

London Cycling Campaign response to Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Kensington High Street to Notting Hill Gate Cycleway

11 June 2019

<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/kensington-high-street-notting-hill-cycleway-consultation>

About the London Cycling Campaign

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 20,000 supporters of whom over 11,000 are fully paid-up members. We speak up on behalf of everyone who cycles or wants to cycle in Greater London; and we speak up for a greener, healthier, happier and better-connected capital.

This response was developed with input from LCC's borough groups.

General comments on this scheme:

- This route is opposed. It is not of sufficient quality to either improve cycle safety significantly for those already cycling in the area or for those who might cycle here if conditions felt safer.

Specific points about this scheme:

- Throughout the scheme, it is our belief that motor traffic volumes and speeds are likely to be too high for a wider range of people to cycle along this route. If the scheme does pass TfL's new Quality Criteria threshold, it is likely it only just does so, and the proposals contained in this scheme are unlikely to drastically alter speeds and volumes.
- On Melbury, Abbotsbury Roads, Princedale, Walmer and Clarendon Roads, it is likely further work on speed reduction is required, particularly around the bend on Melbury Road. Traffic volume reduction is also likely to be required, and there is little clear reason why these roads could not be further filtered or otherwise restricted to reduce or remove through motor traffic. Without filtering, lane widths are also likely to be a significant problem for those cycling here, forced to negotiate with aggressive and fast motor traffic between rows of parked cars.
- Crossing Holland Park Avenue – this crossing is unlikely to be used by those currently cycling in the area, but it is also unlikely to be perceived as cycle infrastructure by those who might but don't currently. Such provision provides neither enough clarity nor enough priority for those who cycle or who potentially would. And shared space areas on busy pavements risk cycle-pedestrian conflict. TfL's proposals under its current Wood Lane – Notting Hill Gate consultation are preferable, although they do risk worsening some issues on Abbotsbury Road (while alleviating others) without further filtering. And a further improvement might be a direct signalised crossing

from the proposed cycle track directly to Norland Square at the same time as the junction signals run.

General points about infrastructure schemes:

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy relies on a growth in cycle trips to keep London moving. This means infrastructure schemes must be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.
- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.
- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport modes for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL's "Healthy Streets" checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.
- All schemes should be designed to enable people of all ages and abilities to cycle, including disabled people.
- Evidence from TfL and from many schemes in London, the UK and worldwide shows the economic benefits, including to businesses, to be found from enabling a wider range of people to cycle more. Further evidence shows how cycling schemes also benefit air quality and reduce climate changing emissions, as well as improving resident health outcomes and reducing inactivity, as mentioned above.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all "critical issues" eliminated. Above 2,000 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) motor vehicle movements per day, or 20mph motor traffic speeds, cycling should be physically separated from motor traffic.