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Executive Summary

Between 21 September and 31 October 2017 we consulted on detailed proposals for Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre. The consultation asked for feedback on the proposals from residents, businesses, employers, transport users and other relevant stakeholders.

In February 2018 we published headline findings from the autumn 2017 consultation. We have now updated our consultation report with detailed analysis of the comments made and postcode analysis of respondents. This report can be found tfl.gov.uk/cs9

This report provides our response to the issues commonly raised during the consultation and the changes we are making to the proposals to reflect the feedback received. We produced this in collaboration with the London Boroughs of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham, and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Overall responses

We received 5,388 direct responses to the consultation, of which 59 per cent supported or strongly supported the proposals, 2 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals, and 39 per cent opposed or strongly opposed the proposals.

93 of the responses were from key stakeholder groups, which comprised politicians, statutory bodies, employers, trade organisations, residents’ associations, developers, campaign groups, disability groups, and more

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website which strongly supported the overall proposals and made suggestions for further improvements. An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans which supported the proposals.

Conclusion and next steps

The feedback we received was invaluable in helping us to further improve the scheme. Section 1.2 of the report includes a summary of the proposed design changes made following the responses received to the consultation.

We are carrying out further consultation on two parts of the route:

- Kew Bridge and Kew Bridge Road to Wellesley Road
- Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue junctions with Chiswick High Road

See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more information.

Following feedback from respondents and the Mayor’s announcement of a new unified brand for London’s growing network of high-quality cycle routes\(^1\), this route

\(^1\) Available at tfl.gov.uk/mayors-transport-strategy
will no longer be called a Cycle Superhighway and we will work closely with our borough partners on the most appropriate wayfinding for this scheme. Subject to the further consultation and the remaining stages of our internal decision-making process, we currently intend to commence construction in summer 2019.
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1. Response to consultation and next steps

1.1 Response to consultation

Between 21 September and 31 October 2017 we consulted on proposals for Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre. The consultation asked for feedback on the proposals from residents, businesses, employers, transport users and other relevant stakeholders.

We received 5,388 direct responses to the consultation, of which 59 per cent supported or strongly supported the proposals, 2 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals, and 39 per cent opposed or strongly opposed the proposals. 93 of the responses were from key stakeholder groups, which comprised politicians, statutory bodies, employers, trade organisations, residents’ associations, developers, campaign groups, disability groups, and more.

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website which strongly supported the overall proposals and made suggestions for further improvements. An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans which supported the proposals.

This report provides our response to the issues commonly raised during the consultation and the changes we are making to the proposals to reflect the feedback received. We produced this in collaboration with the London Boroughs of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham, and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

The feedback we received was invaluable in helping us to further improve the scheme. Section 1.2 of the report includes a summary of the proposed design changes made following the responses received to the consultation.

We are carrying out further consultation on two parts of the route:

- Kew Bridge and Kew Bridge Road to Wellesley Road
- Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue junctions with Chiswick High Road

See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more information.

Following feedback from respondents and the Mayor’s announcement of a new unified brand for London’s growing network of high-quality cycle routes, this route will no longer be called a Cycle Superhighway and we will work closely with our borough partners on the most appropriate wayfinding for this scheme. Subject to the further consultation and the remaining stages of our internal decision-making process, we currently intend to commence construction in summer 2019.

---

2 Available at tfl.gov.uk/mayors-transport-strategy
1.2 Summary of design changes following consultation

Our planned changes are summarised below and described in more detail in Section 2.2. Where no changes are described, we are intending to proceed as per the design consulted on. Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

Section A: Hammersmith Road (between Holland Road and Rowan Road)

- We proposed a taxi rank on Avonmore Road in place of four pay and display parking bays. In the revised scheme, the taxi rank would remain on the north side of Hammersmith Road (accessible via a footway level crossing over the cycle track) and there would be no changes to parking on Avonmore Road. A short section of bus lane would be removed from Hammersmith Road in place of the taxi rank. An additional taxi rank would be provided on the south side of Hammersmith Road adjacent to the footway and would be accessible from the kerb edge.
- We have increased the depth of the cycle track set back on Olympia Way to provide more space for large vehicles to wait when pulling in or out of this side road.
- We have adjusted the layout of the advanced cycle stop line (ASL) on North End Road to ensure that large turning vehicles do not overrun this area when cyclists are waiting at the junction.
- We proposed to remove the cycle hire docking station on Hammersmith Road by Shortlands. In the revised scheme, we have adjusted kerb lines so that the docking station can be retained.
- We proposed new trees at the junction of Hammersmith Road and Shortlands. As there are already a number of trees and planters at this location, we are reviewing opportunities to incorporate new planting and trees in this location.

We are also working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on the evolving proposals for redevelopment of Olympia Exhibition Centre which was submitted for planning application at the end of 2018. The application comprised (among other proposals) pedestrian, vehicle, cycle, public realm, landscaping and highway works along Hammersmith Road. See here for more details.

Section B: Hammersmith Gyratory

- We have simplified the layout of Black’s Road by removing the proposed cycle feeder lane to the gyratory and instead providing a wider footway. Cyclist access from Black’s Road to the route would be maintained via the carriageway.
- We proposed an additional taxi rank on Black’s Road to replace existing parking, disabled and loading bays. In the revised scheme, we will keep the existing bays and instead propose an additional 12m taxi rank in an existing bay on Queen Caroline Street opposite Black’s Road.
- We have reduced the exit lanes from Hammersmith Gyratory to Shepherd’s Bush Road from two lanes to one to provide clear lane designation for drivers. This change also shortens crossing distance for pedestrians over the west arm of Shepherd’s Bush Road.

We are aware of concerns with the quality of current cycling facilities on the A4, and are committed to reviewing this separately in partnership with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham. This includes improvements along the A4 between Hammersmith town hall and Hammersmith gyratory, including links into Black’s Road.

**Section C: Beadon Road**
- No changes are proposed to the design which we consulted on.

**Section D: King Street East (to Leamore St)**
- We proposed to raise the pedestrian crossing at Lyric Square to make it the same height as the surrounding footways. In the revised design, the crossing would be at carriageway level and dropped kerbs would be provided. This is to provide clearer definition between the footways, cycle track and traffic lane.
- We proposed potential urban realm improvements along one section of King Street. We are now proposing to expand this more widely along King Street and this would include seating and greening in line with the Healthy Streets Approach and the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham’s Streetsmart streetscape manual.

**Section E: King Street West (Leamore St to Goldhawk)**
- We have reviewed pedestrian crossings throughout this section with a view to increasing pedestrian priority and space. In the revised design the following crossings will now be signalised across both the carriageway and cycle track rather than signalised just over the carriageway:
  - Toucan crossing on King Street near Studland Street
  - Pedestrian crossing on King Street near Ravenscourt Road
  - Toucan crossing on King Street by Ravenscourt Park
  - Pedestrian crossing on King Street near Black Lion Lane
- We are proposing to provide a new signalised pedestrian crossing on King Street east of Weltje Road in the vicinity of local schools to replace an informal pedestrian crossing west of Weltje Road
- To make space for the additional pedestrian crossing near Weltje Road, we would combine eastbound bus stops E (Ravenscourt Park Station) and F (Ravenscourt Park) into one stop between Ravenscourt Avenue and Ravenscourt Park. We would also move westbound bus stop G (Ravenscourt Park) east towards Beavor Lane. This would also provide more even spacing between bus stops and bring them closer to local schools.

- We are providing ‘keep clear’ road markings on King Street at Rivercourt Road to aid vehicles turning out of Rivercourt Road onto King Street.

- We are proposing to provide 90 metres of designated coach parking along the west side of Rivercourt Road, replacing existing residential parking bays and double yellow lines. This coach parking would be for use by local schools transporting pupils to the local area.

- We have increased the cycle track set back at a number of access points and side roads to provide more space for a vehicle to wait when pulling in or out. This includes the two vehicle access points outside Latymer Upper School, Weltje Road and the access to the West London Free School. The alignment of this access has also been straightened.

- We have included a turning pocket for traffic to wait in when turning from King Street onto Ravenscourt Park or Beavor Lane.

- We proposed for the cycle track opposite Westcroft Square (west) to pass round an existing tree. This tree has since been found to be dead and will instead be removed. We have adjusted the alignment of the cycle track accordingly.

- We are proposing a new tree between three existing trees on the south side of King Street outside No. 375 (subject to ground conditions).

- We are proposing double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting or loading) instead of double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only at certain times) between Nos. 342 and 360 Hammersmith Road as there would not be space for traffic to pass round loading vehicles. Instead, double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only at certain times) are to be provided between Nos. 284 and 288 to the west where there is more space.

We are working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on their plans for the redevelopment of Hammersmith Town Hall, including how this scheme will tie in with the proposed layout at Nigel Playfair Avenue on King Street.

**Section E/F: Goldhawk Road junction**

- We proposed to ban the westbound left turn for traffic from King Street to British Grove and the eastbound right turn for traffic from Chiswick High Road into British Grove. We are no longer proposing to ban these turns due to concerns regarding local access.
• We are no longer proposing a bus gate on Goldhawk Road following a bus operation review that found it would not be beneficial. Goldhawk Road would remain as two lanes
• We have reduced the amount of footway cut back on the south side of Chiswick High Road west of the junction with British Grove with the minimum width of the footway to be retained increasing from 2.5 metres to 2.7 metres and from 3.9 metres to 6.8 metres further west
• We have removed the proposed ‘two stage right turn’ facility for cyclists at this junction as we will instead be separating this movement from motor vehicle traffic using signals

Section F: Chiswick High Road

Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See ftl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

• We are proposing to increase the cycle track set back distance at the junction with Airedale Avenue to provide more space for motor vehicles to wait when turning in or out
• We are proposing to increase the length of the proposed raised junction at Linden Gardens (east) so that it includes traffic exiting the nearby car park
• We have reviewed the design of crossings along the route and are proposing to make the following crossings signalised across both the road and cycle track rather than just the carriageway:
  o Chiswick High Road between Mayfield Avenue and Thornton Avenue
  o Chiswick High Road between Homefield Road and Airedale Avenue
  o Chiswick High Road between Cleveland Avenue and Ravensmede Way
• We are proposing to retain the existing footway width outside Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church. To achieve this we are proposing to reduce the eastbound approach to the junction of Duke’s Avenue from two lanes to one to make space for the cycle track on the carriageway*
• We are proposing 12 metres of additional single yellow line with single blips outside nos. 118 to 120 Chiswick High Road for the local supermarket to load outside of peak hours. We would remove a short section of proposed bus lane on the south side of Chiswick High Road east of Cranbrook Road to make space for motor traffic to overtake vehicles loading here
• We are proposing a new seven metre loading bay on the south side of Chiswick High Road between Brackley Road and Cranbrook Road for the use of the nearby funeral directors. This requires reducing the number of proposed pay and display parking bays here from seven to five
• We are proposing to increase the length of the proposed loading bay on the north side of Chiswick High Road west of Mayfield Avenue from 15 metres to 25 metres to match the length of the existing loading bay
- We are reducing the length of the loading bay on the north side of Chiswick High Road west of Fishers Lane from 28 metres to 18 metres to reduce the impact on the footway.
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Thornton Avenue as a planter has been installed in this location.
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Linden Gardens as this would have blocked pedestrian access to Linden Passage; we will extend the entry treatment at the car park opposite, to create a level crossing point for pedestrians at this location.
- We are proposing to remove the tree outside no 87 Chiswick High Road to maintain more footway width outside the shops at Nos. 87 – 95 Chiswick High Road while allowing appropriate carriageway widths for traffic to pass buses using the bus stop and maintaining movements through the Chiswick Lane junction.
- We proposed four additional pay and display bays on the west side of Duke’s Avenue. Following feedback from the consultation and our discussions with Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church we are no longer proposing these bays and will instead retain the existing single yellow line as this will provide more opportunity for parking as required.
- We proposed three additional pay and display bays on the east side of Duke Road. Following a design review, this has been reduced to two, to ensure large vehicles can exit Bourne Place safely.
- We proposed three additional pay and display bays on the east side of Duke Road. Following a design review, this has been reduced to two, to ensure large vehicles can exit Bourne Place safely.
- We are proposing one additional pay and display bay on Upham Park Road and two additional pay and display bays on Ennismore Avenue.
- We are no longer proposing to remove a tree on the corner of Chiswick High Road and Windmill Road as part of this scheme as the tree has been felled by a utility company.
- We are proposing to ban the right turn out of Duke Road for all traffic (except cyclists) in response to safety and congestion concerns with additional traffic using Duke Road as a result of becoming one-way. Traffic would be able to use Annandale to exit east onto Chiswick High Road instead.
- We previously proposed to reduce Annandale Road from two lanes to one at its junction with Chiswick High Road. We are now proposing to keep two lanes on exit at this junction to facilitate additional motor traffic movements at this junction as a result of the removal of the right turn at the Duke Road junction.
Section G: Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road (between Chiswick High Road and Capital Interchange Way)

- Adding a raised table to the junction of Wellesley Road and Marlborough Road to provide a flush crossing for pedestrians and reduce vehicle turning speeds.

Section H: South Circular Road - Kew Bridge station (between Capital Interchange Way and Kew Bridge)

Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

- We proposed with-flow segregated cycle tracks and a bus lane on the South Circular and Kew Bridge Road between Wellesley Road and Thames Row (including Kew Bridge junction). We are now proposing to make this a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road. This change provides full segregation for cyclists throughout this section and removes the requirement for two bus stop bypasses we proposed on the north side of Kew Bridge Road. The change also addresses cycle safety concerns at Kew Bridge junction, Green Dragon Lane and Lionel Road South.*
- We would maintain a signalised cycle crossing between Wellesley Road and Capital Interchange Way for northbound and southbound cyclists in response to concerns regarding access*
- We are proposing a zebra crossing across the cycle track at the raised crossing point on the east arm of Kew Bridge junction to provide pedestrian priority to all crossings at this junction. This is in response to engagement with local schools in the area*
- We would replace the proposed yellow box junction at Strand On The Green with Keep Clear makings in response to feedback from local residents*
- We are proposing a second southbound traffic lane on Kew Bridge to address an existing bottle neck and improve the efficiency of the Kew Bridge junction*
- We would reduce the width of the western footway on Kew Bridge and make this side pedestrian only, retaining shared use for cyclists and pedestrians on the eastern footway*
- We would retain the footway loading bay on the north side of Kew Bridge junction for use by local businesses.*

Section I: Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street East (between Kew Bridge and Pottery Road)

Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.
- We proposed with-flow segregated cycle tracks and a bus lane on the South Circular and Kew Bridge Road between Wellesley Road and Thames Row (including Kew Bridge junction). We are now proposing to make this a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road. This change provides full segregation for cyclists throughout this section and removes the requirement for two bus stop bypasses we proposed on the north side of Kew Bridge Road. The change also addresses cycle safety concerns at Kew Bridge junction, Green Dragon Lane and Lionel Road South.*
- We proposed to relocate an informal crossing island west of Green Dragon Lane to the east. In the revised proposals we are proposing to remove this informal crossing island in response to safety concerns. A new signalised pedestrian crossing is proposed further east which provides an alternative crossing point for pedestrians (see below).*
- We would provide a new signalised cycle crossing on Brentford High Street at Thames Row to facilitate cyclists switching between with-flow and the two-way cycle track. This would include a new signalised pedestrian crossing.*
- We are proposing to remove eastbound bus stop W – Kew Bridge Station which serves the route 65 from the north side of Kew Bridge Road*
- Following localised traffic modelling, we would no longer propose a bus lane eastbound on approach to Kew Bridge junction.*
- Where we had previously proposed for eastbound cyclists to be in a widened bus lane on the north side of Brentford High Street, between Thames Row and the approach to Kew Bridge junction; we are now proposing a segregated cycle track. The bus lane is proposed to be retained on the outside of the cycle track.*
- We previously proposed to merge the existing loading bays on the north side of Brentford High Street east of the petrol station into a single 20 metre loading bay. We are now proposing to move the existing loading bays, to the outside of the segregated cycle track.*

**Section J: Brentford High Street West (between Pottery Road and Alexandra Road)**

- Changing a short section of segregated cycle track to mandatory cycle lane to facilitate access to a new loading bay on the south side of Brentford High Street, west of the junction with Ealing Road.

**Overall changes**

In addition to the changes above, we are proposing to:

- Include zebra crossings at all bus stop bypasses following the publication of new guidance on Bus Stop Bypasses
- Remove zig zag markings in the cycle track on approach to signalised crossings
- Extend the length of cycle ramps to reduce their gradient

### 1.3 Next steps

The feedback we received was invaluable in helping us to further improve the scheme. Section 1.2 of the report includes a summary of the proposed design changes made following the responses received to the consultation.

We are carrying out further consultation on two parts of the route:
- Kew Bridge and Kew Bridge Road to Wellesley Road
- Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue junctions with Chiswick High Road

See [tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke](http://tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke) for more information.

Following feedback from respondents and the Mayor’s announcement of a new unified brand for London’s growing network of high-quality cycle routes\(^3\), this route will no longer be called a Cycle Superhighway and we will work closely with our borough partners on the most appropriate wayfinding for this scheme. Subject to the further consultation and the remaining stages of our internal decision-making process, we currently intend to commence construction in summer 2019.

\(^3\) Available at [tfl.gov.uk/mayors-transport-strategy](http://tfl.gov.uk/mayors-transport-strategy)
2. Responses to issues commonly raised

We have worked closely with key stakeholders including the London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham and Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea on our response to the issues raised during the public consultation, which are set out in this section.

2.1 Overall proposals

Principles of the scheme

Prioritisation of transport modes

Some respondents expressed their support for prioritising active travel over motor traffic, while others raised concerns about prioritising cyclists over other road traffic, such as private cars, public transport and pedestrians. Some respondents were also concerned that the scheme would encourage cyclist commuter through traffic but would not account for the needs of local cycle traffic. Some people suggested that the changes were not needed or were opposed to cycling in London.

As part of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS)\(^4\), an increase in active travel is being targeted in order to make London a healthier, safer and greener city. A key aim of the MTS is to increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable modes of transport – such as walking, cycling and public transport – to 80 per cent by 2041, up from 64 per cent today.

Investment in cycling and walking forms a key part of this objective and will work hand in hand with public transport improvements to develop an extensive sustainable transport network across the capital. This together forms the Healthy Streets Approach\(^5\) which aims to help reduce the reliance on private vehicles and make walking, cycling and public transport the most appealing and practical choices.

We want to make it easier for people in west London to use sustainable travel and lead active lifestyles. We also want to make the streets along the route healthier, safer and more welcoming places for everyone. The proposals form part of the Mayor of London’s plan for Healthy Streets a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk and cycle by making London’s streets healthier, safer and more welcoming.

Our proposals would bring a high-quality cycle facility to west London, linking town centres in Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford. Data from existing segregated


cycle routes suggest the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes
that are less suitable for them. The introduction of the East-West and North-South
Cycle Superhighways in central London have seen significant increases in cycling as
a mode of transport. Recent survey data for 2017 shows that cycle flows have
increased by up to 200% since pre construction flows along East-West\(^6\) and the
proportion of people choosing to cycle along North South because it feels like the
safest option nearly doubled from 27% before the route was built to 56% after\(^7\).

