

# Executive Decision Report

<b>Decision maker and date of Leadership Team meeting or (in the case of individual Lead Member decisions) the earliest date the decision will be taken</b>	Sue Harris, Executive Director for Environment and Communities Date of report: 05/09/2019 Date of decision (i.e. not before): <i>[insert]</i> Forward Plan reference: 05477/19/T/A - ED	 THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF <b>KENSINGTON                  AND CHELSEA</b>
<b>Report title</b>	LADBROKE GROVE IMPROVEMENTS – RESULTS OF CONSULTATION	
<b>Reporting officer</b>	Director for Transport, Highways, Parks and Leisure	
<b>Key decision</b>	No	
<b>Access to information classification</b>	Public	
<b>Wards</b>	Dalgarno, St Helens Notting Dale, Norland, Golborne, Colville and Pembridge	

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This report outlines the public consultation on proposals to improve road safety and to assist cyclists and pedestrians on Ladbroke Grove. It provides officers' comments on the consultation responses and seeks your approval for detailed design and implementation of a package of measures to assist cyclists and pedestrians.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. It is recommended that:

- a) You note the officer responses to the consultation comments detailed in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.22
- b) You approve the proposals shown in Appendix 5 and summarised in paragraph 5.1 with the addition of a zebra crossing at the junction with Oxford Gardens.

## 3. REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1. Having considered the comments received during the consultation and the balance of opinion registered by consultees I believe it is appropriate to proceed as proposed.

## **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1. As part of the North Kensington Streetscape Review we investigated opportunities for streetscape improvements and measures to tackle road safety hotspots on Ladbroke Grove. In the course of these investigations we identified problems with the existing cycle lanes. These lanes are too narrow, putting cyclists at risk of 'dooring' when passing parked cars. They also deviate sharply at the start and end of parking bays requiring cyclists to swerve sharply to keep within them.
- 4.2. Ideally, a cycle lane should be at least 1.5 metres wide with a buffer of 0.5m when passing parked vehicles. This provides sufficient width for cyclists to remain safely in the lane even when a car door is opened. Unfortunately, Ladbroke Grove is too narrow to provide a wide enough cycle lane on both sides of the road without removing parking bays. There is, however, enough space for a cycle lane on one side of the road.
- 4.3. We therefore developed a design which provides a dedicated cycle lane, focussing primarily on the uphill direction where it can be of greatest benefit to cyclists, and have had initial discussions with representatives of the London Cycling Campaign. This design also incorporates a number of other features aimed at improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

## **5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

- 5.1. The initial package of proposals for Ladbroke Grove on which we consulted comprises a number of elements:
  - Significant lengths of wide cycle lanes, primarily in the uphill direction but in both directions where there is sufficient road width, to improve safety for cyclists.
  - Removal of six central islands to provide sufficient road width for the cycle lane.
  - All existing zebra crossings (six in total) raised to footway level to assist pedestrians and help to reduce traffic speeds.
  - Footway build-outs at the zebra crossing by the Southern Row steps to improve visibility for drivers and pedestrians and to help cyclists to take up the best position on the road.
  - New side road entry treatments comprising raised tables at 13 side road junctions and improvements to the existing side road entry treatments to help reduce the speed of traffic entering and leaving Ladbroke Grove.
  - Modifications to the roundabout at the junction with Barlby Road to improve safety for cyclists.
- 5.2. There would be no changes to existing parking or loading/unloading arrangements and no loss of traffic lanes. Footway widths would remain unchanged. A drawing showing the proposals is appended to this report (see appendix 1).
- 5.3. We consulted ward councillors on our proposals in late 2018 and carried out public consultation in March 2019.

- 5.4. We distributed paper copies of the consultation document to all residents and businesses along the Ladbrooke Grove corridor, a total of 1744 addresses, and supplemented this with an on-line version available through the Council's website. We publicised the consultation borough-wide through ward councillors and residents' associations. Full details of the proposals were made available on the Council's website and in the North Kensington Library on Ladbrooke Grove. A copy of the consultation document is appended to this report (see appendix 2)
- 5.5. We received a total of 143 responses (139 paper questionnaires were returned and four were completed online). We also received a response from the Ladbrooke Association. Full details of the consultation results can be found in Appendix 3
- 5.6. 76 (53 per cent) respondents fully supported the proposals and a further 33 (23 per cent) supported them in part. 28 (20 per cent) opposed the proposals and the remaining six (4 per cent) expressed no preference. Appendix 4 shows that responses were made by people all along the road, and that there was no clear geographical pattern to them.
- 5.7. The majority (79 per cent) of those who supported the proposals in part only, were concerned about the removal of islands. Other concerns related to the cycle lanes (21 per cent), the proposed raised zebra crossings (9 per cent) and traffic speeds (12 per cent). These are discussed below.

