

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>Cllr Tim Coleridge,</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Transport and Arts</p> <p>Date of report: 8 March 2016</p> <p>Date entered on Forward Plan: 21 December 2015</p> <p>Forward Plan reference: 04713/16/P/A</p>	 <p>THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA</p>
Report title (decision subject)	<p>CYCLING QUIETWAYS: BROMPTON CEMETERY TO EXHIBITION ROAD AND DOVEHOUSE STREET TO ST LEONARD'S TERRACE</p>	
Reporting officer	<p>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 two Quietway cycling routes proposed in the Royal Borough, gives officers' comments on those responses, including some modifications to the designs, and seeks your approval to implement both routes.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) You note the officer response to the consultation comments, set out in Appendix B.
- b) You approve construction of the route from Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road, as shown in the designs in Appendix C, subject to statutory consultation procedures described in Appendix E.
- c) You approve construction of the route from Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace, as shown in the designs in Appendix D, subject to statutory consultation procedures described in Appendix E.
- d) You note the traffic management order changes described in Appendix E.

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.
- 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, subject to the availability of funding. Design and construction of the Quietway routes is and will be funded entirely by TfL.
- 4.3. In October 2015, the Council consulted on the detailed designs of two routes to be delivered in the Royal Borough. These were: 1) an east-west route between Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road, via Harrington Road, and 2) a route from Dovehouse Street to St Leonard’s Terrace via Cale Street. This latter route would link two other Quietway routes which are already complete or under construction.
- 4.4. Officers wrote to residents’ associations along the two routes, and to Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists. We received 15 responses from individuals, residents’ associations and Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists.
- 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.

PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 5.1 Details of the comments made about both routes are included in Appendix B, along with officer responses to each.
- 5.2 Several respondents sent very short messages of support for the route or for the Quietway programme in general.

- 5.3 Prior to beginning the consultation we received comments from a councillor who was concerned about the impact on traffic flow of the changes to the junction of Thurloe Place and Cromwell Place. He noted that traffic congestion in South Kensington was already a major local concern, and that any reduction in capacity of this junction would make it worse. Following discussions with TfL, officers amended the design to reduce the traffic capacity impacts.

General observations

- 5.4 Both the London Cycle Campaign (LCC) and the K&C Cyclists made comments about the Council's general approach to designing Quietways – in particular, they felt that 20mph limits, filtered permeability (road closures) and segregation on busier roads should be used to create higher levels of comfort and safety for new cyclists. We also received a suggestion from the Onslow Neighbourhood Association that any new restrictions associated with the Quietways should be in force only at weekends and holidays.

Officer response

- 5.5 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.
- 5.6 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.
- 5.7 It would be confusing to allow cyclists to travel two-way in a one-way street at weekends and holidays but not during the week. It would also render those sections of the Quietways unusable in one direction on weekdays.

Proposed changes to consultation designs

- 5.8 We also received a number of specific comments about particular junctions and sections of the Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road route, and, to a greater

extent, about parts of the Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace route. Officers have considered each of these and also met residents of Tryon Street on site to discuss their concerns.

- 5.9 I have set out the detail of the comments, and our responses to them, in Appendix B. I do not propose to amend to any great degree the designs put to consultation in relation to the Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road route apart from the addition of a Keep Clear marking, and a minor parking change, in Old Brompton Road by Kempsford Gardens as outlined in Appendix B. I also propose to reduce from 5 metres to 4 metres the depth of the Advanced Stop Line (ASL) on Thurloe Place. On the route between Dovehouse Street and St Leonard's Terrace, I propose the changes described below to the designs that went to consultation in Autumn 2015.