TfL’s London Travel Demand Survey (2016) found that there are around 8.17 million
trips per average day in London that could potentially be made by bike in their
entirety. This includes 62 per cent of journeys currently undertaken by motorised
modes\(^8\). By encouraging people to cycle these journeys, road space can be freed up
for journeys that require use of a motor vehicle.

Segregated cycle routes have been shown to carry a greater number of people than
the roads they follow and therefore help to enhance the efficiency of street space
along with other sustainable modes of transport. Two weeks after opening, the East-
West and North-South Cycle Superhighways were moving five per cent more people
per hour than would have been possible without the cycle tracks. Moving forward,
this is expected to increase even more as they attract a growing number of cyclists.

Cycle routes like this scheme aim to provide an accessible option for all cyclists,
rather than just commuters. Over half (51 per cent) of current cycling trips in London
are for shopping and leisure, compared with 28 per cent for commuting. When
potential trips are taken into account, the number of commuter trips falls to 17 per
cent\(^9\). In accordance with this, the route will connect several town centres and
provide connections to local services and amenities, giving cyclists the opportunity to
use the route for both commuting and leisure cycling. Cyclists will be able to join or
leave the route via local side roads, and cycle parking will be provided to allow
cyclists to park their bikes at various points along the route.

**Uptake of cycling**

A number of respondents voiced their support for the scheme as they said it would
encourage more people to cycle in the capital. Other respondents said they were
concerned that the cycle tracks would be underused, and would be ineffective in
encouraging people of all ages and abilities to switch to cycling.

A lack of segregated cycle routes is often identified as a key barrier to cycling of
which is being addressed by this scheme. Data from segregated cycle routes that
have recently opened shows that uptake from cyclists is high in terms of the

---

\(^{6}\) TfL Cycle Counts (2017)
\(^{7}\) TfL Cycle Intercept Surveys (2017)
numbers of the cyclists using routes and the proportion of traffic they make up. Where segregated facilities are provided, we have also observed very high proportions of cyclists using these compared with those remaining in the road. Cycle counts undertaken in the Autumn of 2017 on Blackfriars Road show that during the peak hours, the number of cyclists has increased from 1,995 to 4,462 since 2014; a rise of 124 per cent.

Overall, this has led to a cycling increase of over 150 per cent in the capital since 2000 with new cycling infrastructure such as Cycle Superhighways and Quietways playing a key role in this transport mode change. To build on this cycling growth further, it is clear that dedicated facilities are a key factor.

High volumes of cyclists currently use the eastern sections of the proposed route where there are no protected facilities for them, and many journeys currently made in the area via motorised modes could be made by foot or by bike. TfL’s Strategic Cycling Analysis shows high current and future potential demand along the route alignment, demonstrating immediate and future demand for cycling here. This scheme would also help work towards the ambitious target set out in the MTS, for 70 per cent of Londoners to live within 400 metres of the cycle network.

**Cycle Superhighways**

Some respondents made general comments about Cycle Superhighways. Many of these respondents supported the scheme based on the success of previous routes. Others suggested that lessons learned from other cycle schemes be incorporated into this scheme. Some people were concerned that Cycle Superhighways encourage speeding and others felt the brand had negative connotations.

The introduction of Cycle Superhighways in recent years has had great success in terms of facilitating the growth of cycling in London by providing safe and reliable facilities for a range of cyclists. Recent monitoring data shows that 71% of people surveyed cycling on the East West Cycle Superhighway chose to do so because they feel it is their safest option.

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan has pledged his firm commitment to the continuation of investment in cycling with manifesto pledges to “make London a byword for cycling around the world” and “make cycling and walking safer and easier in the capital”. He also backed the London Cycling Campaign’s aspiration for triple the amount of protected facilities for cyclists.

We constantly review lessons learned from previous schemes to ensure that best practice is followed in the delivery of new schemes. This process involves continually working with a variety of internal and external stakeholders to conduct reviews and identify improvements. Lessons learnt from TfL projects on borough roads including the North-South Cycle Superhighway and Quietways programme will be applied.
As the London cycle network has expanded over the last decade, many different types of branding for cycle routes and infrastructure have emerged, which can be confusing for existing or potential cyclists. The Mayor has recently announced a new, unified brand for the cycle network to address these issues and as such this scheme will no longer be a Cycle Superhighway going forward. More information about the changes to branding are described in the Mayor’s recently published Cycling Action Plan and we will work closely with our borough partners on the most appropriate wayfinding for London’s high-quality cycle network, including this scheme.

See here for our response regarding concerns about cyclists speeding.

Accessibility

A number of people said they were concerned that the scheme would not be suitable for young or elderly people, people with illnesses or disabilities or parents with children.

Our long-term aim is to improve conditions for walking and cycling, and in turn to help relieve congestion on public transport and the roads. This will benefit all public transport and road users, including vulnerable people who travel using those modes.

Cycle routes such as this scheme aim to attract a diverse range of users. Segregated facilities provide a safe and accessible option for cyclists who are less confident in their ability, and for those who wish to increase their confidence when riding. Our tracks also adhere to the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) as closely as possible to provide smooth road surfaces and sufficient space for various types of non-standard cycles, including bikes with trailers for children, tandems, wheelchair-friendly tricycles and hand cycles. This allows people with different needs and requirements to use our tracks.

Research shows cycling is most popular with people aged between 25 and 40. However, a key barrier to cycling is the lack of segregated facilities, and it is anticipated that introducing a segregated cycle track will encourage cycling growth among people below and above these ages. In order to encourage people from a range of age groups to use the route, the scheme will also provide connections to a variety of services and facilities, including local schools. It is acknowledged that there is still more work to be done to encourage new users and we will work closely with local boroughs to promote the route to a variety of audiences alongside providing education and training opportunities. We hope that the changes may also assist those who might like to cycle or cycle more, if conditions for cycling were made more appealing.

Cycles can act as a mobility aid for those who find walking difficult or cannot walk at all. Some people with disabilities ride standard bicycles; others use one of the many types of non-standard bicycle available such as tandems, tricycles, hand cycles or
electric bikes. The Department for Transport has called for an increase in awareness of the use of cycles as a mobility aid\(^9\).

Our research found that 15% of Londoners with a disability already make trips by bicycle\(^10\), which is only slightly below the percentage of non-disabled people who said they use a bicycle (18%). This research also identified that 20% of disabled people said they would “definitely” or “probably” use new routes such as Cycle Superhighways in the future.

In developing this scheme, we have complied with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, to ensure that impacts on groups of people with protected characteristics are identified, considered and mitigated as appropriate. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

When considering the design of our streets, we closely consider the needs of all users throughout the design process, in particular to ensure we have accounted for the needs of those with mobility issues. As part of our design and decision-making process, we have undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) which seeks to take into account potential impacts on those with protected characteristics and the need to ensure that their interests are taken into account. This is a continuing duty and as such we will keep any impacts on protected groups under review as the scheme progresses. In addition, we comply with established national guidance which includes detailed requirements for disabled people.

The consultation also provided an opportunity for those with protected characteristics to give feedback on our proposals and included targeted engagement with specific users such as the Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK, Transport for All and National Autistic Society (among many others). For more information about how the consultation accounted for the needs of those with protected characteristics see our Consultation Report.

The EQIA completed for this scheme shows positive impacts for black and ethnic minority groups, females, disabled cyclists, and cyclists under 25 and over 65 years of age. Positive impacts have also been identified for disabled pedestrians, as the scheme proposes a number of improvements to pedestrian facilities including enhanced crossing facilities, increased footway widths and new pedestrian crossings.

Some negative impacts have been identified where footways are proposed to be cut back or shared use footway is proposed, however footway widths have been assessed to ensure that they are appropriate for pedestrian flows in the area and

---

\(^9\)Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, 2016,

that they allow two wheelchair users to pass safely. Areas of shared use footway are provided where there is sufficient space for pedestrian and cycle flows to be catered for. Some negative impacts have also been identified where we are proposing to install bus stop bypasses. We recently committed to include zebra crossings at all bus stop bypasses. The crossings would have tactile paving and would be raised to footway level to create a flush surface.

**Public transport**

Some respondents expressed their support for the scheme, saying it will reduce pressure on public transport, whilst others asked that proposals should not negatively affect public transport services.

Our proposals aim to work directly alongside public transport to create a more comprehensive network in London and reduce the reliance on private vehicles. The scheme enhances links to existing public transport networks such as tube and rail stations and proposes to minimise negative impacts on public transport – particularly on the bus network.

See [Impact on bus users](#) for more information.

**New developments**

Several respondents said they were concerned new building developments have not been considered in scheme.

We are working closely with our borough partners and developers along the route to ensure that new developments are fully incorporated in our proposals. We have established significant experience working with developers on previous cycle schemes, and are building on this expertise in the delivery of this route. We will continue to engage with these stakeholders and developers throughout the development of the scheme. In addition, our traffic models take into account expected future growth and nearby committed schemes.

Engagement with local developers includes, but is not limited to proposals for Olympia London, 245 Hammersmith Road, Hammersmith Town Hall and Brentford FC.

We are working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on the evolving proposals for redevelopment of Olympia Exhibition Centre which was submitted for planning application at the end of 2018. The application comprised (among other proposals) pedestrian, vehicle, cycle, public realm, landscaping and highway works along Hammersmith Road. See [here](#) for more details.

We are also working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on their plans for the redevelopment of Hammersmith Town Hall, including how this scheme will tie in with the proposed layout at Nigel Playfair Avenue on King Street.
**Route alignment and connectivity**

Some respondents suggested alternative routes for the alignment of this scheme, including along the A4, back streets or the riverside to avoid certain routes such as Chiswick High Road, King Street and Hammersmith Gyratory.

The route alignment was considered at length by TfL and the local boroughs over many years with detailed assessments undertaken to inform this. The aim of the scheme is to encourage more people to choose sustainable travel over motorised options in order to contribute towards the Mayor’s aspiration for 80% of trips be made by cycling, walking and public transport by 2041. To be successful, the scheme must be an attractive route for cyclists with useful connections to local amenities and address current barriers such as safety. It must also contribute to the Healthy Streets approach to improving streets for the benefit of all road users including pedestrians and access to public transport. The chosen alignment, which connects a number of town centres along the A315 and A3000, is integral to achieving these outcomes as it allows Healthy Streets interventions to be targeted to the right audiences in the right places.

TfL’s Strategic Cycling Analysis (SCA)\(^\text{11}\) supports this route alignment. It sets out potential corridors and locations where current and future cycling demand could justify investment and where demand for cycling, walking and public transport is most needed to improve all sustainable transport modes together. Extracts from the SCA data shown below demonstrate that current and future potential cycling demand along the route alignment are within the top 5-10% for the majority of the route. Moreover, the route includes a number of junctions with collision rates above the London average as well as taking in areas of high current walking demand.

---

**Current cycling demand along the route alignment is within the top 5% to 15%.**

**Junctions with poor safety records and current walking demand are also shown.**

\(^\text{11}\) Strategic Cycling Analysis, TfL, June 2017 – available: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/strategic-cycling-analysis.pdf
Potential cycling demand along the route alignment is within the top 5% to 15%. Walking potential is also shown.

Alignment of the route along the A4

We considered a route alignment along the A4 during early stages of the project. While geographically a close parallel alternative, low demand for cycling and high motor vehicle traffic along much of the alignment mean that the A4 would make an unattractive end to end route between Olympia and Hounslow. Connectivity to the A4 is also relatively poor and cyclists would be forced to cross six lanes of traffic at some points to get to the other side of the road leading to long waiting times at junctions. Additionally, unlike the A315, the A4 does not connect multiple town centres or offer the same opportunity to connect with local services and amenities. The feasibility of routing this cycle scheme along the A4 alignment has been revisited since the consultation in light of queries raised, however the route continues to lack fundamental elements integral to an attractive cycle route and a Healthy Streets scheme (see the following sections for more detail). Notwithstanding the above, the MTS sets out the Vision Zero target for addressing collisions in London and TfL is aware of concerns with the quality of current cycling facilities on some sections of the A4, and is committed to reviewing these separately in partnership with the local boroughs. This includes improvements between Hammersmith town hall and Hammersmith gyratory, including links into Black’s Road.

Motor vehicle and cycle counts on the A4 vs A315

Despite there being some facilities along the footways for cycling, the A4 is a hostile and unpleasant environment and cycle counts reflect this. Along the A4, cycle counts decline considerably to the west while along the A315, demand for trips remain strong around Isleworth and Hounslow. Latest cycle counts for 2017\(^{12}\) show that current levels of cycling are still significantly higher on the A315 than the A4 with cycle flows up to 20 times higher on some sections of the route (e.g. Hammersmith Road) than parallel sections of the A4.

\(^{12}\) Department for Transport traffic counts (2017) available here: https://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/
Motor traffic counts along the A4 are also still significantly higher than along the A315 with traffic flows up to 13 times higher on some sections of the A4 compared to parallel sections of the A315.

The eastern section of the route alignment connects Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centres. Dots on map refer to graphs below geographically left to right.

Annual average daily flows of pedal cyclist on the A315 with the equivalent section on the A4. Each pair correspond geographically left-to-right with the map above.
Designing a continuous safe and connected cycle route along the A4, sufficient to attract the large numbers of cyclists required to achieve more sustainable levels of cycling, walking and use of public transport would require significant interventions including segregation.

It is likely that upgrading existing facilities on the A4 to a standard appropriate for wider uptake of cycling would lead to a significant loss of capacity for general traffic, which in turn could result in more traffic on local roads. The primary function of the A4 as a means of facilitating the movement of vehicular traffic needs to be taken into consideration when assessing its suitability as a route for high levels of cycle movements. The A4 is a multi-lane carriageway, with a speed limit of 40mph. This suggests that the impact on local roads of introducing cycle facilities on the A4, and the resultant reductions in capacity for motorised modes that would arise, would be far higher than the proposals on the A315.

Furthermore, designing a route along the A4 would require significant reallocation of space which could result in a series of issues including: loss of pedestrian access to subways, loss of traffic lanes, removal of parking in front of residential buildings, compulsory purchase of residential land, and / or loss of a significant number of trees and verge.

**Pedestrian and cyclist casualties on the A4 vs A315**

Addressing existing safety issues is a key objective of the scheme. There were 55 collisions involving pedestrians and 81 collisions involving pedal cyclists along the A315 route alignment in the three years to December 2017. This compares to 21 and 32 on the equivalent length of the A4 route. This collision data is illustrated below. When considering the higher cyclist flows on the A315 the number of collisions per
cyclist is higher on Chiswick High Road and Kings Street. This shows that a greater road safety benefit for cyclists can be achieved by improving facilities on the A315 than the A4. As set out above, the MTS sets out the Vision Zero target for addressing collisions in London and TfL is aware of concerns with the quality of current cycling facilities on some sections of the A4, and is committed to reviewing these separately in partnership with the local boroughs. This includes improvements between Hammersmith town hall and Hammersmith gyratory, including links into Black’s Road.

![Map of pedestrian and cyclist collision data along A315 and A4](image)

**Map of pedestrian and cyclist collision data along A315 and A4**

### Other alternative route alignments

Some people suggested alternative route alignments such as along back streets or the Thames riverside. Back streets can provide useful local connections or, where suitable parallel routes exist, alternative continuous routes to main roads. In this part of west London, there is a lack of suitable alternative routes to the main roads that do not require significant diversions for cyclists, reducing the appeal and likely uptake of cycling. This is largely due to the limited opportunities to cross the railway between Hammersmith and Goldhawk Road. The exception is along Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road where local residential streets provide a quieter and more direct route for cyclists between Chiswick High Road and the South Circular than via Chiswick roundabout. Our proposals to close off the junction of Wellesley Road and the South Circular to motor traffic are aimed at further reducing rat running traffic along this route making it a more pleasant route for pedestrians, cyclists and local residents.

Cyclists can travel along much of the Thames riverside already via the Thames Path which has shared use provision for pedestrians and cyclists. We did not choose to route this scheme along the Thames Path as it does not provide a direct enough connection east to west. In addition, the capacity of the Thames Path and constraints of the riverside infrastructure would have limited the amount of growth in cycling flows achievable while maintaining a comfortable level of service for pedestrians and cyclists.
An alignment using Chiswick High Road and Goldhawk Road leading to Shepherd’s Bush was also considered, however it was determined that a segregated cycle route along this alignment would place significant pressure on Shepherd’s Bush junction, which is a key hub for buses.

**Connectivity**

A number of respondents were concerned the scheme doesn’t connect to local services or the cycle network and suggested additional links/extensions such as to Hyde Park, Chiswick Business Park, Russell Road, Olympia Overground station, Hammersmith Bridge, the A4, Heathrow, Quietway routes and other destinations.

Cyclist connectivity throughout the route has been considered in detail to ensure that local access to residential areas and amenities is provided. See [Cycle infrastructure](#) for more information about how cyclists would join or leave the route.

At the eastern extent of the route cyclists would be able to connect with a planned cycle route at Russell Road which would connect cyclists heading north to Holland Park roundabout. From Holland Park roundabout, further connections are planned to the north, east and west.

This scheme would also connect to planned cycle routes at Beavor Lane and Bridge Avenue along King Street providing cycle links to Putney Bridge (and connections to Hammersmith Bridge, the Thames riverside and the A4) and Chiswick station. A further cycle route connection to this scheme is planned between Brentford and Twickenham at Syon Park. At the western extent of the scheme, the current proposals would facilitate safe access for cyclists back into the carriageway before the junction with Dock Road, with future proposals planned to Hounslow. The local boroughs also have the opportunity through the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) process to apply for funding to deliver schemes that would further improve connectivity with this route and the wider network to cater for cycling as an everyday mode of transport.

In addition to these schemes, TfL’s recent [Strategic Cycling Analysis](#) identified 25 top potential future cycling connections across London to investigate further. Among these are a north to south connection between Fulham and Wembley via Hammersmith town centre and an east to west extension of this route between Hounslow and Heathrow Airport.

In 2016, TfL consulted on proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities around the junction of Kensington High Street with Warwick Road and Addison Road, see [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/kensington-high-street/](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/kensington-high-street/) for more information. These improvements have now been implemented. At present, we do not have any proposals for a route from Kensington Olympia into central London. With high current and predicted cycle flows and other connections, we are satisfied that the route that we consulted on from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town...
centre can operate successfully irrespective of whether there is any extension east to central London.

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Vulnerable groups**

A number of people raised concerns for vulnerable people, including children, the elderly, the disabled and the visually impaired.

In developing this scheme, we have complied with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, to ensure that impacts on groups of people with protected characteristics are identified, considered and mitigated as appropriate. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

When considering the design of our streets, we closely consider the needs of all users throughout the design process, in particular to ensure we have accounted for the needs of those with mobility issues. As part of our design and decision-making process, we have undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) which seeks to take into account potential impacts on those with protected characteristics and the need to ensure that their interests are taken into account. This is a continuing duty and as such we will keep any impacts on protected groups under review as the scheme progresses. In addition, we comply with established national guidance which includes detailed requirements for disabled people.