#### **Traffic island removal**

- 5.8. Respondents were concerned that the removal of the traffic islands would be detrimental to pedestrians. There are 25 traffic island on Ladbrooke Grove. We propose to remove six. Three of these are at zebra crossings where there is no need for pedestrians to stop half way across the road. The fourth island, which provides an informal crossing facility, is within seven metres of an existing zebra crossing and that crossing provides a suitable alternative crossing point for pedestrians.
- 5.9. If these four islands were to be retained the remaining carriageway would be too narrow to provide a cycle lane. On balance there are more benefits, in terms of safety, to be gained from removing these four islands.
- 5.10. The fifth island, north of the junction with Oxford Gardens, was highlighted by a number of respondents and two specifically requested a zebra crossing at this location. We have considered this request and have looked at the level of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. Our survey results show that the PV<sup>2</sup> criteria for a zebra crossing are met at this location and a zebra crossing could therefore be justified. I therefore propose to amend the design to incorporate a zebra crossing on Ladbrooke Road north of its junction with Ladbrooke Grove.
- 5.11. The final island identified for removal is a small traffic island north of the junction with Bruce Close. It was not designed as a pedestrian refuge and there are no dropped kerbs to assist pedestrians. Few pedestrians cross at this location and

there are nearby zebra crossings, 30 metres north and 40 metres south, which provide safe crossing places. If the island were to be retained a significant length of cycle lane would be lost.

### **Cycle lanes**

- 5.12. There were mixed views on the proposed cycle lanes. Three respondents were concerned that the proposals were insufficient as they did not extend for the full length of the road and did not address the problems of cyclists using the footways at the southern end. Four took the opposite view that the cycle lanes were unnecessary. One respondent suggested that provision for cyclists should be made on alternative roads which are less steep.
- 5.13. The existing cycle lanes are inherently unsafe due to their width and their alignment and therefore need to be removed or replaced. Unfortunately, although desirable, it is not possible to provide uninterrupted cycle lanes for the whole length of Ladbroke Grove due to the width of the road and the need to retain provision for two-way traffic, bus stops, parking and loading/unloading. We continue to develop a network of Cycleway routes in the borough, using quieter roads, but we recognise that many cyclists will still prefer the direct north-south route provided by Ladbroke Grove and it is therefore important to make this route as safe as possible. The current proposals therefore represent the best alternative.
- 5.14. There is potential at the southern end to move parking bays onto the wide footway in between the existing trees, similar to the arrangement on Golborne Road. This would provide space for cycle lanes on both sides of the road between St John's Gardens and Holland Park Avenue. This would result in a loss of parking bays but could be explored further as a separate scheme.

### **Other issues**

- 5.15. There were mixed views on traffic speeds and the need for a 20 mph speed limit. The proposed 20 mph speed limit for the section of Ladbroke Grove between Cambridge Gardens and Westbourne Park Road is the subject of a separate project and it would be inappropriate to consider any modifications to this until the outcome of the experimental 20 mph speed limits and zones have been analysed.
- 5.16. Some respondents were concerned that the proposed raised zebra crossings would be confusing or would create noise. The purpose of these is to help to reduce traffic speeds and provide greater emphasis to the crossing to improve safety for pedestrians. In order to be cycle-friendly the ramps will be sinusoidal, which will also minimise noise.

### **The Ladbroke Association**

- 5.17. The Ladbroke Association (LA) submitted a detailed response with concerns and comments about the proposed cycle lanes, the raised tables for side roads, the pavement build-outs, traffic islands and parking bay reduction.