Tryon Street and the paved area at the northern end of Royal Avenue

- 5.10 During the consultation we proposed to close the southern end of Tryon Street to motor traffic, by means of a bollard. This was welcomed by the K&C Cyclists as an example of filtered permeability. However it was proposed not as a means of reducing traffic flow (very few vehicles use this road), but in order to ensure that cyclists crossing King's Road on the proposed new "Tiger" crossing, into the mouth of Tryon Street, would not be at risk of collision with any vehicle exiting Tryon Street, which is a very narrow road. It would also prevent vehicles entering the Tiger Crossing. The new Tiger crossing was to replace the existing zebra crossing in King's Road that is currently about 20m to the south west.
- 5.11 Several residents, and agents for one of the shops on King's Road, objected to the proposal. They currently stop briefly in Tryon Street to drop off goods or passengers, and although they would still legally be entitled to do this, they would need to reverse some distance along Tryon Street to do so. This in itself could present dangers for cyclists riding in the opposite direction to the reversing vehicle. Officers met residents on site and agreed to investigate ways of retaining an exit onto King's Road, without compromising cyclist safety.
- 5.12 Two ward councillors raised concerns about the proposal to bring cyclists across the paved area between Royal Avenue and the proposed Tiger crossing on Kings's Road. They noted that pedestrians walking parallel to the kerb would not expect to see cyclists crossing their path, and felt that the approach to the Tiger Crossing was too close to the exit from the restaurant immediately to the east of the docking station. They asked whether cyclists could be instructed to dismount and walk their bicycles across the paved section of this route. Experience at other sections of paved area in the borough suggest that many if not most cyclists would ignore any signs requiring them to dismount. Most cyclists, particularly those accustomed to similar schemes elsewhere in London, would expect that on a designated cycling route they would be able to ride along it without dismounting.

- 5.13 Officers have given careful thought to these issues in particular the best means of minimising the risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians on the footways, and have considered similar schemes elsewhere in London. As a result the design has been revised to keep Tryon Street open to traffic, relocate the crossing and to give pedestrian better visual clues to the possible presence of cyclists, without signifying to either road user that cyclists have any priority. Pedestrians will greatly outnumber cyclists at this location, and the almost unbroken flow of pedestrians will in itself provide a strong signal to cyclists that they will have to ride slowly when approaching and leaving the crossing. The revised design is shown in Appendix D.
- 5.14 **We now propose to allow vehicles to exit from Tryon Street, but to turn left only into King's Road; there would be a No Right Turn sign at the exit of Tryon Street to enforce this. This will stop vehicles turning onto the crossing which we now propose should be positioned just to the west of Tryon street, about four metres west of its originally proposed location.**
- 5.15 **We also propose to raise the level of the carriageway to pavement level throughout the junction. This will give cyclists more options to enter or leave Tryon Street, reducing the risk of collision between cyclists and vehicles, and between cyclists and pedestrians.**
- 5.16 The repositioning of the crossing means on the south side of King's Road the point at which cyclists' and pedestrians' desire lines would meet would be in a more open part of the paved area, further away from the restaurant.
- 5.17 **In addition, we will seek to deflect the natural desire line slightly away from the kerbline, so that there will be a "buffer" zone between the Tiger crossing and the desire line. This responds to the concern that cyclists might hurry to get off the crossing and then run straight into pedestrians. These "buffer" areas on both sides of the road will be paved in York stone setts, and edged with corduroy paving. There will also be small bollard-mounted signs to indicate that cyclists and pedestrians will share the space. Finally, we will introduce give way markings to oblige cyclists to cede priority to the east-west pedestrian movement.**
- 5.18 It is proposed that when the new Tiger crossing is implemented the existing zebra crossing and zig zag markings will be replaced with no waiting and loading at any time restrictions.

Chelsea Green

- 5.19 Both the London Cycle Campaign (LCC) and the K&C Cyclists suggested that the priorities at the junction of Cale Street and Whitehead's Grove should be reviewed in the light of the new cycle crossing movements being introduced at this junction. **We agree and now propose to amend the Give Way markings on the western approach to this junction, to make it clear that eastbound cyclists should give way to any right-turning traffic.**

- 5.20 There have also been suggestions that the eastern arm of Chelsea Green (currently one way northbound) should be made two way for cycling so that there is better cycle access onto the Quietway route from Elystan Street to the north, which is already two way for cycling. We agree and intend to take this forward as a separate scheme and carry out the necessary consultations for the proposal.

Cale Street/Sydney Street junction

- 5.21 The previous design for this junction included raising the carriageway up to footway level and adding a buildout to the south-western kerbline. There is a risk that vehicles wishing to turn left into the western arm of Cale Street, if blocked by a vehicle queuing to turn right, would cut across the buildout area (which would be flush with the carriageway). **We not propose not to install the buildout on the south-western corner.**

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 Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road route and the amended design for the route between Dovehouse Street and St Leonard's Terrace route are appropriate and fit for purpose and all the proposed designs and revisions have been approved by TfL. Should you agree my recommendation officers will write to respondents with their responses to the consultees' comments.
- 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 2 on the Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road route. The Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace route would follow, and both would be complete by the end 2016.

The options presented to you are:

- i) To approve implementation of the Quietway routes from Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road, and from Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace (including the changes described in paras 5.9, 5.14 to 5.17, 5.19 and 5.21) 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.