The consultation also provided an opportunity for those with protected characteristics to give feedback on our proposals and included targeted engagement with specific users such as the Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK, Transport for All and National Autistic Society (among many others). For more information about how the consultation accounted for the needs of those with protected characteristics see our [Consultation Report](#).

The EQIA completed for this scheme shows positive impacts for black and ethnic minority groups, females, disabled cyclists, and cyclists under 25 and over 65 years of age. Positive impacts have also been identified for disabled pedestrians, as the scheme proposes a number of improvements to pedestrian facilities including enhanced crossing facilities, increased footway widths and new pedestrian crossings.

Some negative impacts have been identified where footways are proposed to be cut back or shared use footway is proposed, however footway widths have been assessed to ensure that they are appropriate for pedestrian flows in the area and that they allow two wheelchair users to pass safely. Areas of shared use footway are provided where there is sufficient space for pedestrian and cycle flows to be catered for. Some negative impacts have also been identified where we are proposing to
install bus stop bypasses. We recently committed to include zebra crossings at all bus stop bypasses. The crossings would have tactile paving and would be raised to footway level to create a flush surface.

**Pavement space**

Some respondents supported the scheme due to the benefits it will bring for pedestrians. Others were concerned about reduction in pavement space, saying that the needs of pedestrians must be considered to avoid pedestrian congestion.

The scheme proposes a number of benefits for pedestrians, including new and improved crossings, improved public realm with new seating and trees and, where possible, more space to walk. Throughout the route, we have endeavoured to ensure that pavement space is suitable for pedestrian flows and in many locations we are increasing pavement space, particularly around junctions and crossings.

Where we have proposed reductions to the existing footway, we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to assess whether the design of the footways are appropriate to the volume and type of users within the street environment. For example, areas dominated by a range of retail and food and drink premises such as King Street or Chiswick High Road will have different walking characteristics to areas dominated by commercial office buildings such as along some sections of Hammersmith Road. Assessments take into account the usable width of the footway accounting for street furniture, outdoor seating and clearance around buildings and kerb edges.

Where we have made changes to the footway, the majority of locations have a pedestrian comfort level of A+, representing a very comfortable street environment with plenty of space for people to walk at the speed and route they choose. Where this is not possible for short sections such as pinch points, we have sought to maintain a minimum pedestrian comfort level of B+ which is the recommended level of comfort for all areas.

Many people raised concerns about our proposals to cut back the wide footway outside Our Lady of Grace and St Edward R.C Church on Chiswick High Road and the impact this would have on religious events and practices. Following this feedback and subsequent engagement with representatives from the church, we have reviewed the design for this location. We are now proposing to retain the existing footway width outside the church, as well as providing additional space to the side on the corner of Duke’s Avenue.

The Mayor’s Transport Strategy emphasises the importance of providing safe and pleasant streets for pedestrians walk along, and it is a key priority for us to ensure that pedestrians also experience the benefits of new cycle routes. In locations where the cycle tracks are adjacent to the footway, pedestrians will be much further away from traffic and resultant pollution. Healthy Streets assessments are also being
undertaken at key locations throughout the scheme to assess the balance of space and provision for all users. These assessments use questions for each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators to aid designers in considering the issues that affect the experience of using a street and spending time there.

For more information about the impacts on pavement space at specific locations along the route see Section 2.2.

Pedestrian crossings

Some respondents raised concerns that the proposals would make it more difficult to cross the road or the cycle track. Some people were concerned that slower walking pedestrians would not have enough time to cross the road.

Our proposals include changes to pedestrian crossing facilities throughout the scheme with a number of new or improved pedestrian crossings. Existing signal-controlled crossings are retained at or near to current locations. Pedestrian average wait times are not generally predicted to change and have been improved in some locations. New and improved crossings proposed for the route are listed below.

Eight new signalised pedestrian crossings:

- Brentford High Street west of Alexandra Road
- Brentford High Street west of Pottery Road
- Brentford High Street / Kew Bridge Road east of Watermans Park
- Kew Bridge junction across Kew Bridge Road
- King Street west of Weltje Road
- Beadon Road west of Hammersmith Grove
- Hammersmith Grove at the junction with Beadon Road

Pedestrian crossing improvements included as part of this scheme are:

- 39 crossings would be widened with increased comfort levels for pedestrians
- 18 crossings would be shortened, reducing the distance pedestrians need to walk to cross the road
- Six crossings would be simplified including reducing the number of crossing movements required to cross at Kew Bridge junction, Chiswick High Road junction with Heathfield Terrace and Hammersmith Road junction with Shortlands

On Hammersmith Road at the junction with North End Road we are proposing to remove the signalised pedestrian crossing across the east arm of Hammersmith Road while retaining the nearby crossing on the west arm of the junction. Two further crossings would be provided nearby outside Olympia London.

In addition to formal crossings, there would be a number of informal locations along the route, including at some side roads where pedestrians can cross but would need
to give way to traffic before they do so. We would use tactile paving on all crossings and traffic islands along the route and have proposed raised entry treatments at side roads. Tactile paving would be designed in accordance to Department for Transport guidance. We would apply local standards used by our partner boroughs.

Some people were concerned that there may not be enough time for some pedestrians, particularly those with slower walking speeds to cross the road and cycle track. The pedestrian crossing sequence at signal controlled facilities consists of two parts - the “invitation to cross” or green man, and a “clearance period”. The latter is calculated to be long enough to allow someone stepping off the kerb at the end of the green man to get to the other side. This is calculated based upon the distance pedestrians need to cross and average walking speeds.

A speed of 1.2 metres per second is conventionally used to calculate timings for crossings. This caters for 85% of pedestrians, and results in timings that are suitable for the vast majority of crossings. Pedestrian Countdown would be installed at most crossings along the route and indicates the length of time remaining after the green man in which people can finish crossing the road. TfL is developing technology which enables the green man time to be lengthened, which would provide flexibility to extend the invitation to cross depending on the volume of waiting pedestrians.

All crossings of cycle tracks would be on one level, with step-free access from one footway to another and clearly marked out with tactile paving. In some locations, there would be a “formal” signalised crossing point across both road and cycle track where cyclists would be held at a red light and pedestrians would cross both road and cycle track at the same time. At other locations the road crossing would be signalised with an “informal” crossing point over the cycle track. In these locations, there would be a waiting area between the cycle track and the road of at least 2.5m wide to allow for two wheelchairs and / or buggies to pass each other and provide sufficient space for waiting pedestrians.

Following feedback from the consultation, we have reviewed the design of crossings along the route and are proposing to make the following crossings signalised across both the road and cycle track rather than just the road:

- Chiswick High Road near Mayfield Avenue
- Chiswick High Road between Homefield Road and Airedale Avenue
- Chiswick High Road by Cleveland Avenue
- King Street by Black Lion Lane
- King Street by Dalling Road

As part of the changes we are proposing at Kew Bridge, a two-way cycle track is now proposed on the south side of the road. We are proposing to include a zebra crossing over the cycle track on the east arm of the junction instead of signals to improve efficiency of the junction and reduce delay to all users in this area.
Continuous footways
A number of respondents suggested more continuous footways should be included in the scheme at side roads to enhance pedestrian priority over traffic. Continuous footways are pavement spaces that continue over a side road without a step or change in visual design. Their aim is to establish pedestrian priority across side roads and reduce vehicles speeds when turning across them. We have proposed continuous footways at some side roads along the route where the number of vehicles per hour is low and the relative risk of pedestrian / vehicle conflict is therefore low. TfL is currently monitoring the use of continuous footways and the results of this will inform our future design proposals.

Signage and markings
Several respondents suggested that infrastructure should clearly delineate areas for cyclists and pedestrians. A combination of methods are proposed to clearly delineate areas for cyclists and pedestrians. These will include using different surfacing, indicated either by colour or texture, placing delineated strips between the pavement and the cycle track, building the pavement and track on different levels, painting cycle logos on the track, providing cycle wayfinding signs throughout the route in line with London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) and ensuring crossings are clearly marked with tactile paving.

Impact on motorists
Journey times and congestion
The impact of the proposals on general traffic, including loss of traffic lanes was a concern for many people who responded to the consultation. We have made some changes to the proposals which we anticipate will reduce the overall impact on journey times including allowing some turns that were originally proposed to be banned and changing the layout and operation of some junctions. In particular, we expect the impact on journey times between Ealing Road and Kew Bridge to reduce through our revised design for Kew Bridge (see Section 2.2 for more details).

Although we are looking to make significant improvements to facilitate new cycle tracks, there will still be some reallocation of the space away from traffic to provide space for new cycle tracks. In addition, at junctions, we have needed to carefully balance the signal timings for pedestrians, cyclists and traffic flows and as a result this will mean that for some users there may be longer waiting times at some junctions.

We would actively monitor and manage traffic conditions on the roads following the delivery of the scheme, and would aim to mitigate and manage traffic reassignment
following implementation. We are investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time, and we are working to improve road user information so people can make informed journey choices before they travel.

Some people raised concerns that the proposals would impact motor traffic all day while cyclists would only use the cycle tracks in the peaks and suggested cyclist priority at peak hours rather than having dedicated infrastructure. We acknowledge that cycling (and general traffic) flows are often highest during the morning and evening weekday peaks, coinciding with the journey to and from work. As such, our traffic modelling is carried to assess the impacts of the scheme at the busiest times of the day, representing the worst case scenario. By providing more attractive routes connecting town centres and local services, we expect a wider range of people to choose to cycle for a variety of local trips throughout the day and as such, we need to provide a facility that caters for this use.

We actively monitor and manage the road network throughout the day to ensure that impacts are balanced. This includes flexible management of traffic signal timings depending on changes in demand throughout the day. If implemented, we would monitor the network in this location and make adjustments throughout the day as appropriate.

**Impact on parking and loading**

A number of people raised concerns about removal of parking bays. Other respondents suggested stricter implementation of parking restrictions.

In order to accommodate a segregated cycle track, our proposals would involve removing some parking bays and converting some single yellow lines (waiting allowed during certain times) to double yellow lines (no waiting at any time). We have also proposed to reallocate some pay and display parking bays onto nearby side roads. Where we have proposed to remove parking, we have tried to ensure that this will have minimal impact on local residents and businesses by assessing local activity and demand. We are working closely with the local boroughs of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham to ensure parking spaces for residents are not adversely affected by our proposals. All changes to parking and loading will also be subject to statutory consultation (traffic orders). See Section 2.2 for our response to concerns about parking along particular sections of the route and see here for our response regarding impacts on loading.

Within the boroughs of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham, parking enforcement is led by the local council. For more information, please see https://www.lbhf.gov.uk/parking or https://www.hounslow.gov.uk/info/20052/parking.
Access and through traffic

Some respondents supported proposals to close roads or ban turns as they felt this would reduce through traffic, whilst others suggested that traffic would be pushed down residential roads or raised concerns over access to minor roads.

Our proposals aim to reduce through traffic on residential roads. For example, the scheme proposes no access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road or Stile Hall Gardens. Here, up to 75 per cent of vehicles travelling through the residential area are non-residential through traffic. Reducing traffic volumes on these roads would reduce congestion at peak periods, make it easier for pedestrians to cross roads and improve conditions for people who want to cycle.

Following feedback received during consultation, we have made some changes to access arrangements along the route including no longer proposing to ban the left turn from King Street to British Grove or the right turn from Chiswick High Road to British Grove and making Duke Road left turn out only. For more information about local access arrangements and for further detail on these changes please see Section 2.2.

Our traffic modelling previously undertaken for the consulted proposals showed that displacement of traffic would likely occur away from the A315 towards the A4. Following design changes made since consultation, updated traffic modelling shows that during the evening (PM) peak, westbound traffic is predicted to reroute westbound onto the A4 as an alternative to Wellesley Road. Traffic would also reroute from the northern side of Hammersmith Gyratory, including Beadon Road onto Shepherds Bush Road in the morning (AM peak). No access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and from Stile Hall Gardens will result in a predicted reduction of traffic in the westbound direction on Chiswick High Road and Wellesley Road while traffic reroutes partly via Oxford Road northbound and then Chiswick Roundabout. Smaller amounts of spread out rerouting is also predicted in this area.

If implemented, we would work with the local boroughs to review the impact of the scheme on traffic on surrounding roads and further measures may be considered where appropriate.

Emergency services

Some respondents expressed concern about congestion increasing response times for emergency service vehicles. Others were concerned about the impact of introducing new road humps or raised tables on ambulances carrying patients with spinal injuries.

We have liaised with emergency services such as the London Ambulance Service to ensure that they are aware of the proposed changes to the road network and that their requirements have been considered. For example, we are seeking to ensure that where raised tables are proposed to improve pedestrian safety, the impact of
these on ambulances is kept to a minimum by ensuring the the gradient of ramps either side meet minimum design standards. We will continue to engage with emergency services throughout the design development of the scheme.

**Crossing the cycle track**

Several respondents were concerned that it would be difficult for motorists to cross the two-way cycle track at junctions or side roads. Depending on the layout of the junction and the position of the cycle track, there will be a number of locations where motor vehicles would need to cross the cycle track when turning on or off the main road.

At junctions with traffic signals, motor vehicles would be separated from cyclists with separate approach lanes and signal timings, significantly reducing the chance of conflict at these locations.

Where the cycle track passes non-signalised side roads, there is a potential for conflict between cyclists and motor traffic entering or exiting. Where possible, we have sought to eliminate this conflict through signalising junctions, closing roads or banning certain movements. Where this not possible due to capacity or access constraints, or where vehicle flows are low, we have sought to reduce the likelihood of conflict arising through a combination of some or all of the design approaches set out in guidance such as the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) including:

- Setting the cycle track further into the side road to provide space for turning motorists to wait after leaving the main carriageway before crossing the cycle track. This also provides an area for drivers to wait before turning out of the side road without blocking the cycle track
- Restricting access or egress from the side road to reduce the number of vehicle movements
- Reducing the kerb radii to reduce the speed at which motorists can enter and exit the side road
- Introducing raised tables to reduce motorist speeds entering or exiting the side road
- Providing contrasting coloured surfacing and cycle logos across the junction to raise awareness of the presence of the cycle track and the fact that cyclists are crossing

The design treatment proposed at each side road is dependent on local conditions such as traffic and pedestrian flows, one-way or two-way nature of the street and visibility. Clear road markings such as give way lines and cycle logos are proposed at all side roads to highlight the requirement for motor vehicles to give way to cyclists. We continually review the best way to provide priority for cycling at non-signalised side road crossings and design standards continue to develop as schemes of this nature are implemented.
Demand management

Some people suggested demand management measures should be introduced to reduce motor traffic and specifically for vehicles looking to avoid the A4. Others felt there should be more traffic calming measures to reduce speeds.

Reducing motor traffic is a key aim of the scheme which we hope to achieve by reallocating road space away from private modes towards more sustainable alternatives. By making walking and cycling more attractive and encouraging more sustainable travel, we hope to encourage a reduction in traffic. Local traffic calming measures such as raised tables, reduced access points and tighter turning radii are proposed throughout the scheme to reduce the appeal of driving private vehicles. In addition, the London borough of Hounslow are seeking to expand 20mph speed limits to a number of roads along the route and in Hammersmith & Fulham 20mph speed limits have been applied to most roads along the route.

Impact on cyclists

Priority at junctions and side roads

Many respondents supported the scheme as they believe it will make cycling safer for people of all ages and abilities. Some respondents suggested there should be clear cyclist priority at side roads and called for further restrictions on entry and exit. A number of people also raised issues about cyclist protection at junctions and suggested cyclist priority including time and space separated junctions.

Junctions and side roads along the route provide opportunities for cyclists to join or leave the route to reach local destinations. We have used a number of different design approaches in these locations to reduce the chance of conflict between cyclists and motorists or pedestrians and providing cyclist priority where appropriate.

At junctions with traffic signals, cyclists would be separated from motor traffic and pedestrians through time and space with separate traffic signals and timings. This significantly reduces the chance of conflict at these locations.

The design treatment proposed at each side road is dependent on local conditions such as traffic and pedestrian flows, one-way or two-way nature of the street and visibility. Clear road markings such as give way lines and cycle logos are proposed at all side roads to highlight priority for cyclists and the requirement for motor vehicles to give way. For further detail concerning cyclist safety on side road junctions see Section 2.1.

Journey times

Several people commented on the impact on journey times for cyclists, with some believing they would decrease and others believe they would increase. Some respondents also said there were too many traffic lights on the route.
In order to improve cyclist safety along the route, separate traffic signals are proposed for cyclists. In some locations this means that cyclists would get a green light at a different time to motor traffic or that additional signals are proposed to separate movements that would previously have been in conflict with motor traffic.

As part of the updated traffic modelling undertaken for this scheme, we assessed the impact of the proposals on cyclist journey times. As a result of the introduction of several pedestrian crossings extending across the cycle track, cyclist journey times are predicted to increase marginally. The introduction of the crossings and designated priority is however expected to lead to increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Cycle infrastructure**

**Segregation**

A number of respondents expressed their support for segregated cycle lanes. Some suggested the whole route should be segregated, and that more parking spaces should be removed in order to make this possible. There was concern that unsegregated sections such as shared bus / cycle lanes and Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road would leave unexperienced cyclists vulnerable or will discourage cyclists using the whole route.

Types of cycling intervention are categorised according to the degree of separation they offer between cyclists and motor vehicles. Where there are higher volumes of traffic, segregation is most appropriate. The London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) recommends that cycling with traffic is suitable where traffic flows are low.

This scheme is designed to ensure a high level of service for cyclists, in line with the LCDS. All areas on main roads with heavy traffic flow are segregated with clear differentiation between traffic and pedestrians. There are also two sections of the route that are proposed to be traffic free with the junction of Wellesley Road and the South Circular Road closed to traffic and approximately 400m of the westbound cycle track through Waterman’s Park.

Proposals to reduce through-traffic on quieter roads on the alignment, together with measures to control vehicle speeds at side road junctions would make sure traffic volumes on these roads are low enough to ensure a high-quality facility for cyclists. Wellesley Road and Heathfield Terrace provide a more direct alternative route to the A315 which avoids Chiswick roundabout.

The east end of the route starts in Kensington and Chelsea and 24 hour bus lanes are proposed for a short stretch for cyclists joining the route. While segregated lanes would provide the highest protection for cyclists on this type of road, bus lanes still provide a degree of separation from general traffic. Cyclists who are not comfortable
continuing on the route at this point would be able to join and leave the route at Russell Road via a planned cycle route which would connect to the route at this point.

In some locations there would be short breaks in segregated cycle tracks to facilitate local access or servicing, for example at driveways. In these locations, we have proposed advisory cycle lanes to highlight the presence of cyclists to motor traffic.

**Two-way cycle tracks**

Some people suggested the use of with-flow or semi-segregated tracks rather than two-way cycle tracks, and suggested maximising the width of the track to allow for overtaking and to avoid congestion. Others had general concerns with two-way tracks, with some people saying they would be unsuitable for local journeys. Others suggested minimising the switching of cycle tracks from one side of the road to the other.

Two-way cycle tracks are proposed along the majority of the route as they provide significant advantages over with-flow tracks in this location. A two-way track on one side of the road allows for more efficient use of road space than with-flow tracks which would require twice the amount of segregation and more space for the cycle track as kerbs on both sides reduce the usable width of the track.

