


# Executive Decision Report

<p><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>	<p>Cllr Tim Coleridge, Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Transport and Arts Date of report: 19 October 2015 Date first entered on Forward Plan: 22 June 2015  Forward Plan reference: 04584/15/P/A</p>	 <p>THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA</p>
<p><b>Report title (decision subject)</b></p>	<p>CYCLING QUIETWAY: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION</p>	
<p><b>Reporting officer</b></p>	<p>Bi-Borough Director for Transport and Highways</p>	
<p><b>Key decision</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Access to information classification</b></p>	<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 Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route. The implementation of the Quietway route from Oakley Street to Holbein Place was the subject of a separate key Decision report (KD04563/15).

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) You approve construction of the route from Albert Bridge to Harrington Road, as shown in the designs in Appendix C,
- b) You approve the making of the traffic management order changes described in Items 1i), 1iii) and 5 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 Albert Bridge to Harrington Road.

### **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.
- 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 route 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 a total of 29 responses, from individuals, residents' associations and Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists.
- 4.4. This report describes the comments received during this consultation.
- 4.5. In addition, the Council carried out statutory consultation on traffic management order changes relating to the Quietway proposal. The proposed changes were to allow two-way cycling in the one-way section of Dovehouse Street, in the one-way section of Cale Street, and in Glendower Place, as well as associated parking changes in Dovehouse Street and Cale Street. This report covers the responses received to those. We had already carried out statutory consultation for the two way cycling proposals in Sumner Place and Onslow Square which you approved in 2014 as part of our on going cycling permeability programme, but we agreed to defer implementation until the grid route is approved.

## **5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

- 5.1. Details of the comments made about the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route are included in Appendix B.
- 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 85<sup>th</sup> 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 in the consultation, the one that attracted most comment was two-way cycling in one-way streets. Although this is not a new or uncommon design approach, several respondents felt that it was dangerous, particularly for pedestrians who might not look in both directions before crossing a road. There was a view that by allowing cycling in both directions on some one-way streets, we would risk feeding the mistaken belief that it is acceptable to cycle in both directions on *all* one-way streets. It was also argued that one-way streets were introduced to prevent rat-running, so removing the one-way restriction for cycling would lead to more rat-running by cyclists. Conversely, one respondent felt that cycling in both directions should be allowed on *all* one-way streets.

### **Officer response**

- 5.11 The excellent safety record at 21 sites where we have introduced two-way cycling demonstrates that there is nothing inherently dangerous about it in principle, though we always take care to consider the specific characteristics of each road. One-way streets in which two-way cycling is allowed are readily identifiable by their signs: if there is no "except cycling" plate underneath a "no entry" sign, there is no special provision. Cycling illegally against the one-way flow was already quite common on some one-way streets long before we introduced legal (and properly signed) two-way cycling. Moreover, there is no evidence that our two-way cycling schemes have led to an increase in cycling against the one-way flow in streets where this remains illegal. In response to the

concern about cyclist rat-running, it is true that by their nature Quietways will provide routes for cyclists that will allow them to avoid the busier roads used by through traffic. We do not have any forecasts on the likely number of people using the Quietways, but it is unlikely that the routes in the Royal Borough would carry flows so great as to cause any of the problems associated with rat-running by motor vehicles, namely noise, pollution, or increased risk of collision.

### **Specific observations**

- 5.12 We also received a number of specific comments about sections of the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route, and officers have spent time considering our responses to these. In particular, we have revised our proposals for Oakley Street, in response to concerns about the speed of traffic along this road, and we have amended the alignment of the route just south of Fulham Road. I set out the detail of the comments, and our responses to them, in Appendix B. This includes responses to the three objections received to the statutory consultations on traffic order changes. In summary, we now propose the following changes to the route as it was consulted upon in March:

#### **In Dovehouse Street**

- The route will now run the entire length of Dovehouse Street, rather than using the western part of Cale Street and Stewart's Grove to reach Fulham Road.
- In the section of Dovehouse Street that is south of Britten Street, we no longer propose to narrow the eastern footway. We now propose to raise the full width of the carriageway to the footway level, where there is a run of four resident parking spaces. This will deter vehicles from accelerating hard towards Britten Street and will also mean that, should any vehicle fail to wait behind the parked cars if there is a cyclist coming southbound, that cyclist will not be caught between that vehicle and the eastern kerb.
- Modifications to the junction of Dovehouse Street and Kings Road to retain current entry width for motor traffic and provide protection for emerging cyclists.
- We will widen the pedestrian island at the northern end of Oakley Street and introduce signs to discourage large vehicles turning left into Oakley Street from King's Road.

#### **In Oakley Street**

- Raising the carriageway to footway level at the Margareta Terrace junction as well as at the Phene Street junction.
- Building a traffic island in the centre of the road, about midway between the two side road junctions and removing one parking space on each side of the road, opposite the island to accommodate one tree each.

- At regular intervals, inserting square patches of a flush, stone surface into the carriageway, with a cycle symbol on it. These would be comfortable enough for cyclists to ride over, but sufficiently different from the asphalt to encourage motorists to take a more central line in the road, and not come so close to the parked cars, or the cyclists.

## **6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS**

- 6.1. Having considered all of the comments made during the original consultation, officers consider that the amended designs proposed for the Albert Bridge to Harrington Road route are appropriate. Furthermore, I believe the objections that were made during the statutory consultation on traffic order changes, should not be upheld, for reasons that I set out in Appendix B. We propose to go back to respondents outlining our revised proposals which I believe take on board the material concerns raised.
- 6.2. 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 3 on some sections of the route and aim to complete the route by the end of the financial year.
- 6.3. The options presented to you are:
- i) To approve implementation of the full Quietway route from Albert Bridge to Harrington Road and to inform you of any further feedback we receive from residents before starting construction. This is the option I recommend.
  - ii) To approve implementation of the Quietway route north of Kings Road. Officers would then report back on the resident feedback regarding the changes proposed on Oakley Street before getting your approval to implement these measures.
  - iii) To request further changes before implementing any part of the 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 Albert Bridge to Harrington Road is £350,000. 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](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*

**APPENDICES B to C** – see separate files.



**Changes to Traffic Management Orders that were put to statutory consultation in June and July 2015**

During the early part of the summer, officers carried out statutory consultation on the traffic management order changes set out in points 1 to 7 below. We received an objection to 1i), 1iii) and 5. These objections and the officer responses are described in Appendix B of this report.

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.

\*We do not need to implement item 1ii) and 6 in order to construct the north-south route, and will revisit this proposal as part of a future Quietway route.