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 allow two-way cycling in Elystan Place and Tryon Street, the introduction of the banned right turn from Tryon Street to King's Road and cycling on the northern paved area of Royal Avenue as set out in Appendix E . There are also the several changes to parking, waiting

and loading which are being processed under the Miscellaneous Parking Amendments process – also listed in Appendix E. We will report back with any objections we receive to the statutory consultations for all these measures.

- 7.2 Although the use of Tiger Crossings is outlined in the new London Cycle Design Standards their use is not yet formally authorised by the Department for Transport. Some boroughs have already gone ahead and implemented the crossings and the feedback we have received is that they are working successfully, but technically they are non-prescribed markings. However, the Tiger crossing marking is to be included in the new Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, due to be introduced this summer, which will allow us to go ahead and introduce the crossing in line with our programme for this route.

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 done in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (or its successor).

10 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The estimated cost of implementing the Quietway route from Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road is £190,000. The cost of the Quietway route from Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace is £120,000. 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 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) Brompton Cemetery to Exhibition Road

Comment	Officer response
<p>1. Old Brompton Rd/Kempsford Gdns (Drawing DIST-001)</p> <p>The London Cycle Campaign (LCC) felt that cyclists crossing Old Brompton Road between Brompton Cemetery and Kempsford Gardens needed assistance.</p>	<p>Our monitoring shows that there are often sufficient gaps in traffic to allow cyclists to wait and then cross Old Brompton Road in one movement. However we have noted that when there is congestion at the junction with Finborough Road, eastbound queues can back up across the mouth of Kempsford Gardens. We therefore propose to provide Keep Clear markings in Old Brompton Road at the junction.</p>
<p>2. Kempsford Gdns (Drawing DIST-002)</p> <p>The LCC requested that filtered permeability be used to remove through trips from this road, and that the cycle lane should be a protected track.</p> <p>Another felt that the cycle lane would be too narrow and place cyclists at risk of collision with car doors.</p>	<p>There is a contraflow cycle lane in Kempsford Gardens which is only 1.2m wide from the edge of parked vehicles and has been in operation for many years with no evidence of any problems. The proposals involve widening this lane to 2m which can be achieved without affecting traffic flow. This accords with LCDS recommendations for cycle lanes adjacent to parking.</p> <p>Kempsford Gardens is a one-way road, with traffic entering from the Warwick Road end. There is no reason for through traffic to use this route in preference to Old Brompton Road, and the traffic volumes are not high enough to justify closing the road.</p>
<p>3. Earl's Court Sq. (Drawing DIST-003)</p> <p>A respondent felt that the cycle lane would be too narrow and place cyclists at risk of collision with car doors.</p>	<p>There is already a contraflow cycle lane in Earl's Court Square which is only 1.2m wide from the edge of parked vehicles which has been in operation for many years with no evidence of any problems. The proposals involve widening this lane to 1.8m which is the widest possible without impinging on opposing south westbound traffic flow. This will be sufficient to allow contra flow cyclists to avoid collision with opening car doors.</p>
<p>4. Harrington Gdns mini-roundabouts at Collingham Gdns and Ashburn Pl. (Drawing DIST-006)</p>	<p>The mini roundabouts perform the useful function of dealing with traffic demands that are fairly evenly balanced on each of the approaches.</p>