Cyclists going in the ‘peak’ direction would have more available space compared within a two-way track compared to a one-way track. A two-way track allows cyclists to overtake, which is important when providing for different types of cyclists of different abilities. We have considered current and potential future flows of cyclists along each part of the route to inform the width of the cycle track. In addition, two-way cycle tracks provide further flexibility where cycle flows are tidal for morning and evening peaks.

It is also more efficient to manage cycle movements through junctions with a two-way cycle track. The two-way track contains cyclists in one area, making it easier to hold left turning traffic back for example. Cyclists can also receive a green light at the same time as ahead traffic which increases the amount of green time they get as the ahead traffic is generally the larger flow.

The London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) states that two-way tracks on one side of the road have practical advantages for some street types where there are many more side roads and/or greater levels of kerbside activity on one side than the other, or where that condition can be created.

Areas where two-way tracks are proposed along the route exhibit these characteristics. For example, on the south side Chiswick High Road between Annandale Road and Linden Gardens, a service road and car park run parallel to the main carriageway. This significantly reduces the level of kerbside activity, including
parking and loading, taking place in this section on the High Road, resulting in a two-way track being more suitable. Pedestrian flows are also significantly higher on the north side of the road which remains relatively untouched by the proposals.

Conversely, at Hammersmith Gyratory, the north side of the road provides a more suitable location for the two-way cycle track as it reduces the requirement for traffic on the gyratory to cross the cycle track. It also provides better connections with Hammersmith Road and King Street which connect to the north side of the gyratory at either side.

The two-way track switches from the north side of the road to the south side along King Street, by Holcombe Street where kerbside activity increases along the north side of King Street. At this location, traffic is one-way westbound and cyclists will switch to the south side via a signalised cycle crossing. A parallel pedestrian crossing is also provided here. At either end of the route, the two-way track splits to with-flow track. In these locations, traffic will also be held at a red signal and a cycle crossing is provided to facilitate cyclists’ safe crossing from one side of the road to the other.

Despite two-way tracks being on one side of the road, local access is maintained at the majority of junctions and side roads and we will continue to look at ways to improve links to and from the route from side roads during the detailed development of the design. At junctions, cyclists turning movements will be accommodated with separate signal staging, two-stage turns or toucan crossings. At side roads, there will be gaps in the segregation island for cyclists to wait to cross the road. These gaps are wide enough to accommodate waiting cyclists while not blocking the track for others continuing ahead. In some locations, it has not been possible to provide access to or from certain side roads and cyclists would need to join or leave the route via a nearby side road.

Following feedback from the consultation about safety concerns at the Kew Bridge junction and the South Circular Road, we are now proposing two-way cycle tracks between Wellesley Road, through Kew Bridge junction to Waterman’s Park. This change removes the conflict between cyclists and turning traffic at Lionel Road South, removes the interaction between cyclists and buses at Kew Bridge station bus stop and improves the efficiency of the junction. Connectivity would also be provided between Wellesley Road and Capital Interchange Way in both directions where previously it would only have been provided in one direction.

People also raised concerns about the lack of attention paid by pedestrians when crossing or that pedestrians would use the cycle track as an extension of the pavement. Others were concerned about cars parking in the cycle track.

Segregated cycle tracks will be separated from pedestrians with a kerb upstand similar to kerbs used to delineate the edge of the footway and carriageway. The cycle tracks will also be clearly marked with cycle logos particularly where
pedestrians or motor vehicles need to cross the cycle track. Crossing points over the
cycle track will be provided for pedestrians as signalised crossings, zebra crossings
or informal crossings. At formal crossings, cyclists will be expected to stop and give
way to pedestrians. At informal crossing points, the cycle track will be raised to
footway level to provide a flush crossing point for pedestrians and highlight the
crossing to cyclists so that both users can look out for one another.

Two-way cycle tracks have significant practical advantages over one-way tracks, and
clear signage would be in place to delineate the cycle tracks from the footway with
crossing points provided to allow people to cross them safely. Just as pedestrians
look left then right to cross the road, they would also look left then right when
crossing the cycle track.

Traffic lights along the route would also break up the flow of cyclists so there should
be sufficient gaps for pedestrians to cross. Following a review of the designs since
consultation, we are also proposing to signalise more of the crossings over cycle
tracks – see here for more information.

We aim to make the cycle facilities clearly recognisable through defined
infrastructure and road markings to reduce the likelihood of vehicles mistakenly
driving or parking in the cycle track. Where we have installed two-way tracks in other
locations such as the North-South Cycle Superhighway, cycle logo markings and
‘cycle only’ signs have been installed at all entrances and exits. We are aware of
isolated instances where some drivers were mistakenly entering the cycle track
however this has decreased over time as drivers have become more accustomed to
new layouts. Cycle tracks provide right of way for cyclists under Section 65 of the
Highways Act (1980) and anyone that is found to be parking within a designated
cycle track can be issued with a fixed penalty notice as this is prohibited.

**Signage and markings**

Some respondents considered the quantity of wayfinding signs for cyclists confusing
and suggested that the route should be clearly marked. The Mayor’s recently
announced new, unified cycle network will include consistent wayfinding and
branding with road signs, road markings and online wayfinding tools. Signage and
wayfinding form a key part of any cycle scheme, providing cyclists with clear and
accessible information at key decision making points and for reassurance along the
route. In addition, connections to other cycling routes will be marked along the route.
We will take into account opportunities to use existing infrastructure to reduce clutter
and we will be mindful of sightlines and conservation areas.

**Cycle parking**

Some respondents suggested there should be an increase in cycle parking
provision. Cycle parking has been proposed throughout the scheme. The exact
location and number of spaces will be assessed at the detailed design stage, taking
into account considerations of safety and demand, delivery and servicing requirements.

**Surface and maintenance**

Some people suggested that tracks should be swept regularly. Others were concerned that proposed blue paint becomes slippery when wet.

Local authorities have a responsibility for cleansing the highway under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) which they receive funding for through local taxes and government grants. While changes to the road layout may result in adjustments to existing cleaning regimes, we would expect cleansing of the cycle track to be carried out appropriately, and in line with EPA duties.

Over recent years TfL together with many other highway authorities has invested heavily in projects intended to promote cycling as a healthier and more environmentally friendly form of transport as well as to improve the safety of cyclist while they are on the road.

Colour contrast has been proposed along the route at potential conflict points where physical segregation is not practicable or possible. Installation of these surfaces are required to meet appropriate skid resistant values ensuring satisfactory performance for road users. Regarding concerns over blue paint installed on cycle routes in the past, TfL has continued to work with industry experts to develop alternative and improved specifications that perform better than those used before. Colour contrast materials proposed for this route will be confirmed at the detailed design stage in collaboration with the relevant highway authority.

**Impact on bus users**

**Bus stops**

A number of respondents raised issues about changes to bus stops. Other respondents were concerned at the loss of bus stops.

There are circa 50 bus stops along the route and the position of the majority of these will remain unchanged by our proposals. We are proposing to make some changes to the road layout which impacts the location of some bus stops. This includes moving or consolidating some stops and introducing bus stop bypasses.

In locations where we are proposing changes, we have considered the impacts carefully and are satisfied that minimum spacing between stops and access to local services would be maintained.

Proposed changes to bus stops in the latest designs include:

- 11 relocated bus stops, of which 7 are by less than 50 metres
- 8 bus stops to be removed, all of which will be consolidated with nearby stops
- 18 bus stops where we are proposing bus stop bypasses

**Bus stop bypasses**

Some respondents were concerned over conflict between cyclists and motorists or pedestrians at bus stops or about access, particularly for the elderly and disabled.

Bus stop bypasses have been introduced across London on segregated cycle routes to avoid the need for cyclists to enter the adjacent traffic lane to pass a stopped bus and enable continuous segregated cycle routes.

Bus stop bypasses operate by directing cyclists behind the bus stop within the segregated cycle track. Bus passengers can access the bus stop island where the bus flag and shelter (if present) are located to wait for a bus by crossing the cycle track at a marked crossing point. The bus stop island will always be at least 2.5 metres wide, which enables wheelchair users to safely get off the bus before crossing the cycle track to the footway.

Our research has found that bus stop bypasses are safe for all road users, including bus passengers. Routing cycle traffic away from the road is an effective way to create safe, attractive cycling facilities along bus routes. The risk of conflict between cycles and pedestrians has been found to be very low, while providing a dedicated crossing point for bus passengers and design features that encourage slower cycling help to make the bus stop area more comfortable for everyone to use.

Following engagement with TfL representatives from stakeholder groups such as the RNIB, Guide Dogs for the Blind, London Travel Watch, London Cycling Campaign and Living Streets, TfL recently committed to including zebra crossings at all bus stop bypasses. Depending on the layout of the footway, zebra crossings would be at the back of the bus stop bypass or one at each end. The crossings would have tactile paving and would be raised to footway level to create a flush surface.

As two-way cycle tracks are proposed along the majority of the route, the number of bus stops requiring bus stop bypasses is kept to a minimum at just under a third of bus stops along the route.

In the consulted designs, at five bus stops on Brentford High Street where space is limited and expected cycle flows are lower, the footway and waiting area were proposed to be combined so that all pedestrians would cross the cycle track at raised, zebra crossing points at each end of the island to continue their journey via the waiting area island. Following conversion of the proposed with-flow tracks to two-way tracks along this section, the number of this type of bus stop bypass required has reduced to three.
Bus lanes

Some people raised issues with the removal of bus lanes, whilst other respondents suggested the addition of more bus lanes and longer lane opening hours including 24 hour operation.

To accommodate the segregated cycle track we have proposed to remove some sections of bus lane. Elsewhere we have maintained or proposed new sections of bus lane. Due to the incremental nature that bus lanes have been implemented across the network over time, operational hours across the route differ which can be confusing for drivers. As part of the proposals for this scheme, we proposed to make operating hours throughout the route more consistent and proposed to operate bus lanes from 7am to 10am and 4pm to 8pm, Monday to Sunday.

Following a review of bus lane operational timings against likely bus passenger benefits, we are now no longer proposing to extend the end of the weekday evening peak operation from 7pm to 8pm. At weekends, we are proposing for bus lanes to be operational during the peaks (7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm) on Saturdays but not operational on Sundays. These changes affect proposed bus lanes on Hammersmith Road, King Street, Chiswick High Road and Brentford High Street. These operating hours are appropriate to ensure consistent bus journey times in the peak hours, whilst allowing for off-peak loading opportunities and evening and Sunday parking for businesses and visitors.

On Kensington High Street we proposed to introduce a new 24 hour eastbound bus lane which would connect with the existing eastbound bus lane at the eastern end of Hammersmith Road. We proposed to increase operation of the existing bus lane at the eastern end of Hammersmith Road from peak operation, Monday to Saturday to 24 hour operation seven days a week. This is because we are proposing that the bus lane will be used by cyclists and it is therefore important that the lane is kept free from general traffic at all times of the day. Bus lanes on Kew Bridge Road currently operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week and this would remain the case in our proposals.

Journey times and delay

Some respondents were concerned about increased journey times and delays to bus services.

We undertook detailed traffic modelling on the consulted proposals to understand how the route could affect journey times for all road users, including bus passengers. Pre-consultation modelling predicted that journey times for bus routes would change, with the proposals resulting in a reduction in journey time on some routes, while other routes would see an increase.
In particular, routes that run east along Kew Bridge Road from Ealing Road to Kew Bridge would have been adversely affected, as would routes that run along Beadon Road on the approach to Hammersmith Gyratory. Some other journeys by bus were predicted to be shorter at certain times of day, particularly from Hammersmith Bus Station to Holland Road in the morning peak.

Following feedback received from the consultation and local stakeholder engagement, we are proposing a number of changes in the Kew Bridge area to reduce the impact of the scheme on bus routes that run east along Kew Bridge Road from Ealing Road to Kew Bridge. Instead of with-flow segregated cycle tracks between Wellesley Road and Waterman’s Park, we are proposing a two-way cycle track. This change addresses a number of concerns regarding safety at Kew Bridge junction and simplifies the way we can operate the junction, giving more time to affected traffic movements (see Section H for more information about these proposals). We are also proposing to address an existing bottleneck at Kew Bridge junction by including a second southbound traffic lane on Kew Bridge, leading to increased capacity compared with the consulted designs. The updated traffic modelling shows an improvement in the journey times for five bus route in the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peaks.

Site observations suggest that the zebra crossing on Beadon Road reduces the efficiency of the traffic lights at the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Gyratory. Our proposals would replace this zebra crossing with traffic light controlled crossings at the junction with Hammersmith Grove, making it easier for our traffic engineers to manage traffic and buses along Beadon Road towards Hammersmith Gyratory. Some minor adjustments are proposed as part of design changes made since consultation and the bus routes that travel via Beadon Road are now predicted to see an improvement in journey times on their route overall. This is also due in part to a predicted decrease in flow on Beadon Road. We would also implement ‘SCOOT’ signal technology along the route to enable more flexible management of traffic and buses throughout the day.

Environmental impacts

Air quality, health and pollution

Some respondents expressed their support for the proposals due to the positive impacts on air quality. Others were concerned that pollution would increase as a result of congestion and about the impact this would have on health.

A key objective of cycling schemes is to help improve the health of Londoners in line with the Healthy Streets approach, and fulfil the Mayor’s ambition of every Londoner completing a minimum of 20 minutes of walking or cycling per day. It is estimated
that this could save the NHS £1.7bn in treatment costs over the next 25 years\textsuperscript{13}, and result in 85,000 fewer people being treated for hip fractures, 19,200 fewer people suffering from dementia, and an estimated 18,800 fewer Londoners suffering from depression. Currently, only 34 per cent of Londoners complete 20 minutes of walking or cycling a day.

New cycle facilities proposed as part of the scheme would help to encourage people to use active modes of transport, which could achieve significant health benefits. The proposals aim to encourage people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so. The Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) was developed by the World Health Organisation and monetises the benefit from deaths prevented in the population as a result of increases in physical activity\textsuperscript{14}. When HEAT is used to measure the expected benefits from the increase in cycling trips as a result of delivering this scheme, an annual monetised benefit of circa £11.5m is predicted. This is based on a prediction of additional cycle trips a day\textsuperscript{15} and an increase in average trip length as a result of the scheme.

Air pollution is one of the most significant challenges facing London. A number of schemes aimed at improving London’s air quality are planned including taking steps to reduce air pollution from our bus fleet and reducing emissions from taxis and private hire vehicles. This includes setting up ‘Low Emission Bus Zones’ and expanding the electric vehicle charging network. We have also implemented the T-Charge, and will introduce the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) in April 2019. We are investing to make London’s streets healthy, safe and attractive places to walk and cycle. We hope that enabling more journeys to be made on foot or by bike will encourage people to choose more sustainable modes of transport in the area.

Although not a traffic generating scheme, our proposals would change how traffic moves around the area, which may result in some associated and localised changes to air quality and noise levels. We have undertaken independently assessed environmental evaluations of the impacts of our schemes including Noise and Air Quality Assessments. Based on current levels of mode share, these indicate that changes in noise and air quality are not expected to change significantly. Some improvements in noise and air quality are predicted along the route including along Chiswick High Road and King Street where there are high pedestrian flows. We hope that enabling more journeys to be made on foot or by bike will encourage people to choose more sustainable modes of transport in the area.


\textsuperscript{14} HEAT uses the value of statistical life (VSL) approach to quantify the benefit of reducing premature deaths. VSL reflects the amount an average person is willing to pay to reduce their risk of death.

\textsuperscript{15} Calculated using TfL’s ‘Cynemon’ tool for predicting increases in cycle flows as a result of improvements to infrastructure
Green infrastructure

Many people were opposed to plans to remove trees and said they were concerned trees would be damaged or suggested planting new trees to enhance urban realm. People said removal of trees would spoil aesthetics, the quality of the environment or increase CO\textsuperscript{2}.

We do not take removal of green infrastructure lightly and have made every effort to retain this along the route. We have proposed approximately 30 new trees along the route while only nine are proposed to be removed. We are not proposing to remove any existing planters. There would therefore be an overall net gain in green infrastructure.

The planting of new trees is subject to site investigations and conditions and we will be undertaking assessments to determine where this is possible as there are often utilities beneath the footway and carriageway which can prevent this. We have attempted to reduce the need for the loss of any trees, but this has been necessary in some locations to facilitate the provision of the cycle track, maintain appropriate footway and carriageway space and minimise the impact on bus journey times.

As part of the development of the project we carry out ecological surveys to determine where local green infrastructure and habitats are and use these to inform our construction methodologies and practices.

Economic impacts

Business and local economy

Some respondents said they supported the scheme as it would benefit shops and have a positive impact on the local economy. Others were concerned that loss of pedestrians using the high street, parking, outdoor space and increased journey times would negatively impact the local economy including shops, businesses, house prices and local café culture, particularly in Chiswick. Some people also expressed concern about the impact of the scheme on loading, deliveries and servicing for businesses.

Our proposals would help connect town centres including Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford, linking important amenities and facilities in the heart of these town centres, and making them more pleasant places to live, work, shop and spend time. People who cycle, walk or use public transport to access their local high streets are likely to visit more often, resulting in higher spend per month.\textsuperscript{16} Streets which are easier to cross, less noisy and have cleaner air draw shoppers to spend more time there and cycling improvements can also bring more people visiting or travelling through an area, which means a supply of new potential customers and opportunities

\textsuperscript{16} http://www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/cycling-and-economy
for businesses. For more information about the economic benefits of investment in walking and cycling, including reports, studies and evidence packs see here.

To make it easier to cross roads and high streets, we have improved pedestrian crossings and installed some new crossings. We have also proposed to install new seating areas and plant new trees, providing space for people to stop rest and spend time. As well as enabling more Londoners to walk and cycle more often, these proposals would help to create more welcoming and inclusive streets.

Pavement café licences are granted to food premises such as cafes, restaurants or bars to allow them to place tables and chairs on the public footpath to sell refreshments. In developing our designs, we have reviewed locations along the route where outdoor seating is provided. At the majority of these locations along the route there would not be any changes. Where we have proposed to cut back footways, we have ensured that this does not impact outdoor seating space currently used or the ability for people to walk along the adjacent footways. Overall, we hope that by converting more of the highway to non-polluting transport modes, our proposals will make dining outside at these restaurants more attractive than it currently is, helping to stimulate business.

As part of the development of our design proposals, we commissioned a survey to be undertaken with local businesses along the route to understand their requirements for loading and servicing. Around 72 per cent of businesses targeted provided a response, excluding any vacant properties at the time of the survey. We used the information collected in this survey to inform locations where loading provision is proposed. Where businesses need access to the main road to unload goods, we have ensured that loading facilities are provided in close proximity in accordance with distances set out in TfL’s Kerbside Loading Guidance. In some cases, businesses told us that they use nearby side roads or have their own loading area and do not need to load from the main road and we have taken this into account. We do not expect the changes we have proposed to impact the ability for businesses and retailers throughout the route to receive deliveries and therefore would not expect this to impact local trade. Following a review of the designs and of the feedback received during the consultation, we made some changes to the location of loading provisions in some areas, details of which are set out within Section 2.2 of this report.