- 5.18. The LA was concerned that there would be insufficient space to provide a cycle lane alongside parking bays and also questioned the issue of dooring. In response, the scheme has been designed so that cycle lanes are only provided where sufficient road width is available. There is guidance from TfL on the design of cycle lanes and the need to design-out dooring. This has also been the subject of publicity campaigns.
- 5.19. The LA supported the proposals for additional raised tables and requested the same treatment for six additional junctions. Of these, the Blenheim Crescent junctions already have entry treatments incorporating raised tables. The remaining junctions are traffic signal controlled and raised tables would not be appropriate.
- 5.20. The LA is concerned that pavement buildouts would reduce the width of cycle lanes causing cyclists to swerve. This is currently a problem with the existing layout but the new cycle lanes have been designed to avoid this problem.
- 5.21. The LA is opposed to the removal of any more islands than those identified for removal in the consultation document. In response, no additional islands will be removed as part of this scheme.
- 5.22. The final point raised by the LA was that any reduction in parking should be avoided. In response, the only loss of parking is a minor shortening of a parking bay on St John's Gardens that will not affect the number of vehicles that the bay can hold.

## 6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

- 6.1. There are four options for consideration:

**Option A:** do nothing. This would leave the sub-standard cycle lanes in place exposing cyclists to a high risk of accidents and would not tackle the existing road safety hotspots which have been identified. I do not recommend this option.

**Option B:** remove the existing sub-standard cycle lanes. Although this option would remove the unsafe cycle lanes, by putting nothing in their place it would do little to assist cyclists and would not tackle the other road safety issues identified. I do not recommend this option.

**Option C:** approve the scheme as proposed. This option would improve road safety for both cyclists and pedestrians and has the support of just over 50 per cent of respondents. However, there are a number of concerns raised by residents in response to the consultation and so I do not recommend this option.

**Option D:** approve the original scheme with the addition of a zebra crossing in place of the existing island north of the junction with Oxford Gardens. This would tackle the concerns raised. **This is the option I recommend.**

- 6.2. If you approve option D we would aim to start construction work in Autumn 2019

## **7. CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

7.1. This report describes the public consultation undertaken on Ladbroke Grove and the online public consultation carried out simultaneously. Ladbroke Grove runs between the Dalgarno, St Helen's, Notting Dale and Norland wards on the west side and the Golborne, Colville and Pembridge wards on the east side. We consulted the Ward councillors for all seven of these wards prior to the public consultation and we have also consulted the Ladbroke Association.

## **8. HUMAN RESOURCES AND EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

8.1. There are no Human Resources Implications arising directly from this report.

8.2. The Council has had regard to its Public Sector Equality Duty contained under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and places a general equality duty on the Council when exercising its functions and the making of such decisions to have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, or other prohibited conduct; advance of equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender assignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sex orientation. The duty also applies to marriage and civil partnership but only in relation to the elimination of discrimination.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 The Council has the power to carry out such works pursuant to Part V of the Highways Act 1980 and Part 3 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The Council has had regard to the Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 when exercising such functions.

## **10. FINANCIAL, PROPERTY, IT AND ANY OTHER RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 The total cost of implementation has been estimated at £674,000. This includes £362,000 for the improvements to the zebra crossings and the side road entry treatments, £62,000 for the changes to the traffic islands, £228,000 for the improvements to the roundabout at the Barlby Road junction and £22,000 for the changes to the cycle lanes.

10.2 The scheme will be funded from the approved TfL Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding (£274,000) and Council Streetscape and Highway Improvements budgets (£400,000).

10.3 Corporate Finance has been consulted and comments that the financial implications of this decision are as explained in paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2 to this report. It is confirmed that the current Capital Programme includes sufficient budget provision to meet the costs of the recommended streetscape improvements.

10.4 There are no property or IT implications arising directly from this report.

Mahmood Siddiqi  
**Director for Transport, Highways, Leisure and Parks**

**Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) – Background papers used in the preparation of this report**

none

**Contact officer(s):** Lis Loebner, Senior Traffic Engineer, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, 020 7361 2802, lis.loebner@rbkc.gov.uk

**Formal clearance requirements for all key decision reports** [insert]

Cleared by Finance (officer's initials)	SS
Cleared by <u>Corporate</u> Finance (officer's initials)	PM
Cleared by Director of Legal Services (officer's initials)	LLM
Cleared by Communications & Community Engagement (officer's initials)	NT