<p>The LCC felt that the two mini-roundabouts on Harrington Gardens should be removed; meanwhile the Onslow Neighbourhood Association (ONA) felt that the proposed changes to the Harrington Gardens/Collingham Gardens mini-roundabout would have no benefits for cyclists or vehicles.</p> <p>A resident also called during the traffic order consultation period to object to the change as being unnecessary.</p>	<p>Removing the roundabouts would require priority to be given to either the north-south or east-west routes. The LCC favour giving priority to the east-west cycle Quietway. However, this is likely to result in much higher east-west motor traffic speeds through the junctions and would also lead to increased queues on the other approaches along with driver frustration which are likely to result in overall traffic and environmental disbenefits.</p> <p>The mini roundabout at the junction with Collingham Gardens has a collision rate above the average for mini roundabouts in RBKC. The proposals for this roundabout are designed to further channel and regulate traffic through the roundabout, which will not only benefit cyclists but are measures designed to reduce the junction's collision rate.</p>
<p>5. Stanhope Gdns/Harrington Rd (Drawings DIST-008, DIST-009)</p> <p>The LCC criticised the proposals for not going far enough to reduce volumes of traffic along this stretch of road, for instance by closing the road to through traffic, and for not making greater changes to the junctions with Queen's Gate and Gloucester Road.</p> <p>A second respondent suggested that two-way cycling be introduced in the west and east arms of Stanhope Gardens to improve access to the Quietway route on the southern arm.</p>	<p>While Stanhope Gardens is busier than most roads on the borough's proposed Quietway network, we have proposed measures to reduce the sense of traffic domination, by lowering speeds. Closing the road to through traffic would have significant disadvantages to bus users, and to local residents and businesses. Crossing the Queens Gate and Gloucester Road junctions under signal protection should not be difficult, particularly with the benefit of Advanced Stop Lines.</p> <p>There would be little benefit in converting all arms of Stanhope Gardens to two way cycling given the limited options to and from the A4 Cromwell Road at the northern ends of the roads.</p>
<p>6. Harrington Rd/Cromwell PI/Thurloe PI (Drawing Q49-012, Q49-013)</p> <p>The ONA and a local resident both expressed concern that a) the proposed changes would increase congestion in this part of South Kensington and b) this was not an appropriate junction</p>	<p>The provision of ASLs at this junction is important and a minimum requirement by TfL. We have reduced the depth of the ASL to the minimum 4m. As the first cycle stop line will be positioned one metre closer to the pedestrian crossing this means that the proposed second motor traffic stop line will be just three metres back from its existing position. This is unlikely to make any significant difference to the rate of discharge or</p>

<p>through which to direct cyclists, especially novice cyclists. The ONA also objected to the proposed zebra crossing in Thurloe Place, on the grounds that it would increase congestion and was not needed.</p>	<p>the operation of the junction. Furthermore this proposal only involves a change to road markings so could easily be modified if necessary.</p> <p>Surveys show a demand for pedestrian crossing along this section of Thurloe Place. Because of the gaps in traffic, pedestrians often cross Thurloe Place between Cromwell Place and the bus stops opposite – often from behind buses with sightlines obscured. In the past three years three collisions have involved injury to pedestrians in this section. Consideration was already being given to the provision of crossing facilities here prior to the proposed cycle Quietway route being announced. We have included this pedestrian facility as part of the Quietway proposals. The proposal is likely to have a moderating effect on traffic behaviour along Thurloe Place which will also benefit cyclists. It is not possible to model the impact of a zebra crossing on traffic flow as pedestrian demand and numbers will fluctuate significantly. However, we do not envisage that the use of the crossing will cause a build up of queues to the extent that it will impact on the operations of the Harrington Road or Exhibition Road junctions.</p>
<p>7. Exhibition Road (Drawings Q49-014,Q49-015)</p> <p>The LCC and K&C Cyclists expressed disappointment that no changes were proposed to Exhibition Road; in particular, that there was no proposal to reduce volumes or speeds of motor traffic by closing it at one end. The Exhibition Road Cultural Group welcomed the Quietway but raised concerns about pedestrian safety.</p> <p>There was a request for more cycle parking in Exhibition Road.</p>	<p>The Exhibition Road scheme has been closely monitored since its completion. Over 1300 cyclists a day are using Exhibition Road – around one in seven of all vehicles on the road. Our collision data do not suggest a cyclist safety problem here.</p> <p>We have not proposed any changes in the road that would compromise pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Currently all of the cycle parking is located close to the junction with Cromwell Road. Officers have identified locations further north, in the vicinity of the Science Museum, where there is space for more cycle parking in the “transition zone”.</p>