In the consulted designs, we proposed to increase kerbside loading restrictions in some areas in line with our proposals to increase bus lane operational hours. Following a review of these timings against likely bus passenger benefits, we are now no longer proposing to extend the end of the weekday evening peak operation from 7pm to 8pm. As such, weekday loading restrictions would not need to be extended to this time. We also proposed to extend bus lane operational hours to Saturday and Sunday peaks which would have meant loading restrictions during these times. We are now proposing for bus lanes to be operational only during peaks
on Saturdays. Further information about how these changes impact different parts of the route are set out in Section 2.2. All changes to loading restrictions will be subject to statutory consultation (traffic orders).

We promote policies such as freight consolidation or retiming deliveries to reduce businesses reliance on road network space. This can also benefit businesses by sharing the cost of deliveries and creating a more pleasant street environment for their customers. Restrictions on loading during peak times reduces the interaction between deliveries and peak traffic, pedestrian and cycle flows, encouraging businesses to schedule their deliveries outside of these times. Improved infrastructure proposed as part of this scheme would also aid businesses in switching to using cycle freight for local deliveries which can provide considerable competitive advantage with faster and more reliable deliveries and estimated cost savings of between 34 and 64% against the cost of using a van\(^{17}\).

See here for information about the impacts of the scheme on parking and here for information about the impacts of the scheme on pavement space and footfall.

**Funding**

Some respondents were concerned over the costs of the scheme, with several stating it will waste council money and should instead be paid for by cyclists.

This is a TfL funded scheme being delivered in partnership with local boroughs as part of the Mayor of London’s Healthy Streets portfolio. Cycling schemes form part of a package of measures to improve transport in the city and bring a range of impacts which include substantial benefits to safety, transport capacity, health, the environment, public realm and benefits for businesses. The costs and benefits of the scheme form part of the scheme business case, which is used to assess the overall outcomes gained against the cost for the lifetime of the scheme. We have worked to minimise the costs at each stage of the project, and believe the scheme presents value for money to the public.

The maintenance of roads in the UK is currently funded through general taxation and not through specific taxes on road users, such as Vehicle Excise Duty (VED). Therefore, most cyclists already contribute to the cost of maintaining roads by virtue of paying income tax, VAT and council tax. In addition to cyclists, those exempt from VED include electric car drivers, drivers of the lowest-emitting diesel and petrol vehicles (<100g CO2/km), disabled drivers, drivers of vehicles built before 1976, and agricultural vehicles.

**Cyclist behaviour**

Attitude and compliance

Some respondents said they were concerned that cyclists disobey traffic lights. Others raised concerns about aggressive cycling, lack of awareness towards other road users, including pedestrians and disregard to the Highway Code.

We promote the message that the Highway Code must be adhered to by all road users, and we are strongly in favour of promoting the ethos of ‘responsible cycling’ and mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. This means working to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement and cycling at night without adequate lighting.

Statistics on road traffic collisions in Greater London show the number of injuries and fatalities for pedestrians in collisions involving cyclists are far lower than those involving motor vehicles. Nonetheless, cyclists are expected to follow the same rules in the Highway Code as other road users as per the Road Traffic Act 1991.

Offences reported by police are dealt with in one of the following ways:

- Provisional fixed penalty notice. For cycle offences, this is currently £50.
- Diversion course. For cyclists, this is an online course and entails a reduced penalty.
- Summons to attend a court hearing. In certain circumstances, cyclists could be fined up to £2,500 for dangerous cycling and up to £1,000 for careless cycling – this would include incidents where cycling on a pavement has severely compromised the safety of another road user.

Enforcement activity is conducted in a balanced way. Enforcement is targeted most at those causing danger. More drivers are reported for offences than cyclists, and for a wider range of offences, such as speeding, driving without due care, using a mobile phone or disobeying traffic signals.

With the launch of any new cycle route, we undertake a range of engagement and enforcement activity for all road users including cyclists. This includes:

- Representatives from the Metropolitan Police present on site to provide support and assistance to the public. They educate people how to use the new road layout and advise on appropriate behaviour for all road users
- TfL Travel Ambassadors provide assistance and advice to road users and hand out leaflets informing road users about changes to road layouts and the new innovative features

We recognise that some pavement cyclists break the law to avoid the dangers of motor traffic. However, we anticipate that providing dedicated and safe space for cyclists will discourage people from riding on pavements. Providing dedicated space for cyclists can also help other road users by letting them know where to expect cyclists to be.
Speed

A number of respondents expressed concern over speeding cyclists posing a danger to other cyclists, with some suggesting a cyclist speed limit or physical measures to reduce speeds. Others raised concerns over pedestrian safety due to the speed of cyclists. There is currently no legislation which imposes a speed limit on cyclists, and as such a restriction on our routes would not be legally enforceable. We have designed our cycle tracks to be wide enough to allow cyclists of different abilities to overtake one another and have implemented a number of physical measures such as ramps and road markings to highlight locations where cyclists would need to look out for pedestrians such as crossing points over the cycle track.

Impact on churches

Many respondents raised issues about Our Lady Grace & St Edward Church, including the impact of narrowing pavements on religious events, limiting access to the church and potential pedestrian-cyclist conflict. Some suggested the cycle track should be diverted around the church instead of running along the pavement in front.

We have been working closely with the representatives from Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church to understand their concerns in more detail and consider changes that can be made to our design to mitigate these. The pavement width outside the church is one of many aspects we have been reviewing as part of our design changes in this location. It is understood that the wide pavement serves a multitude of uses, allowing the congregation to gather outside after services or religious ceremonies, funeral directors to bring coffins into the church, processions to form and emergency evacuations to take place.

Following an extensive review of the design in this location, we are now proposing to maintain the existing footway width outside the church. In order to achieve this we have adjusted the layout of the junction of Chiswick High Road and Duke’s Avenue. We are also proposing to retain existing single yellow lines on the west side of Duke’s Avenue where we had previously proposed pay and display bays. This would allow people to park and load during off peak times and for funeral cars to park at any time with a funeral exemption. Blue badge holders would also be able to park here at any time of the day.

See Section 2.2 for further details regarding our review of the designs in this location.

Impact on schools

Some respondents supported the proposals as they considered the scheme would provide safe routes to school, whilst others were concerned about pedestrian and cyclist conflict outside schools or impacts on the ability to drop children off. We also received responses directly from local schools regarding logistics and safety.
Under our proposals, all existing properties within the area, including schools, will remain accessible by motor vehicle. In some locations, the ‘school run’ can be a cause of motor traffic congestion in the morning and evening peak. The traffic modelling we carried out assessed the worst-case scenario for motor traffic focussing on the busiest hour in the morning and evening peak periods, chosen following an analysis of traffic counts.

In the long-term, we expect our proposals to make walking and cycling more attractive and contribute to reducing motor traffic congestion and improving road safety around schools by encouraging local people to walk or cycle school run trips, instead of driving.

TfL and the local boroughs also work with schools to encourage a greater mode share of cycling as a means of travel to school and funds cycle training within schools and local authorities. This includes providing funding to schools for bicycle maintenance, cycle training and grants for pool bikes and secure cycle parking facilities. The London Borough of Hounslow also hold Saturday cycling sessions for children and young people to improve their cycling confidence. National cycling events such as Sustrans Big Pedal and Bike to School Week are also specifically targeted at increasing cycling levels for the journey to and from school. Over 1,500 London schools are also involved with TfL’s STARS accreditation scheme which inspires young people to think different about travel and health.

We have engaged with a number of local schools throughout the development of the scheme to ensure that our proposals appropriately cater for their needs in terms of operation and pupil safety. Since consulting on the designs last year, we have made changes to the proposed pedestrian crossings along King Street nearby to a number of schools and nurseries. We are now proposing to make the staggered crossing outside Latymer Upper School straight across rather than staggered so that pupils crossing to reach Ravenscourt Park station and local bus stops can do so in one movement and both cyclists and traffic will be held on a red light. We are also proposing a new straight across crossing to the west outside West London Free School.

We are proposing coach parking along Rivercourt Road to support the transportation of pupils from local schools to nearby sports grounds. This is in response to concerns regarding reduced ability for coaches to stop on King Street in the current and proposed designs.

Safety

Many people supported safer cycling infrastructure in London while others said the proposals would decrease safety. Some were concerned over safety at Chiswick High Road specifically.
The scheme aims to improve safety for all road users through a number of interventions. Collision data has been assessed and proposals focus on addressing safety issues along the route. As with all schemes of similar nature, we will monitor the completed route to ensure it is operating as expected, and to understand whether any further changes may be required.

All schemes are also subject to a thorough Road Safety Audit (RSA) process at each stage of the design and post implementation. An RSA considers the road safety implications of all measures proposed, their safety impact on the network under all anticipated operating conditions, and their road safety implications on all types of road user. Fundamental to the principle of an RSA is ensuring that due consideration is given to the effects on any scheme on all road users including pedestrians and vulnerable user groups. This is a continual process throughout the design and construction process.

When we launch new cycle routes, officers from the Metropolitan Police along with TfL Ambassadors promote adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourage responsible cycling and driving.

We are also working with the Metropolitan Police Service and London Boroughs on our Vision Zero ambition to tackle danger across the whole transport network, and eliminate death and serious injuries from London’s transport by 2041.

Policy

A number of people raised policy issues around cycling including suggesting cyclists are licenced, insured, should pay tax, follow the Highway Code or take a test. Others said it should be compulsory for cyclists to use cycle lanes and that bells on bicycles should be mandatory.

Any change to the law that would require cyclists to register their bikes, or to carry insurance, would require legislation at a national level and lies outside of the Mayor’s jurisdiction. In the case of third party damage or injury, road users can actually claim compensation for injury caused by an uninsured person, including cyclists.

Several thousand cyclists are members of cycling groups such as CTC (the national cycling charity) and the London Cycling Campaign (LCC). These groups offer automatic third party insurance for their members should they be involved in a collision with other road users, but there is no practical mechanism for making this compulsory in London. There is no other European country which has a cycle registration system.

Vehicle Excise Duty is levied on individual vehicles, with zero emission vehicles continuing to be exempt. As bicycles produce no emissions, they too would be exempt from paying the duty, were it applied to them.
We promote the message that the Highway Code must be adhered to by all road users, and we are strongly in favour of promoting the ethos of ‘responsible cycling’ and mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. This means working to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement and cycling at night without adequate lighting.

**Complementary measures**

Some respondents suggested complementary measures, including improved education and training for cyclists and motorists. Others suggested measures to discourage private car use, take polluting vehicles off the road, limit traffic to 20 mph and reduce the cost of public transport.

TfL funds Bikeability and Cycle Skills through the boroughs’ Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and other funding streams. The majority of Bikeability is delivered at schools, however many boroughs also offer holiday courses and family training. Cycle Skills sessions are offered free by all London boroughs to anyone who lives, works or studies in London, and include four different sessions to suit cyclists’ needs. Additionally, TfL offers London by Bike and Advanced London by Bike sessions to encourage safe and responsible cycling in the capital.

We also offer training for motorists, including a Safe Urban Driving (SUD) course for commercial freight drivers, which equips them with the knowledge and skills needed to share the road safely with vulnerable road users, and Van Smart (VS), which aims to reduce work-related road risks. TfL supports boroughs to run these courses along our cycle network.

TfL currently operates the Low Emission Zone (LEZ) across Greater London to encourage the most polluting vehicles to become cleaner. This will be supplemented by the introduction of an Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) in central London from April 2019 which will require vehicles to meet new, tighter emission standards. For more information, please see our response on health, air quality and pollution.

The Mayor’s Transport Strategy sets out the goal that, by 2041, all deaths and serious injuries will be eliminated from London’s transport network and identifies specific areas to focus on as part of the [Vision Zero Action Plan](#). This includes widespread introduction of new lower speed limits. Large sections of new 20 mph speed limits have been introduced by Hammersmith & Fulham council and are planned across sections in Hounslow.

The cost of public transport is under constant review by TfL, and customers have recently benefited from the fares freeze and introduction of the Hopper Fare on buses. However, changes to fares on public transport do not form part of these proposals.
By giving people space and time to cycle through the area more easily, and by providing improved crossing facilities for pedestrians, we can encourage more people to use these healthy and sustainable forms of transport while keeping other traffic moving. These improvements would help to make these streets work better for walking, cycling and public transport, so both individuals and the community as a whole can benefit.

**Construction impacts**

Some people were worried about disruption during construction, with several stating that this would adversely affect businesses and reduce cyclist safety.

We would plan construction carefully to minimise disruption to those who live, work and travel through the areas. We would also aim to minimise construction impacts as much as possible. We will carry out extensive communications and engagement with local residents, cyclist groups, businesses and other stakeholders to ensure they have the information they need to plan ahead and adapt their travel arrangements where necessary, reducing any impact on their journeys and operations during the construction period. We also provide road traffic information to help people better plan their journeys and make informed choices about how, where and when they travel.

**Consultation approach**

**Consultation publicity**

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not publicised the consultation widely enough.

We are satisfied that the consultation was well publicised. The channels we used to publicise the consultation are detailed in Chapter 2 of our Consultation Report, and included leaflets, emails, social media, 11 drop-in events, public meetings and press coverage. People could attend any of the drop-in events. We sent out over 70,000 letters to nearby addresses and 230,000 emails to people who live locally or use our transport services in the area. We also visited over 600 businesses and organisations along the route. The 5,388 responses that we received compares favourably with consultations on other similar sized infrastructure projects, and we are satisfied the responses provided us with a strong understanding of the issues about the scheme.

**Length of consultation**

Some respondents expressed concern that the consultation period was too short.

The public consultation was open for six weeks from 21 September to 31 October 2017. Of the 5,388 responses received 93 were submitted by stakeholders. We are
satisfied that sufficient time was provided for individuals and stakeholders to consider the proposals and formulate their responses. The feedback we received has been invaluable in helping us to improve the scheme.

**Concern that the proposals would be implemented regardless of consultation**

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposals were too far advanced to be changed.

We are satisfied that the consultation took place at a time when the proposals were still at a formative stage. We have made revisions to the scheme in response to the feedback received and we are carrying out further consultation in two sections of the route. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

**Support for the scheme by non local campaigns**

A stakeholder expressed concern that support for the scheme had been increased by non local campaigns.

We received 5,388 direct responses to the consultation, of which 59 per cent supported or strongly supported the proposals, 2 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals, and 39 per cent opposed or strongly opposed the proposals.

Template emails were considered separately from this. We received an additional 941 template emails via the London Cycling Campaign website and 34 template emails from Sustrans which supported the proposals.

We put considerable effort into publicising the consultation near the scheme, because we recognise that local people possess highly useful local knowledge. However respondents from outside the area can also contribute valuable information. Consultation is intended to highlight issues relevant to the scheme, which might not have been revealed during our feasibility stage. Anyone can highlight a valid concern, suggestion or opinion about a scheme, not just people who live near a scheme.

**Clarity and quality of information**

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposals lack detail, or were unclear or biased. Some respondents felt the materials were misleading on the number of trees to be removed.

We are satisfied that we provided more than adequate information to allow consultees to understand and form an opinion about the scheme. We asked a question about the quality of the consultation and 86 per cent considered this to be very good (32 per cent), good (34 per cent) or acceptable (20 per cent).

Before we launch a consultation we carefully consider what information to publish, aiming to find the best balance between transparency and not providing a confusing
amount of information. In this instance, we took the decision to publish a significant quantity of material.

Our experience is that consultees vary in how they like to receive information, with different preferences for written information, diagrams or maps, discussing on a face to face basis or a combination of these. We are satisfied that we provided a range of methods about our proposals.

Our proposals for the removal of trees were clearly shown on the consultation drawings for each section of the route with a description in the corresponding drawing key. We also set out proposals for the removal of trees in the consultation text for each section included on the website. This approach is similar to other consultation materials we have produced for past consultations and we are satisfied that this information was clear.

A stakeholder criticised the use of a “partial support” option. We used a five option scale of support: strongly support, support, neither support nor oppose, oppose, strongly oppose. This is well established method used widely in social research.

Drop in events
A stakeholder criticised the consultation drop-in event at the Cross Keys, saying it was confusing, too small and poorly lit. Another stakeholder expressed concern that consultants at public events did not offer sufficiently detailed responses to queries posed.

We sought to provide a range of accessible drop-in events along the route, most of these have been well received. We note the comments made about the Cross Keys venue. Representatives from TfL and officers from local authorities attended drop-in sessions and were fully briefed on the proposals.

Journey time impact information
Some respondents were concerned that journey time impacts were misleading, inaccurate, not representative, or there was not enough information about the impact on buses.

We carried out detailed traffic modelling in order to understand the expected impact of our proposals on road users, including general traffic, bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians. A text summary of the modelling work was included in the public consultation materials, along with tables of predicted journey times and longer text descriptions of the predicted impacts. A number of stakeholder events were held to allow further discussion on proposals. The modelling information is still available on our consultation website along with updated modelling on the website for our further consultation.
**Scheme costs and funding sources**

Some respondents suggested scheme costs and funding sources be made available as part of the proposals.

Our Business Plan sets out our funding for projects under the Healthy Streets programme. We seek to achieve the maximum value for our investment and disclosing exact project budgets could affect our ability to do this.

**Concern proposals will be diluted through the consultation process**

Some respondents were concerned the proposals will be diluted through the consultation process.

The feedback we received has helped us to improve the scheme’s design and we have made a number of changes to address concerns raised. Throughout the review of the design we have ensured that the core principals of the scheme are maintained and that designs take into account local and national guidance as well as lessons learned from similar projects.

**Alternative route options**

Some respondents were concerned that alternative route options were not presented in the consultation.

A significant amount of work was undertaken during the development of this scheme to choose the route alignment, details of which can be found in Section 2.1. As we did not feel that any alternative route alignments provided viable alternatives, we did not consult on options during this consultation.

**2.2 Issues relating to individual sections of the route**

This section sets-out our response, in collaboration with the relevant highway authorities, to the issues commonly raised in consultation relating to individual sections of the route. Please see section 2.1 for responses to issues relating to the overall proposals. Some issues were raised across a number of sections of the route and our response to these are included in Section 2.1 and referenced in each section below for clarity and completeness.

**Section A: Hammersmith Road (between Holland Road and Rowan Road)**

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route as follows:

- We proposed a taxi rank on Avonmore Road in place of four pay and display parking bays. In the revised scheme, the taxi rank would remain on the north side of Hammersmith Road (accessible via a footway level crossing over the
cycle track) and there would be no changes to parking on Avonmore Road. A short section of bus lane would be removed from Hammersmith Road in place of the taxi rank. An additional taxi rank would be provided on the south side of Hammersmith Road adjacent to the footway and would be accessible from the kerb edge.

- We have increased the depth of the cycle track set back on Olympia Way to provide more space for large vehicles to wait when pulling in or out of this side road.
- We have adjusted the layout of the advanced cycle stop line (ASL) on North End Road to ensure that large turning vehicles do not overrun this area when cyclists are waiting at the junction.
- We proposed to remove the cycle hire docking station on Hammersmith Road by Shortlands. In the revised scheme, we have adjusted kerb lines so that the docking station can be retained.
- We proposed new trees at the junction of Hammersmith Road and Shortlands. As there are already a number of trees and planters at this location, we are reviewing opportunities to incorporate new planting and trees in this location.

