal to to widen the cyclist gaps either side of the barrier between Phene Street and Oakley Gardens, could result in an increase in motorcycles passing the barrier.

Officer response

3. Officers agree that the cycle route presents an opportunity to improve the sightlines at this junction, and to relieve congestion, by keeping the approach to Oakley Street clear of parked vehicles. Officers will begin the statutory consultation process that will be necessary to amend the traffic orders and will report to you any objections that we receive, as we would normally do.
4. The current width of the cycle gaps either side of the barrier at Oakley Gardens is 0.9m to 1.0m and we propose to increase this to 1.5m to allow for more comfortable passage, and to meet the standards set out by TfL in the LCDS.. It is noted that motorcycles are already able to use the gap to pass the barrier, so it is not likely that this proposal will make any material difference to the number of motorcycles, or to their speed.

St Leonard's Terrace

5. A resident suggested that St Leonard's Terrace is not a suitable cycling route because of the existing speed humps in the road, because local residents are unlikely to use the route, and because having more cyclists at the junction with Franklin's Row would make it harder for pedestrians to cross the road. The resident was also concerned about additional signs on the street and suggested that a better route alignment would be Royal Hospital Road.
6. Conversely, it was suggested that St Leonard's Terrace could be closed to through traffic to prevent rat-running.

Officer response

7. While the design of the speed humps presents a small degree of discomfort to cyclists (as well as vehicle drivers and passengers), they do serve to keep speeds down along a long and straight stretch of road. Although it is difficult to know how many additional cyclists will use the route, it should still be possible for

pedestrians to cross the road during a gap in cycling and motor traffic. In response to a separate complaint by a resident, we are proposing to convert a short stretch of single yellow line to double yellow line, to prevent obstructive parking where St Leonard's Terrace meets Franklin's Row. As St Leonard's Terrace is a straight road with few major junctions, we will need few Quietway signs along this stretch of the route.

8. Royal Hospital Road is a busier road than St Leonard's Terrace and has a large number of coaches using it. It does not reach all the way to Oakley Street so the route would involve a detour via one of the north-south roads.
9. Closing St Leonard's Terrace to through traffic would displace that traffic onto parallel streets, without providing a substantial safety benefit.

Turks Row section

10. It was felt that this road sees a high degree of activity when pupils are brought to or collected from Garden House School, and that adding more cycles to the road would not be wise.

Officer response

11. The problems associated with school drop-off and collection are understood, and we have worked with the school to minimise these. The raised table and two entry treatments that we have proposed on Turk's Row will slow traffic here, and there is no reason why cyclists should not use this road.

Lower Sloane Street

12. The route crosses Lower Sloane Street from Turk's Row to Holbein Mews. This requires cyclists to make a right turn into the side road from the main road. To assist with this, we proposed "over-run" areas in granite setts in the centre of the main road. Vehicles would avoid going onto the over-run areas unless forced onto that line by any vehicles parked at the kerbside. This would give cyclists waiting to turn right with a degree of protection from oncoming traffic.
13. It was suggested by one respondent that in place of the over-run areas there should be an area of carriageway protected by kerbs, into which only cycles would be able to enter.

Officer response

14. It is not possible to provide a kerbed island as this will impede larger vehicles and buses negotiating the junction unless parking all around the junction and outside local shops was banned at all times. The proposed overrun areas will encourage drivers to use the tarmac carriageway and will be more effective in deflecting traffic flow than white lines markings alone. However, if need be traffic will be able to enter the the over-run areas in order to pass parked vehicles and negotiate the junction.

APPENDIX C

Consultation plan of the two Quietway routes

See separate pdf file

APPENDIX D

Design drawings for Quietway route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place

See separate pdf file

APPENDIX E

Changes to Traffic Management Orders that will be subject to statutory consultation in June and July 2015

1. To permit two-way cycling in:
 - i. Glendower Place (this will not form part of the Cycling Grid but will provide an alternative route on Saturdays when Bute Street is closed to traffic)
 - ii. Cale Street, from Dovehouse Street to Sydney Street
 - iii. Dovehouse Street, from King's Road to Britten Street
2. To convert single yellow line to double yellow line in Phene Street at the junction with Oakley Street, to prevent congestion
3. To convert section of zig-zag markings to double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oakley Street, near the junction with Phene Street.
4. To convert 2.5m of residents parking in Alpha Place to single yellow line.
5. To remove two residents' parking spaces in Dovehouse Street south of the junction with Britten Street, to ensure that there is sufficient width for northbound motor traffic and southbound cyclists.
6. To relocate one motorcycle bay and two Blue Badge parking bays from the north side of Cale Street to the south side, at its junction with Dovehouse Street.
7. To remove one Blue Badge parking bay from Cale Street.