ii) Dovehouse Street to St Leonard's Terrace

Comment	Officer response
<p>8. Cale Street (Drawing DIST-011)</p> <p>A resident believed that traffic associated with the hospital made the western section of Cale Street unsuitable to be a Quietway.</p>	<p>The traffic flows on Cale Street are not so high as to be unsuitable for a Quietway. It is a one-way street, which we propose to make two-way. There will be gaps in the traffic sufficient for eastbound cyclists to proceed past the parking bays at the western end of the road. At the eastern end, where there are parking bays on the south side of the road, westbound vehicles would have to give way to oncoming cycles.</p> <p>TfL have advised that their research shows that head-on collisions are a very low risk. Cyclists and drivers tend to make sensible judgements about giving way to each other.</p>
<p>9. Junction of Cale St/Sydney St (Drawing DIST-011)</p> <p>The Onslow Neighbourhood Association (ONA) criticised the proposal to extend the footway on the western side of this junction. The ONA noted that narrowing the carriageway here would block northbound traffic whenever there was a vehicle waiting to turn right from Sydney Street into Cale Street. A resident also expressed concern about the impact on traffic flow.</p> <p>The London Cycle Campaign (LCC) was concerned that the pavement widening and the installation of a raised table would not do enough to stop this junction being a barrier for inexperienced cyclists.</p>	<p>Further consideration of this design has uncovered a risk of vehicles driving over the proposed buildout on the south-west corner, given that this would be flush with the new raised carriageway. Although there are few vehicles making the straight-on northbound manoeuvre highlighted by the ONA, there is a significant left-turn movement here, which could also be frustrated by right-turning traffic.</p> <p>Although there would be enough space for cars to turn left or go straight on without encroaching on the buildout, there is still a risk that some vehicles would do this. We therefore propose to remove the buildout.</p>
<p>10. Junction of Cale St/Ixworth Pl. (Drawing DIST -012)</p> <p>The LCC noted that some traffic turns out of this junction at speed.</p>	<p>Traffic emerging from Ixworth Place is required to give way. The cycle logo markings which will be laid across the mouth of junction will make emerging drivers more aware of cyclists.</p>

<p>11. Junction of Cale Street and Whitehead's Grove (Drawing DIST-013)</p> <p>The LCC asked for measures to reduce the risk of conflict between eastbound cyclists on Cale Street, and turning vehicles</p>	<p>We have reviewed the markings at the junction of Cale Street/Whitehead's Grove. At present traffic approaching on the western Cale Street arm has to give way to traffic turning right into Whitehead's Grove. Drivers making that right-turn know that no vehicles will continue eastbound across their path.</p> <p>Although we would ideally allow eastbound cyclists to continue without ceding priority, this would require revising the priority markings in ways that would seem counterintuitive to road users, and which would therefore not be followed. We now propose to add a separate Give Way marking for eastbound cyclists proceeding along the one-way westbound arm of Chelsea Green. Cycle markings will highlight the new eastbound cycle movement into Elystan Place.</p> <p>In addition, we propose to improve access to the Quietway route by allowing cyclists to enter the eastern arm of Chelsea Green, which is one-way northbound, from the northern end.</p>
<p>12. Tryon Street (Drawing King's Road)</p> <p>The original proposal to close Tryon St by means of a bollard just north of the junction with King's Road attracted objections from several residents, and an agent representing an adjacent trader. Officers met several residents on site in December.</p> <p>They were concerned that the proposal would effectively prevent them dropping off or picking up passengers, or deliveries, as they would then be required to reverse back up most of the length of the road to Elystan Street. They noted that traffic flows on this road were already very low.</p> <p>A resident of a nearby street felt that two-way cycling in Tryon Street</p>	<p>The original proposal was designed to ensure that northbound cyclists could enter the mouth of Tryon Street, which is narrow, without any risk of conflict with southbound vehicles as it was to be closed to traffic at King's Road. Although flows on the road are very low, it is important to provide some "escape" space for cyclists. The road closure was never intended as a traffic reduction measure – flows are already very low.</p> <p>Officers accept that the previous design would have required an increase in vehicle reversing manoeuvres, which is not desirable from a safety point of view. Officers have produced a revised design. Officers now believe that this escape space can be provided without closing the road completely, by enlarging the paved area at the junction, and allowing cyclists to ride on this defined section of pavement. Although Tryon Street would be kept open to traffic the right turn out would be banned, which local residents indicated would be acceptable. This would allow the crossing on Kings Road to be positioned</p>