We are also working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on the evolving proposals for redevelopment of Olympia Exhibition Centre which was submitted for planning application at the end of 2018. The application comprised (among other proposals) pedestrian, vehicle, cycle, public realm, landscaping and highway works along Hammersmith Road. See here for more details.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

**Principles of the scheme**

**New developments**
See Section 2.1 for our response regarding new developments along the route.

**District line service to Olympia**
A few respondents suggested that weekday underground services to Kensington Olympia should be reinstated.

TfL withdrew the District line weekday service in 2011 following consultation. When the service ran it carried fewer than 30 people per train and caused delays to 150,000 customers through Earls Court (caused by Olympia trains having to cross or merge with the main District line), with a knock on effect for all District line customers. Removing the weekday District line service helped to eliminate those
delays and enabled us to increase peak capacity on the most crowded sections of the District line. Analysis shows restoring weekday services would lead to both a financial cost to LU (running near empty trains), dis-benefits to passengers and greater unreliability.

**Impact on motorists**

**Journey times and congestion**

There was concern raised about current congestion levels along Hammersmith Road and some people felt that the proposals would worsen this due to the removal of traffic lanes or reallocation of road space. Some people also commented that the traffic lanes are currently too narrow.

Hammersmith Road is currently dominated by motor traffic and can be an intimidating and unpleasant place to cycle and walk. The proposals for this scheme aim to provide dedicated space for cyclists along with improvements for pedestrians. This includes a new pedestrian crossing at Shortlands and widening of ten crossings along this stretch. By making walking and cycling more attractive along Hammersmith Road we aim to encourage more people to switch from private cars to sustainable modes, thus reducing levels of congestion. The cycle track would replace some sections of traffic lane or bus lane in each direction however remaining traffic lanes have been designed to be of sufficient widths to accommodate the different types of vehicles we expect to be using it.

We carried out detailed traffic modelling in order to understand the expected impact of our proposals on road users, including general traffic, bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians. The modelling information is still available on our consultation website along with updated modelling on the website for the further consultation. The revised proposals not expected to result in a significant change for this section of the route.

**Taxi rank on Avonmore Road**

A number of people raised concerns about the proposed relocation of a taxi rank from Hammersmith Road to Avonmore Road. Concerns included the lack of visibility from London Olympia and the impact the rank might have on Avonmore Road on residents and with proximity to local schools. Following a review of this proposal, we are no longer proposing the taxi rank on Avonmore Road and instead are proposing it on the north side of Hammersmith Road outside London Olympia. As the taxi rank would be alongside the two-way cycle track, access would be via a raised informal crossing. A second taxi rank is proposed on the south side of Hammersmith Road and would be accessible from the kerb edge.
Parking on Hammersmith Road

Some people said they were opposed because of a loss of parking. On the north side of Hammersmith Road, we propose to retain nine of the current 11 parking bays by Latymer Court. It is not possible to retain all 11 bays due to the proximity of these bays to junctions and bus stops. We also proposed to remove four parking bays on Avonmore Road to make space for a relocated taxi rank from Hammersmith Road. As we are no longer planning to relocate this taxi rank, these four bays will now be retained. In addition, we proposed 19 new parking bays on side roads which remain in our proposals. Overall there would be a net loss of two parking bays on Hammersmith Road alongside a net gain of 19 parking bays on side roads in this section.

Cycle infrastructure

Bus lanes on Kensington High Street

The east end of the route starts in Kensington and Chelsea and 24 hour bus lanes are proposed for a short stretch for cyclists joining the route. While segregated lanes would provide the highest protection for cyclists on this type of road, bus lanes still provide a degree of separation from general traffic. Cyclists who are not comfortable continuing on the route at this point would be able to join and leave the route at Russell Road via a planned cycle route which would connect to the route at this point.

With-flow to two-way track switch

People were concerned about the location where the two-way track switches from with-flow to two-way track. At either end of the route, the two-way track splits to with-flow track to allow cyclists to rejoin the carriageway. In these locations, traffic will be held at a red signal and a cycle crossing is provided to facilitate cyclists’ safe crossing from one side of the road to the other.

Contra-flow cycling on Olympia Way

Some people suggested introducing contra-flow cycling on Olympia Way. Olympia Way is a private road owned by Olympia London Exhibition Centre. Changes to Olympia Way are included as part of their plans to re-develop this site. Following a review of designs since consultation we have proposed to set the cycle track further back into Olympia Way to increase space for vehicles to wait and give way to cyclists when turning in.

Junctions and side roads
Cyclist access to North End Road

Some respondents were concerned about cyclist access at North End Road. Cyclists will be able to join the route from North End Road via a gap in the segregation using the advance stop line (ASL) on North End Road. Early release signals for cyclists are proposed to provide cyclists with a green light ahead of traffic. It has not been possible to propose a signal controlled access for cyclists from the route to North End Road as doing so would increase the signal time needed and lead to congestion at the junction causing delays to all modes. Cyclists wishing to access destinations via North End Road could either dismount and use the pedestrian crossing on the west arm of the junction or use alternative routes either side of this junction. This includes Edith Road to the west where signalised facilities for cyclists are proposed or Avonmore Road to the east where cyclists are segregated with the direction of traffic flow.

A315 Kensington High Street / A3220 Holland Road

Some people were concerned about the junction of A315 Kensington High Street and A3220 Holland Road. This junction is outside the extent of the scheme however TfL has undertaken recent improvement works at this junction as part of a separate scheme. See https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/kensington-high-street/ for more details.

Left turn only at Edith Road

A few people were concerned that there would be no option to turn right when travelling from Edith Road eastbound to Hammersmith Road. Traffic (including cyclists) is currently only permitted to turn left (westbound) when exiting Edith Road. While the proposed changes at this junction introduce signalised access for cyclists to and from Edith Road including for those turning right, left turn only will be maintained for traffic from Edith Road. Traffic wishing to travel eastbound would need to do so via alternative routes as per current arrangements.

Access to Avonmore Road

Some people were concerned over access to the junction at Avonmore Road. Access for traffic and cyclists would be maintained in and out of Avonmore Road.

Safety at Blythe Road

A few people raised concerns about the safety of the junction of Hammersmith Road and Blythe Road. A two-way cycle track would run along the north side of Hammersmith Road as it passes Blythe Road. A number of measures are proposed at this junction to reduce the risk of conflict between road users. Footway build outs and raised table are proposed to reduce the speed of vehicles turning in and out. In addition, this reduces the crossing distance for pedestrians and provides more footway space. To increase visibility between cyclists and traffic at this junction, the
The cycle track is proposed to be bent inward allowing space for a vehicle turning in or out to give way to cyclists travelling from either direction before proceeding. The cycle track is proposed to be painted in a contrasting colour with cycle logos and give way markings to highlight priority for cyclists. Traffic signs would also be installed to highlight the two-way nature of the cycle track for traffic approaching on Blythe Road. A single lane in each direction for traffic on Blythe Road is also proposed which reduces the likelihood of visibility being blocked by a vehicle in an adjacent lane. This approach to managing two-way cycle tracks at side roads is set out in the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS).

**Traffic on Olympia Way**

Some people were concerned about Olympia Way being a bottleneck. Olympia Way is a private road owned by Olympia London Exhibition Centre. Changes to Olympia Way are included as part of their plans to re-develop this site.

**Impact on bus users**

**Changes to bus stops**

Some people said they were opposed to the relocation of bus stops. There are nine bus stops along this section of the route. We are proposing to make some changes to the road layout which impacts the location of some bus stops and we are proposing to introduce bus stop bypasses at others.

Proposed changes to bus stops in this section of the design include:

- Relocating bus stop G – Latymer Court east slightly to provide space for vehicles to overtake a stopped bus and therefore maintaining network resilience
- Consolidating westbound bus stop D – Kensington Olympia with bus stop E – North End Road as bus stop D is a coach service stop only and combining them provides more space for vehicles to overtake stopped buses.
- Consolidating eastbound bus stop G – Latymer Court with bus stop H – Brook Green to provide better spacing between bus stops resulting in journey time efficiency.
- Adding bus stop bypasses to the following eastbound bus stops alongside the cycle track:
  - Bus stop K – Kensington Olympia station
  - Bus stop J – North End Road
  - Bus stop G – Latymer Court

In locations where we are proposing changes, we have considered the impacts carefully and are satisfied that minimum spacing between stops and access to local services would be maintained.
Changes to bus lanes

Some people opposed the removal of bus lanes. To accommodate the segregated cycle track we have proposed to remove some sections of bus lane. Elsewhere we have maintained or proposed new sections of bus lane. See Section 2.1 for information about changes to bus lane operational hours on Hammersmith Road.

Impact on pedestrians

Pavement space and pedestrian congestion

Respondents raised concerns about current pedestrian congestion, reduction of space for pedestrians and further pedestrian congestion this might cause. People suggested that footway space should be increased.

Throughout the route, we have endeavoured to ensure that pavement space is suitable for pedestrian flows. Along Hammersmith Road, the cycle track replaces general traffic or bus lanes for the majority of the route and we have endeavoured to keep footway cut backs to a minimum. In some locations such as at side roads, we are proposing to increase footway space to tighten the radius of junctions and reduce crossing distances for pedestrians. Where we have proposed reductions to the existing footway, we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to assess whether the design of the footways are appropriate to the volume and type of users within the street environment. Assessments take into account the usable width of the footway accounting for street furniture, outdoor seating and clearance around buildings and kerb edges.

Where we have made changes to the footway, the majority of locations have a pedestrian comfort level of A+, representing a very comfortable street environment with plenty of space for people to walk at the speed and route they choose. Where this is not possible for short sections such as pinch points, we have sought to maintain a minimum pedestrian comfort level of B+ which is the recommended level of comfort for all areas.

Complementary measures

Traffic calming measures

Some people suggested that traffic calming measures such as 20mph is introduced along this section of the route. Local traffic calming measures such as raised tables, reduced access points and tighter turning radii are proposed throughout the scheme to reduce the appeal of driving private vehicles. The London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham have introduced 20mph speed limits to the majority of roads in the borough, including King Street, however this does not yet include Hammersmith Road.
Section B: Hammersmith Gyratory (from Rowan Road to King Street East)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route as follows:

- We have simplified the layout of Black’s Road by removing the proposed cycle feeder lane to the gyratory and instead providing a wider footway. Cyclist access from Black’s Road to the route would be maintained via the carriageway.
- We proposed an additional taxi rank on Black’s Road to replace existing parking, disabled and loading bays. In the revised scheme, we will keep the existing bays and instead propose an additional 12m taxi rank in an existing bay on Queen Caroline Street opposite Black’s Road.
- We have reduced the exit lanes from Hammersmith Gyratory to Shepherd’s Bush Road from two lanes to one to provide clear lane designation for drivers. This change also shortens crossing distance for pedestrians over the west arm of Shepherd’s Bush Road.

We are aware of concerns with the quality of current cycling facilities on the A4, and are committed to reviewing this separately in partnership with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham. This includes improvements along the A4 between Hammersmith town hall and Hammersmith gyratory, including links into Black’s Road.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Principles of the scheme

Scope of the scheme

Some people suggested adding further cycle tracks to improve north and south links to and from the gyratory. Others suggested a gyratory bypass to Fulham.

Providing cycle facilities around the whole gyratory was considered early in the design stage for the Hammersmith Gyratory scheme before it became part of the this scheme. While we recognise that Hammersmith Gyratory would benefit from such improvements, it is not currently possible to consider changes of this scale within this scheme’s financial and road network capacity constraints. We believe that the proposals for the north arm of the gyratory address the principal cycling route through the gyratory while balancing demands for space among other road users in the area.
The scheme would however connect to planned cycle routes at Beavor Lane and Bridge Avenue along King Street providing cycle links south to Putney Bridge (with connections to Hammersmith Bridge, the Thames riverside and the A4) and Chiswick station. In addition, TfL’s recent Strategic Cycling Analysis identified 25 top potential future cycling connections across London to investigate further. This included a north to south connection between Fulham and Wembley that could provide links to the route at Hammersmith town centre.

**Impact on motorists**

**Road layout**

Some respondents welcomed the proposals and suggested that the current road layout needs improving while others were concerned about removal of traffic lanes.

Hammersmith Gyratory is a very important location for the movement of pedestrians, motorists, bus passengers and cyclists. We have carried out traffic modelling of our proposals and presented these as part of the consultation. Throughout the design process we have recognised the need to balance the requirement for improved cycling provision while maintaining motor traffic movement around the gyratory. Despite the cycle tracks replacing traffic lanes for some sections, we believe that our proposal achieves this balance.

As a result of design changes made since consultation and expected traffic rerouting, journey times through Hammersmith Gyratory are expected to reduce. The northbound exit onto Shepherds Bush Road would be reduced from two lanes to one lane and consequently would see a small increase in journey times along this section in the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peaks.

**Cycle Infrastructure**

**Route of track**

Some respondents suggested that cyclists should use alternative routes to bypass the gyratory, via the south side of the gyratory under the flyover or elevating the route above the road.

[Section 2.1](#) sets out our rationale for the route alignment and connectivity, including investigation of alternative routes to avoid the gyratory.

In 2015, TfL investigated building a Hammersmith ‘flyunder’ as part of a programme of work looking at relocating roads underground in a number of locations across London. The study proved that it would be feasible to build a tunnel to replace the flyover and provide opportunities to regenerate Hammersmith town centre. The study also estimated the significant construction cost of the scheme due to the tunnelling it
would involve. As this is primarily a regeneration scheme for the town centre, this would not fall within the remit of this scheme.

Some people raised concerns about the proposed cycle tracks including preference for with-flow over two-way tracks. Others were concerned that some sections of the cycle track required cyclists to take sharp turns around bends. Some people also said that the cycle track does not need to run to Black’s Road.

Currently, cyclists wishing to cross from one side of the Hammersmith Gyratory to the other must do so with general traffic. For westbound cyclists, this requires cyclists to travel round the east, south and then west side of the gyratory, crossing several lanes of traffic with no segregation. In the proposed design, the two-way track along the north side of the gyratory allows westbound cyclists to take a more direct contra-flow route through the junction, fully segregated in space and time. This will make the route safer and more convenient for cyclists. Following a review of the designs, we have made some changes to the cycle track to simplify the layout of the cycle track. This includes removing the cycle feeder lane on Black’s Road. We have also adjusted the angle of the cycle track between Shepherd’s Bush Road and Beadon Road to reduce the severity of the turn.

**Cycle signals**

A number of respondents were concerned that traffic lights at the gyratory would mean that cyclists might be delayed. People suggested that the traffic lights are coordinated to ensure minimum delay for cyclists.

In order to improve cyclist safety along the route, separate traffic signals are proposed for cyclists. In some locations this means that cyclists would get a green light at a different time to motor traffic or that additional signals are proposed to separate movements that would previously have been in conflict with motor traffic. Allowing cyclists to travel through the gyratory in one movement would mean that traffic and buses would have to be held at a red signal for much longer which would lead to unacceptable delays to the local road network.

Our updated traffic modelling shows that cyclist journey times westbound from Hammersmith Road are predicted to improve due to the shorter, more direct route of the cycle track. Cyclist progression through the gyratory would also be optimised so that cyclists are only stopped once eastbound in the morning (AM) peak.

The new designs have also introduced several pedestrian crossings extending across the cycle track and as a result cyclist journey times along the route are expected to increase marginally. The introduction of the crossings and designated priority is however expected to lead to increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
Cycle track

Some people raised concerns about cycle ramps and others called for the cycle track to have a smooth and level surface. Ramps are proposed where the cycle track changes level between carriageway level and footway level. Typically this occurs at pedestrian crossings where the crossing points are flush with the footway or where the cycle track is proposed to be at footway or intermediate level to accommodate underground services or maximise capacity of the track. Following a review of the designs, we have increased the length of all proposed cycle ramps in the design to provide a smoother transition between levels. All new cycle tracks would be constructed with a smooth and level finish to provide a comfortable riding surface.

Some people said that the width of the track should be maximised for cyclists. Cyclist flows can be tidal depending on the time of day – in peak hours, there is often a dominant movement. Cyclists going in the ‘peak’ direction would have more available space compared within a two-way track compared to a one-way track. A two-way track allows cyclists to overtake, which is important when providing for different types of cyclists of different abilities. We have considered current and potential future flows of cyclists along each part of the route to inform the width of the cycle track. In addition, two-way cycle track provide further flexibility to accommodate expected future growth in cycling.

Access to / from Shepherd's Bush Road

Some people were concerned about access to or from Shepherd's Bush Road for westbound cyclists. While we endeavour to provide access between the route and local roads, in some locations such as this, it is not possible to do so due to space restrictions and limited road user visibility.

Impact on pedestrians

Safety

Some people were concerned that the proposals would make the area less safe for pedestrians including vulnerable groups such as disabled and elderly people. Others had concerns about conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists or that space for pedestrians would be reduced.

The proposals for the scheme mean that pedestrians and cyclists will each have dedicated space to move through Hammersmith Gyratory. Cyclists in a two-way cycle track will be separated from pedestrians on the pavements with a kerb upstand as would be provided between pavements and the carriageway. They will also be separated from pedestrians at junctions and crossing points with separate signals.

In order to facilitate the proposed changes, some reallocation of space has been necessary. Much of the space for the cycle track will come from existing road space...
however there will be some localised sections of footway cut back and some areas where we have increased space on footways. The design of pedestrian footways and crossings are appropriate to the volume and type of users of that environment.

See Section 2.1 for more information about how we have taken the needs of the elderly and disabled into consideration.

**Crossings**

Some respondents were concerned that the proposals would make it difficult for people to cross the road. Others suggested minimising waiting times and maximising crossing times for pedestrians.

Pedestrian crossing improvements proposed at Hammersmith Gyratory include widening six of the nine existing crossings to increase capacity for pedestrians and narrowing the carriageway at three crossings, shortening the distance pedestrians need walk to cross the road. Pedestrian islands have also been increased in size to create more space for pedestrians and to reduce pedestrian congestion.

As part of our traffic modelling undertaken for the proposals we set out estimated wait times for pedestrians. The design changes following consultation are not expected to significantly change the pedestrian wait time set out during the consultation, which highlighted an overall improvement for pedestrians.

See Section 2.1 for more information about how we ensure that there is enough crossing time for pedestrians.

**Impact on bus users**

Some people were concerned that the proposals would result in delays to bus services at the gyratory and others opposed the removal of bus lanes.

We undertook detailed traffic modelling on the consulted proposals to understand how the route would affect journey times for all road users, including bus passengers.

Pre-consultation modelling predicted that journey times for bus passengers would change with the proposals resulting in a reduction in journey time on some routes, while other routes would see an increase. While we did not propose to remove any existing bus lanes, routes that run along Beadon Road on the approach to Hammersmith Gyratory were predicted to be affected. Routes from Hammersmith Bus Station to Holland Road were, however predicted to be shorter at certain times of day.

Site observations suggest that the zebra crossing on Beadon Road reduces the efficiency of the traffic lights at the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Gyratory. Our proposals would replace this zebra crossing with traffic light controlled
crossings at the junction with Hammersmith Grove, making it easier for our traffic engineers to manage traffic and buses along Beadon Road towards Hammersmith Gyratory. Some minor adjustments have been made to the new junction since the previous consultation, and the bus routes that travel via Beadon Road have experienced an improvement in bus journey times on their route overall. This is also due in part to a predicted decrease of flow on Beadon Road. We would also implement 'SCOOT' signal technology along the route to enable more flexible management of traffic and buses throughout the day.
Section C: Beadon Road

There are no proposed changes for this section of the route and we are intending to take the design forward as consulted.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Impact on motorists

Removal of traffic lanes

Some people raised concerns about the removal of traffic lanes decreasing capacity of the road. Beadon Road has two general traffic lanes along the length of the road with three traffic lanes and a cycle lane marked out at the junction with Hammersmith Gyratory. The three traffic lanes are currently below minimum widths for general traffic lanes (with one being only 1.7 metres wide). Site observations show as these lanes are too narrow, traffic does not use all three lanes and queues at the junction as if it were two lanes. We have therefore proposed two traffic lanes at the junction to formalise this arrangement.

Cycle Infrastructure

Segregation

Some people suggested that segregated cycle facilities are provided on Beadon Road and were concerned that the proposed advisory lane is insufficient. People were also concerned that the cycle lane stops at the bus stop and suggested a bus stop bypass be proposed.

At the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Gyratory, cyclists are provided with a short segregated lane and a cyclist only stop line to reduce conflict with general traffic as they join the cycle route. The proposed advisory lane between Hammersmith Grove and the stop line is intended to assist cyclists getting to the near side so that they can access the stop line. It is not possible to segregate or provide a bus stop bypass along this section of the road due to the requirement for vehicles to cross to access the station and due to kerbside loading. As the rest of Beadon Road is not part of the cycle route, further changes fall outside the scope of the scheme.
Junctions

Signalising Beadon Road
Some people opposed the proposed new signalised junction on Beadon Road saying it would not improve traffic flow. Others supported the new signals or said that the current zebra crossings cause congestion.

Site observations suggest that the zebra crossing on Beadon Road reduces the efficiency of the traffic lights at the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Gyratory. This is because traffic is required to stop for pedestrians wishing to cross the road as soon as they arrive at the crossing. With heavy pedestrian flows in this location due to the proximity of the crossing to Hammersmith station and Lyric Square, this means that demand for the crossing is high and traffic stopped at the crossing may not be able to proceed through the next set of traffic lights even if they are green. This increases waiting times and causes congestion.

Our proposals would replace this zebra crossing with two traffic light controlled crossings which would allow our traffic engineers to more effectively manage traffic movements along Beadon Road towards Hammersmith Gyratory. Two crossings also provide more space for pedestrians to cross and cater for more desire lines. We would also implement ‘SCOOT’ signal technology along the route to enable more flexible management of traffic and buses throughout the day. See Section 2.1 for more information about signal technology and demand management.

Reducing traffic lanes at Hammersmith Grove
Some people supported proposals to narrow Hammersmith Grove at the junction with Beadon Road while others were concerned about this. Due to the one-way direction of Beadon Road, vehicles exiting Hammersmith Grove may only turn left. Furthermore, no vehicles can enter Hammersmith Grove as it is one-way out only and as such, two lanes are not necessary.

The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham recently reduced Hammersmith Grove to one lane as part of wider improvements to this street and our proposals. This change means that the footway in this location is wider for pedestrians and the crossing over Hammersmith Grove is shorter. Our proposals would signalise this left turn out for traffic meaning that there will no longer be a requirement for vehicles to give way.

Impact on bus users
Some people raised concerns that the proposals would increase bus journey times and suggested additional bus lanes be implemented. Others opposed existing bus stops.
There are currently no bus lanes on Beadon Road. We previously consulted on proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory in 2015, separate to this scheme. During that consultation, a new bus lane was proposed on Beadon Road however concerns were raised about the reduction in capacity for general traffic.

In response to this, we reviewed the designs and revised our proposals to ensure traffic can flow more freely through the junction with Hammersmith Grove. In addition, we proposed to signalise the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Grove. Currently, vehicles exiting Hammersmith Grove and pedestrians crossing Beadon Road are uncontrolled. This can constrain the amount of traffic on Beadon Road that can flow into Hammersmith Gyratory. Controlling these movements with traffic signals would increase capacity for buses and general traffic on Beadon Road.

The existing bus stop on Beadon Road provides a key interchange for bus passengers accessing Hammersmith station and we have no plans to remove this.

**Impact on pedestrians**

Some people were concerned that the proposals would make the area at Hammersmith Grove less safe for pedestrians or had concern about pedestrian congestion or vulnerable pedestrians.

The changes proposed would provide a number of benefits for pedestrians in this busy location. These include two new signalised crossings over Beadon Road and a shorter signalised crossing over Hammersmith Grove and more footway space at Hammersmith Grove. The proposed layout would also cater for key pedestrian movements to from the east or west to Lyric Square where a wide crossing is also proposed.

See [Section 2.1](#) for more information about how the scheme caters for vulnerable pedestrians.
Section D: King Street East (between Hammersmith Gyratory and Leamore Street)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route as follows:

- We proposed to raise the pedestrian crossing at Lyric Square to make it the same height as the surrounding footways. In the revised design, the crossing would be at carriageway level and dropped kerbs would be provided. This is to provide clearer definition between the footways, cycle track and traffic lane.
- We proposed potential urban realm improvements along one section of King Street. We are now proposing to expand this more widely along King Street and this would include seating and greening in line with the Healthy Streets Approach and the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham’s Streetsmart streetscape manual.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Impact on motorists

Congestion

Some people raised concerns about removal of traffic lanes and current levels of congestion. This section of King Street is currently one-way westbound for all traffic. Our proposals would not remove any traffic lanes along this stretch but would reduce the width of the carriageway to accommodate the two-way cycle track. At bus stops, traffic would still be able to overtake buses so as not to cause delays.

A new pedestrian crossing has been included in the revised designs to help cater for the several schools in the vicinity. The crossing would operate as part of a linked group of traffic signals to avoid any significant impacts to buses or general traffic. We expect the crossing to be well used during school start and end times but our models show the overall impact on journey times for vehicles will be minimal.

Road layout

Some people said they supported the proposals as King Street is already one-way. Others felt that the proposals would create confusion for road users. People also raised concerns that the proposals would limit the ability to exit onto Hammersmith Broadway from King Street or about access for emergency vehicles. As noted above, King Street is already one-way westbound for all traffic and there are no new restrictions on the movements for general traffic, including emergency vehicles. Our proposals would introduce a segregated two-way cycle track on the north side of the
road allowing cyclists to travel along King Street in both directions. The cycle track would be separated from the carriageway with either a traffic island or level different and marked clearly as a cycle track. Double yellow lines will also provide a visual distinction along the edge of the carriageway. At the junction of King Street and Hammersmith Broadway, cyclists will be able to continue east across the top of the gyratory via the two-way track. Cyclist movements would be separated from traffic by signal control to reduce the likelihood of conflict with general traffic. General traffic would only be able to turn onto King Street at this point as per existing arrangements. At the junction of King Street and Bridge Avenue, the cycle track is on the opposite side of the road to the junction so traffic turning in or out would not need to do so across the cycle track. Cyclists wishing to access Bridge Avenue from the cycle track would need to give way to traffic before crossing. Due to the proximity to a pedestrian crossing, there would be opportunities when traffic is stopped for cyclists to do so.

**Cycle Infrastructure**

**Route of track**

Many people supported the proposals to extend contraflow cycling further along King Street and said that current cycling conditions are unsatisfactory on King Street. Some people suggested cyclists use other quiet roads such as Beavor Lane, Black Lion Place or Vencourt Place instead. These quiet roads can provide useful local connections but are not suitable parallel routes for this scheme. Alternative routes to the main roads that require significant diversions for cyclists are likely to reduce the appeal and uptake of cycling. This route would connect to planned cycle routes at Beavor Lane and Bridge Avenue along King Street providing cycle links to Putney Bridge (providing connections to Hammersmith Bridge, the Thames riverside and the A4) and Chiswick station.

**Width of cycle track**

Some people said that narrow cycle tracks make it dangerous to overtake slower cyclists. When designing the scheme, we have taken into account current and expected future cycle flows to inform the width of the cycle track. The two-way cycle track is proposed to be at least 2.8 metres wide for this section of the route. A two metre cycle track would, according to LCDS cater for up to 300 cyclists in the peak hour and a 3 metre cycle track would cater for between 300 and 1000 cyclists in the peak hour which exceeds current demand and would allow cyclists of different speeds to overtake one another. Where flows are tidal, for example during peak times, two-way tracks also offer a more flexible use of space, allowing cyclists to use the opposite side of the track for overtaking if free from oncoming cyclists.

**Impact on pedestrians**
Safety

Some people supported the proposals saying they would improve safety. Others were concerned that the proposals would make the area less safe for pedestrians, increase pedestrian and cyclist conflict as pedestrians could walk into the cycle track without looking.

Along this section of King Street, the two-way cycle track will be separated from pedestrians with either a segregation island or a kerb upstand similar to kerbs used to delineate the edge of the footway and carriageway.

Three signalised crossing points would be provided along this section of the route allowing pedestrians to cross the road and cycle track while traffic and cyclists are held on a red light. Pedestrians wishing to cross the road and cycle track away from these formal crossings points would need to do so with care, looking left and right as they would if crossing any other two-way road. Traffic lights along the route would break up the flow of cyclists providing sufficient gaps for pedestrians to cross.

Pavements

Some people suggested that the pavements in this area are already too narrow and opposed further reduction in walking space, including the north side of King Street east of Lyric Square. People suggested increasing pavement space, removing street clutter or making King Street pedestrianised.

Pedestrian studies were undertaken along King Street to inform the design of this section of the route. Along the majority of the route, pedestrian counts show that pedestrian comfort levels are B+ or higher, indicating a good level of service. Our proposals would narrow the width of some sections of the footway however we would also look to remove street clutter from footways to free up existing disused space. We are also proposing to relocate the pedestrian crossing to Lyric Square where there is more space for people to pass those waiting to cross.

The pavement on the north side of the road, east of Lyric Square is currently one of the busiest sections of King Street. A pinch point is created here by wide containment kerbs with guard railing and a number of advertising boards outside retail properties. Our proposals would reduce the width of the footway in this location but would also remove the guard railing, increasing usable space for walking.

Restricting traffic completely from King Street would require eight bus services to be re-directed, restricting access to the high street for people travelling by bus. We commissioned a survey with local businesses along the route to understand their requirements for loading and servicing, which indicated many businesses along King Street rely on servicing onto the main road and would be impacted should access be restricted. We understand that removal of general traffic movements is an ongoing aspiration of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham and TfL will support the borough in developing these plans alongside the implementation of this scheme. In
addition, we will work with the borough to introduce urban realm improvements such as seating and greening along King Street as part of this scheme, in line with the Healthy Streets approach.

**Crossings**

Some people were concerned that it would be more difficult to cross the road. As set out above, three signalised crossing points would be provided along this section of the route allowing pedestrians to cross the road and cycle track while traffic and cyclists are held on a red light. Pedestrians wishing to cross the road and cycle track away from these formal crossings points would need to do so with care, looking left and right as they would if crossing any other two-way road. Traffic lights along the route would break up the flow of cyclists so there should be sufficient gaps for pedestrians to cross.

**Economic impacts**

Some people supported the scheme as they felt it would benefit high street shops while other people were concerned about loss of footfall affecting business. Some people were concerned that businesses would be affected by restricted delivery and servicing access and that this would damage the local economy.

As set out earlier in this report, people who cycle, walk or use public transport to access their local high streets will visit more often, resulting in higher spend per month. Low traffic streets such as King Street are also easier to cross, less noisy and have cleaner air, drawing shoppers to spend more time there. Cycling improvements will also bring more people visiting or travelling through an area, which means a supply of new potential customers and opportunities for businesses in the area.

As part of the development of our design proposals, we commissioned a survey to be undertaken with local frontages along the route to understand their requirements for loading and servicing. We used the information collected in this survey to inform locations where loading provision is proposed. Along this section of King Street, the majority of businesses load away from the main road, for example on Black’s Road which runs parallel to the south. Where businesses need access to the main road to unload goods, for example the pubs on the south side of King Street, we have ensured that a loading bay is provided in close proximity in accordance with distances set out in TfL’s Kerbside Loading Guidance. In some cases, businesses told us that they use nearby side roads or have their own loading area and do not need to load from the main road and we have taken this into account. We do not expect the changes we have proposed to impact the ability for businesses and retailers to receive deliveries and therefore would not expect this to impact local trade.

---

Impact on bus users

Some people were concerned that by narrowing the carriageway, buses would not be able to overtake parked vehicles. Along this stretch of the route, double yellow lines with double blips are proposed which would restrict parking at the kerbside. Goods vehicles would be able to load from marked bays which would be inset from the carriageway and would not obstruct movement of traffic. General traffic would be able to overtake buses stopped at bus stops.

Some raised concerns about the impact of relocating the westbound bus stop on elderly and disabled people. We are proposing to relocate bus stop U – Kings Mall Shopping Centre to the west slightly where the pavement is wider which would provide more space for people to wait. The bus stop would be directly accessible for pedestrians on the south side of the road and accessible from the north side of the road via either the signalised pedestrian crossing at Bridge Avenue or Lyric Square.
Section E: King Street West (between Leamore Street and Goldhawk Road)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route. These include:

- We have reviewed pedestrian crossings throughout this section with a view to increasing pedestrian priority and space. In the revised design the following crossings will now be signalised across both the carriageway and cycle track rather than signalised just over the carriageway:
  - Toucan crossing on King Street near Studland Street
  - Pedestrian crossing on King Street near Ravenscourt Road
  - Toucan crossing on King Street by Ravenscourt Park
  - Pedestrian crossing on King Street near Black Lion Lane
- We are proposing to provide a new signalised pedestrian crossing on King Street east of Weltje Road in the vicinity of local schools to replace an informal pedestrian crossing west of Weltje Road
- To make space for the additional pedestrian crossing near Weltje Road, we would combine eastbound bus stops E (Ravenscourt Park Station) and F (Ravenscourt Park) into one stop between Ravenscourt Avenue and Ravenscourt Park. We would also move westbound bus stop G (Ravenscourt Park) east towards Beavor Lane. This would also provide more even spacing between bus stops and bring them closer to local schools
- We are proposing ‘keep clear’ road markings on King Street at Rivercourt Road to aid vehicles turning out of Rivercourt Road onto King Street
- We are proposing to provide 90 metres of designated coach parking along the west side of Rivercourt Road, replacing existing residential parking bays and double yellow lines. This coach parking would be for use by local schools transporting pupils to the local area
- We have increased the cycle track set back at a number of access points and side roads to provide more space for a vehicle to wait when pulling in or out. This includes the two vehicle access points outside Latymer Upper School, Weltje Road and the access to the West London Free School. The alignment of this access has also been straightened.
- We have included a turning pocket for traffic to wait in when turning from King Street onto Ravenscourt Park or Beavor Lane
- We proposed for the cycle track opposite Westcroft Square (west) to pass round an existing tree. This tree has since been found to be dead and will instead be removed. We have adjusted the alignment of the cycle track accordingly
- We are proposing a new tree between three existing trees on the south side of King Street outside No. 375 (subject to ground conditions)
- We are proposing double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting or loading) instead of double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only at certain
times) between Nos. 342 and 360 Hammersmith Road as there would not be space for traffic to pass round loading vehicles. Instead, double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only at certain times) are to be provided between Nos. 284 and 288 to the west where there is more space.

We are working closely with the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham on their plans for the redevelopment of Hammersmith Town Hall, including how this scheme will tie in with the proposed layout at Nigel Playfair Avenue on King Street.

Changes at the junction of Goldhawk Road which was consulted as part of Sections E and F include:

- We proposed to ban the westbound left turn for traffic from King Street to British Grove and the eastbound right turn for traffic from Chiswick High Road into British Grove. We are no longer proposing to ban these turns due to concerns regarding local access.
- We are no longer proposing a bus gate on Goldhawk Road following a bus operation review that found it would not be beneficial. Goldhawk Road would remain as two lanes.
- We have reduced the amount of footway cut back on the south side of Chiswick High Road west of the junction with British Grove with the minimum width of the footway to be retained increasing from 2.5 metres to 2.7 metres and from 3.9 metres to 6.8 metres further west.
- We have removed the proposed ‘two stage right turn’ facility for cyclists at this junction as we will instead be separating this movement from motor vehicle traffic using signals.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

**Impact on motorists**

**Congestion**

People were concerned that proposals would increase congestion at Goldhawk Road. We have made changes to the proposed operation of this junction including removing the proposed banned turns into British Grove and removing the proposed bus gate on Goldhawk Road. Our updated traffic models show the overall impact on journey times for vehicles will be minimal.
Road layout

There was concern over removal of traffic lanes or that roads would not be wide enough for large vehicles. Some people were also concerned about the ability of traffic to exit side roads.

Along this section of King Street, the cycle track would replace sections of the existing westbound bus lane and general traffic lanes would be retained in each direction. Traffic lanes would be sufficiently wide to cater for the types of vehicles that use this route, including allowing more space around bus stops to allow for overtaking.

See Section 2.1 for information about how traffic would exit at side roads.

Access to British Grove

People raised concerns about access to British Grove with our proposals to ban turns here or felt that relocated bus stops would block driver visibility or that traffic would be pushed down residential roads including St. Peters Square. People were also concerned about parking restrictions on British Grove.

At consultation we proposed the ban the left and right turns into British Grove. Following feedback received regarding access to British Grove for local residents, we are no longer proposing to ban these turns and have revised the design and traffic signal operation at the junction to accommodate this. Cyclists and pedestrians will still be separated from traffic by separate signal stages. The layout of the junction has been designed so that westbound vehicles would have forward visibility of the traffic signals despite the bus stop being relocated slightly closer to the junction. We are not proposing any changes to parking restrictions on British Grove.

Cycle Infrastructure

Route of track

Some people said that the current eastbound track is not well used and confuses people. There was also concern that the scheme would make cycling more complicated at Studland Street. Along the westbound one-way section of King Street between Studland Street and Bridge Avenue there is a narrow existing eastbound cycle track. Despite providing a useful contraflow connection for this stretch, the lack of onward eastbound facilities limits its use for cyclists wishing to reach destinations beyond this point. The narrow width of the cycle track also means that capacity and quality are limited making the facility less attractive. The two-way track proposed as part of this scheme would provide eastbound facilities west of this point as well as facilitating onward eastbound connections through and beyond the gyratory. The cycle track would provide more space for cyclists and accommodate westbound
flows too. At Studland Street, the cycle track would pass through the junction on the south side of the road, avoiding turning movements into Studland Street.