<p>would be unsafe for “timid” cyclists.</p> <p>Conversely, the LCC and the K&C Cyclists welcomed the proposal to close Tryon Street.</p>	<p>immediately west of Tryon Street. The proposed repositioning of the crossing combined with the use of surface materials and markings will make pedestrians more aware of cyclists and should reduce the risk of potential conflict.</p>
<p>13. King’s Road and paved area of Royal Avenue (Drawing King’s Road)</p> <p>The LCC and K&C Cyclists welcomed the proposal to create a “Tiger” crossing for cyclists, across King’s Road, between Tryon Street and the paved area of Royal Avenue.</p> <p>Ward councillors and a resident expressed concern about the potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on the southern footway, close to the Itsu restaurant.</p> <p>The Royal Avenue Residents’ Association was generally supportive of the proposal, but asked whether the westbound bus cage just east of the crossing should be repositioned, or even removed.</p>	<p>The new design takes account of councillors’ concerns. The repositioning of the crossing means on the south side of King’s Road has moved the point at which cyclists’ and pedestrians’ desire lines would meet to a more open part of the paved area, further away from the restaurant. In addition, there will now be a “buffer” zone between the Tiger crossing and the pedestrian desire line. These “buffer” zones on both sides of the road will be paved in York stone setts, and edged with corduroy paving. There will also be small bollard-mounted signs to indicate that cyclists and pedestrians will share the space. Finally, we will introduce give way markings to oblige cyclists to cede priority to the east-west pedestrian movement.</p>
<p>14. Royal Avenue (Drawing CHEL-005)</p> <p>This road is, unusually, one-way in an anti-clockwise direction. Cyclists entering it from the north would be required to turn right and follow the existing one-way restrictions. One consultee felt that this road should be made two-way for cycling, while another felt there was a risk that northbound cyclists would ride on the pavement to avoid oncoming southbound traffic.</p> <p>Officers have since learned that some local residents are worried</p>	<p>There will be sign posting provided to make it clear to southbound cyclists leaving the paved area that the roads around the square are one way clockwise and that they should turn right to reach St Leonard’s Terrace. However, some southbound cyclists, particularly if wishing to continue towards Lower Sloane Street, might ride against the one-way northbound flow in the eastern arm of Royal Avenue. Northbound cyclists arriving from the west might be tempted to travel against the one-way southbound flow on the western arm, (although there would be no practical advantage in doing so).</p> <p>If the direction of the one-way restriction were reversed to run clockwise, this would address the</p>

that southbound cyclists entering the carriageway in the north-east corner of Royal Avenue would ride against the one-way northbound flow on the eastern arm of the road.

first concern. However, northbound cyclists arriving from the east would have to travel along three sides of Royal Avenue, rather than one under the current arrangements.

It will be difficult to prevent all illegal contraflow manoeuvres, and officers suggest that we monitor actual cycling behaviour before proposing any changes to the restrictions.

We consider that if necessary it would be possible to introduce two way cycling in the eastern arm of Royal Avenue. Traffic flows are very low and there is room for a car and cycle to pass. There is also be no parking permitted along the eastern footway (on the the left side of contraflow cyclists) so if need be cyclists could stop by the footway should a wider commercial vehicle wish to pass).

Changes to Traffic Management Orders

Two way cycling in one-way streets

The TRO for introducing two way cycling in the one-way section of Cale Street, between its junctions with Dovehouse Street and Sydney Street has already been approved as part of the Oakley Street to Harrington Road Quietway route. This is now ready to be implemented.

We will still need to consult on the proposals to permit two-way cycling in:

- i. Elystan Place, and
- ii. Tryon Street.

Although not part of the quietway route we now propose to consult on a separate scheme to implement two way cycling in Elystan Street, between Whitehead's Grove and Elystan Place, ie the eastern arm of Chelsea Green

Other traffic management measures

We will still need to consult on:

- i. banning the right turn from Tryon Street into King's Road, and
- ii. creating small areas of shared space on the footways to be used by cyclists and pedestrians on King's Road and Royal Avenue between the carriageways of Royal Avenue and Tryon Street.

Parking, waiting and loading changes

As part of the original two-way cycling scheme for Cale Street, officers also consulted on a proposal to relocate a motorcycle parking bay and two Blue Badge disabled parking bays, and to remove one further Blue Badge bay, at the western end of Cale Street. Subsequently, officers concluded that none of these changes were necessary, and we have since put up street notices to confirm our intention to leave the parking here unchanged.

Under the Miscellaneous Parking Amendment process in February 2016 we consulted on the following waiting and loading restrictions:

1. Removal of one resident parking space from the slip road outside Brompton Cemetery on Old Brompton Road.

2. Changes to parking at the junction of Harrington Gardens/Collingham Road mini roundabout junction.
3. Realignment of single yellow lines around a new kerb build-out, and minor repositioning of a bus cage, on Stanhope Gardens.
4. Changes to a bus cage and single yellow line markings to allow the introduction of a zebra crossing with zig zag markings at the junction of Thurloe Place and Cromwell Place.

Should we receive objections to any of these traffic order changes, we will report them in the normal way, and consider the implications for delivery of the Quietway routes.

Consultation will be carried out at a later date on providing a new Tiger crossing with zig zag marking in King's Road by Tryon Street and removing the existing zebra crossing and remaining zig zag markings to the south west and replacing these with no waiting and loading at any time restrictions.