Others said that vehicles currently park in the cycle track. We aim to make the cycle facilities clearly recognisable through defined infrastructure and road markings to reduce the likelihood of vehicles mistakenly driving or parking in the cycle track. Where we have installed two-way tracks in other locations such as the North-South Cycle Superhighway, cycle logo markings and ‘cycle only’ signs have been installed at all entrances and exits. We are aware of isolated instances where some drivers were mistakenly entering the cycle track however this has decreased over time as drivers have become more accustomed to new layouts. Cycle tracks provide right of way for cyclists under Section 65 of the Highways Act (1980) and anyone that is found to be parking within a designated cycle track can be issued with a fixed penalty notice as this is prohibited.

**Cycle track**

There was concern raised that trees would be too close to the cycle track between St Peters Square and Black Lion Lane. In some cases, the cycle track will run parallel to a line on trees however we would ensure that there is an appropriate buffer between the tree trunk and the cycle track, as we would do for any nearby street furniture. We have also ensured that the cycle track does not encroach into the width of the tree pit.

People also raised concerns about the width of the cycle track or suggested signage and markings to make side road priority for cyclists obvious.

See Section 2.1 for further details regarding priority junctions and side roads.

See Section 2.1 for further details regarding two-way cycle tracks.

**Segregation**

Some suggested physical barriers be put between cyclists, cars and pedestrians. The cycle tracks will be separated from the footway and carriageway with either a kerb upstand or raised delineation strip. Higher physical barriers reduce the effective width of the cycle track as cyclists cannot cycle too close to them for risk of hitting their handlebars or pedals. They also reduce the ability for cyclists to stop and dismount to access cycle parking and local amenities.

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Pavements**

People were concerned about reduction in walking space and suggested increasing pavement widths. Specific concerns were raised about pavement widths at British Grove.
Throughout the route, we have endeavoured to ensure that pavement space is suitable for pedestrian flows. Along King Street, the cycle track replaces the westbound bus lane for the majority of the route and we have endeavoured to keep footway cut backs to a minimum. In some locations such as at side roads, we are proposing to increase footway space to tighten the radius of junctions and reduce crossing distances for pedestrians. Where we have proposed reductions to the existing footway, we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to assess whether the design of the footways are appropriate to the volume and type of users within the street environment. Following feedback received during the consultation we have changed our proposals at the junction of British Grove. We are proposing to reduce the extent of footway cut back originally proposed on the south side of Chiswick High Road west of British Grove.

Crossings

People suggested pedestrian priority be made at crossings. There are currently seven pedestrian crossings along this section of King Street. All existing signal-controlled crossings would be retained at or near to current locations providing pedestrian priority across the road. We are also proposing to convert existing zebra crossings to signalised crossings in two locations.

Following feedback from the consultation, we have reviewed the design of crossings along the route and are proposing to make the following crossings signalised across the road and cycle track rather than just the road:

- King Street by Black Lion Lane
- King Street by Dalling Road

Since consultation, we are also proposing a new pedestrian crossing to the east of Weltje Road which would support pupils crossing between local schools nearby.

Impact on bus users

Some people opposed the proposed removal of the westbound bus lane. See Section 2.1 for our response regarding changes to bus lanes. Other people raised concerns about changes to bus stops. There are seven bus stops along this section of the route. We are proposing to make some changes to the road layout which impacts the location of some bus stops and we are proposing to introduce bus stop bypasses at others.

Proposed changes to bus stops in this section of the design include:

- Relocating eastbound bus stop C – Dalling Road to Studland Street to provide sufficient space for vehicles to overtake a stopped bus
- Relocating westbound bus stop G – Ravenscourt Park Station to the east by 40 metres to provide sufficient space for vehicles to overtake a stopped bus
• Consolidating eastbound bus stop F – Ravenscourt Park with bus stop E – Ravenscourt Park Station to facilitate the provision of a new pedestrian crossing by Weltje Road and relocating bus stop E to the east by 80 metres to provide sufficient space for vehicles to overtake a stopped bus

• Adding bus stop bypasses to the following eastbound bus stops alongside the cycle track:
  - Bus stop WA – Hammersmith Town Hall
  - Bus stop D – Ravenscourt Park Station
  - Bus stop G – Ravenscourt Park
  - Bus stop H – Goldhawk Road

In locations where we are proposing changes, we have considered the impacts carefully and are satisfied that minimum spacing between stops and access to local services would be maintained.

**Environmental impacts**

Some people were opposed to removal of trees. We are proposing to plant one new tree along this section of King Street alongside removal of one small tree. At consultation we originally proposed to remove two trees however we have adjusted our designs and now no longer need to remove the tree on the south side of King Street by West London Free School. Opposite Westcroft Square, we had proposed for the cycle track to go round an existing tree however this tree has now been identified as dead and will instead be removed.

**Economic impacts**

People were concerned about economic impact on local shops and businesses or about restricted delivery and servicing access. Along this section of King Street, loading can be undertaken on double or single yellow lines where there are single blips on the kerbside or within loading bays.

As part of the development of our design proposals, we commissioned a survey to be undertaken with local frontages along the route to understand their requirements for loading and servicing. We used the information collected in this survey to inform locations where loading provision is proposed. Where businesses need access to the main road to unload goods, we have ensured that either a loading bay or single blips are provided in close proximity in accordance with distances set out in TfL’s Kerbside Loading Guidance. In some cases, businesses told us that they use nearby side roads or have their own loading area and do not need to load from the main road and we have taken this into account.

Following a review of the designs and of the feedback received during the consultation, we made some changes to the location of loading provisions as follows:
• We are proposing double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting or loading) instead of double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only during certain times) between Nos. 342 and 360 Hammersmith Road as there would not be space for traffic to pass round loading vehicles. Instead, double yellow lines with single blips (waiting / loading only during certain times) are to be provided between Nos. 284 and 288 to the west where there is more space.

In the consulted designs, we also proposed to increase restrictions on loading on the south side of King Street from 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm, Monday to Friday to 7am to 10am and 4pm to 8pm Monday to Sunday. This was in line with our proposals to increase bus lane operational hours to these times. We are now no longer proposing to extend weekday operation of bus lanes to 8pm so weekday loading restrictions would remain as existing. At weekends, loading would be restricted from 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm on Saturdays but unrestricted on Sundays. All changes to loading restrictions will be subject to further statutory consultation (traffic orders).

Some people were concerned that the proposals would result in a loss of café culture. Pavement café licences are granted to food premises such as cafes, restaurants or bars to allow them to place tables and chairs on the public footpath to sell refreshments. In developing our designs, we have reviewed locations along King Street where outdoor seating is provided. The cycle track is located on the outside of the tree line, replacing bus lane for much of this section of the route. As such, cut backs to the footway don’t encroach designated outdoor seating space which is located within the tree line. Overall, we hope that by converting more of the highway to sustainable transport modes, and moving traffic further away from the footways, our proposals will make dining outside at these restaurants more attractive than it currently is, helping to stimulate business.

**Impact on Schools**

Some people were concerned about the ability to drop children off at school. Other people were concerned about loss of pavement space in the area around schools. We also received feedback during the consultation from local schools who supported the proposals in principle but had concerns about safety and access for their pupils. We have undertaken further engagement with schools since the consultation to understand their concerns in more detail and to consider changes that can be made to our designs to mitigate these.

Under our proposals, all existing properties within the area, including schools, will remain accessible by motor vehicle. In the long-term, we expect our proposals to make walking and cycling more attractive and contribute to reducing motor traffic congestion and improving road safety around schools by encouraging local people to walk or cycle school run trips, instead of driving.
Following feedback from the consultation, we have made changes to the proposed pedestrian crossings along King Street nearby to a number of schools and nurseries. We are now proposing to make the staggered crossing outside Latymer Upper School straight across so that pupils crossing to reach Ravenscourt Park station and local bus stops can do so in one movement and both cyclists and traffic will be held on a red light. This also increases available footway space for pedestrians to wait before crossing.

We are also proposing a new straight across crossing to the east of Weltje Road outside West London Free School. To make space for the additional pedestrian crossing, we would combine eastbound bus stops E (Ravenscourt Park Station) and F (Ravenscourt Park) into one stop between Ravenscourt Avenue and Ravenscourt Park. We would also move westbound bus stop G (Ravenscourt Park) east towards Beavor Lane. This would provide more even spacing between bus stops and bring them closer to local schools.

Following our engagement with Latymer Upper School, we are proposing 90 metres of coach parking along the east side of the school on Rivercourt Road, replacing existing residential parking bays and double yellow lines. This is to facilitate the collection and drop off of pupils from local schools to nearby sports grounds. This is in response to their concerns regarding the reduced ability for coaches to stop on King Street following our proposal to remove the westbound bus lane here. This proposal will be subject to statutory consultation (traffic orders).

**Impact on residents**

Some people were concerned that the scheme would restrict access to properties and for deliveries. We are not proposing any changes that would impact the ability for residential properties to receive deliveries. As set out earlier in this report, we are also no longer proposing banned turns for traffic into British Grove.
Section F: Chiswick High Road (from Goldhawk Road to Heathfield Terrace)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route. Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfi.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details. These include:

- We proposed to ban the westbound left turn for traffic from King Street to British Grove and the eastbound right turn for traffic from Chiswick High Road into British Grove. We are no longer proposing to ban these turns due to concerns regarding local access.
- We are no longer proposing a bus gate on Goldhawk Road following a bus operation review that found it would not be beneficial. Goldhawk Road would remain as two lanes.
- We have reduced the amount of footway cut back on the south side of Chiswick High Road west of the junction with British Grove with the minimum width of the footway to be retained increasing from 2.5 metres to 2.7 metres and from 3.9 metres to 6.8 metres further west.
- We have removed the proposed ‘two stage right turn’ facility for cyclists at this junction as we will instead be separating this movement from motor vehicle traffic using signals.
- We are proposing to increase the cycle track set back distance at the junction with Airedale Avenue to provide more space for motor vehicles to wait when turning in or out.
- We are proposing to increase the length of the proposed raised junction at Linden Gardens (east) so that it includes traffic exiting the nearby car park.
- We have reviewed the design of crossings along the route and are proposing to make the following crossings signalised across both the road and cycle track rather than just the carriageway:
  - Chiswick High Road between Mayfield Avenue and Thornton Avenue
  - Chiswick High Road between Homefield Road and Airedale Avenue
  - Chiswick High Road between Cleveland Avenue and Ravensmede Way
- We are proposing to retain the existing footway width outside Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church. To achieve this we are proposing to reduce the eastbound approach to the junction of Duke’s Avenue from two lanes to one to make space for the cycle track on the carriageway.
- We are proposing 12 metres of additional single yellow line with single blips outside nos. 18 to 20 Chiswick High Road for the local supermarket to load outside of peak hours. We would remove a short section of proposed bus lane on the south side of Chiswick High Road east of Cranbrook Road to make space for motor traffic to overtake vehicles loading here.
- We are proposing a new seven metre loading bay on the south side of Chiswick High Road between Brackley Road and Cranbrook Road for the use...
of the nearby funeral directors. This requires reducing the number of proposed pay and display parking bays here from seven to five

- We are proposing to increase the length of the proposed loading bay on the north side of Chiswick High Road west of Mayfield Avenue from 15 metres to 25 metres to match the length of the existing loading bay
- We are reducing the length of the loading bay on the north side of Chiswick High Road west of Fishers Lane from 28 metres to 18 metres to reduce the impact on the footway
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Thornton Avenue as a planter has been installed in this location
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Linden Gardens as this would have blocked access to Linden Passage
- We are proposing to remove the tree outside no 87 Chiswick High Road to maintain more footway width outside the shops at Nos. 87 – 95 Chiswick High Road while allowing appropriate carriageway widths for traffic to pass buses using the bus stop and maintaining movements through the Chiswick Lane junction.
- We proposed four additional pay and display bays on the west side of Duke’s Avenue. Following feedback from the consultation and our discussions with Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church we are no longer proposing these bays and will instead retain the existing single yellow line as this will provide more opportunity for parking as required*
- We are proposing one additional pay and display bay on Upham Park Road and two additional pay and display bays on Ennismore Avenue.
- We are no longer proposing to remove a tree on the corner of Chiswick High Road and Windmill Road as part of this scheme as the tree has been felled by a utility company
- We are proposing to ban the right turn out of Duke Road for all traffic (except cyclists) in response to safety and congestion concerns with additional traffic using Duke Road as a result of becoming one-way. Traffic would be able to use Annandale to exit east onto Chiswick High Road instead.*
- We previously proposed to reduce Annandale Road from two lanes to one at its junction with Chiswick High Road. We are now proposing to keep two lanes on exit at this junction to facilitate additional motor traffic movements at this junction as a result of the removal of the right turn at the Duke Road junction*

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

**Principles of the scheme**
Prioritisation of modes

Some people queried the use of segregation from motor traffic for cyclists along Chiswick High Road saying that the scheme does not meet with London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS, 2014) guidance.

LCDS sets out requirements and advice for cycle network planning and for the design of dedicated cycle infrastructure. Currently Chiswick High Road has on carriageway advisory cycle lanes and bus lanes however, as set out earlier in this report, there are a high number of collisions involving cyclists occurring along this route suggesting that this provision could be improved.

Traffic volumes and speeds also play a key role in the choice of facility and LCDS recommends that if cyclists are not separated from traffic then level of service is highest where actual traffic speeds are below 20mph and even then, the highest levels of service come with peak volumes below 200 vehicles per hour. While the London Borough of Hounslow are seeking to implement 20mph speed limits along Chiswick high Road, traffic flows are around 700 vehicles per hour in the peak which far exceeds the recommended peak volumes. As set out earlier in this report, cyclists surveyed using existing segregated cycle routes say that one of the main reasons they choose to cycle is because the route feels safe enough to do so.

See Section 2.1 for our response regarding prioritisation of different transport modes.

Conservation and aesthetics

Some people were concerned that the scheme would damage local aesthetics or that the history, tradition and feel of the area would be negatively affected. Others said they supported the benefits the scheme would bring to the village character and businesses and that it would improve aesthetics.

As set out earlier in this report, there is high current and future demand for cycling along the proposed route, including along Chiswick High Road. There are also a high number of collisions involving pedestrian or cyclist casualties. The designs for this area look to transform the street to provide the right balance of space for cycling, walking and use of public transport and tackle issues of safety to encourage mode shift.

While we appreciate the importance that the history and aesthetics of an area can have, we must also provide appropriate infrastructure for the needs of those using it. In order to provide high quality cycle facilities along Chiswick High Road, changes to the road layout are essential. This includes reallocation of road space, particularly on the southern side where the cycle track is proposed. When designing the scheme, we have tried to maintain elements of local importance that contribute to the aesthetics of the area.
We are aware that Chiswick High Road (between Chiswick Lane and Heathfield Terrace) was designated a recognised Conservation Area in 2015 and we have consulted with conservation officers at Hounslow Council on the proposals who have, so far, raised no objections.

Key characteristics that led Chiswick High Road to be designated as a Conservation Area are set out in Hounslow Council’s Chiswick High Road Conservation Area Appraisal and include “its development as a shopping street in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and the survival of the buildings from this age…with a strong and consistent parapet line, high quality detailing and use of materials.” As our proposals are limited to the layout of the highway, it will not alter any of the buildings however choice of materials such as surfacing and street furniture will be in keeping with the conservation status of the area.

Within the highway area, the report notes that “The High Road itself is an extremely busy road but the wide pavements lined with trees serve as a buffer for pedestrians” and “The trees that line the road are an essential part of the character of the conservation area and help buffer pedestrians from the busy traffic on the main road.” We are proposing to plant up to nine new trees along Chiswick High Road alongside removal of just three. We are also proposing to retain all of the existing planters.

We have proposed the cycle track on the outside of the trees for the majority of the length of the route which would further separate pedestrians from the busy High Road. Only at the west end of the road by Heathfield Terrace where pavements are very wide is the cycle track proposed to go between the tree line and footway however this does not decrease the overall distance pedestrians would be from traffic, and a buffer between the cycle track and the carriageway would increase the distance between pedestrians and general traffic. As such, the provision of a cycle track reduces the overall space within the street taken up by motor vehicles and our noise and air quality assessments demonstrate that this would lead to improvements for people in the area.

We have considered the local café culture by ensuring that every outdoor licence along the street has been considered in the design and accommodated for within the layout of the footways. We have retained or relocated existing street furniture such as benches and cycle stands and proposed new street furniture where appropriate. We are also looking to de-clutter unnecessary street furniture by consolidating signs onto fewer posts and removing redundant pieces. We have recognised that the north side of the street has a higher pedestrian demand and have limited our proposals on this side of the road. Our proposals would upgrade out of date infrastructure such as signals and signs and bring new, low energy alternatives with benefits such as pedestrian countdown systems which show how much time there is left to cross the road. We have also engaged with local businesses and retailers to understand their
loading and servicing requirements to ensure that this is accommodated within the
designs and the retail and economic function of the street is maintained.

We feel that the scheme will likely enhance rather than diminish the amenity value of
the area and help towards creating a ‘village feel’. We would continue to engage with
conservation officers throughout the continued development of the scheme to ensure
any impact on specific amenity assets is minimised.

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Pavement Space**

Many people raised concerns about how the scheme might impact pedestrian
footways including reallocating parts of wide pavements to cyclists. Specific
concerns were raised about potential pinch points at Our Lady of Grace and St
Edward church and at the junction with British Grove and others raised concerns in
general about current pedestrian congestion.

Along Chiswick High Road, the majority of space for the cycle track is being taken
from road space. In some locations it has been necessary to adjust kerb lines
leading to some localised reductions in the width of current footways. In other
locations we have extended kerb lines out into the road converting road space to
footway. In addition, further pavement space is provided in the form of segregation
islands between the footway and cycle track, for example at bus stop bypasses and
some crossings. On the south side of the road, pedestrians would also be further
away from traffic than they are under the existing layout as the cycle track provides a
further buffer between the pavement and the road.

Demand for pedestrian space along Chiswick High Road was assessed during the
design development of the scheme by looking at pedestrian flows along the route.
Pedestrian count surveys undertaken for the scheme show there are significantly
more pedestrians on the north side of the road than the south side with peak hour
flows on weekday or weekends being at least double and in some cases, up to nine
times higher on the north side than the south.

Our proposals for a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road mean that the
north (busier) side is substantially unchanged with no significant changes to footway
widths. On the south side, the cycle track replaces road space for much of the route
however some kerb line changes have been necessary which lead to increased or
decreased footway space in some locations.
Footways are only proposed to be reduced where it is not possible to take space from the road without impacting upon the safe operation of the road network and then only where the remaining footway widths are sufficient for the flow of pedestrians who use them.

As described in Section 2.1, pedestrian comfort level assessments have been undertaken to inform the design of the scheme and all locations where footway cut backs are proposed along Chiswick High Road remain within recommended levels of comfort for high street activity. This provides enough space for people to walk at the speed and route they choose and as such pedestrian congestion is not expected to be an issue. In addition, we have ensured that all footways are at least a minimum of two metres wide to allow two wheelchairs or strollers to pass comfortably.

Following feedback received during the consultation we have changed our proposals at the junction of Chiswick High Road and British Grove. We are proposing to reduce the extent of footway cut back originally proposed on the south side of Chiswick High Road west of British Grove. We are also proposing to increase the footway outside Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church, see below for more details.

Café culture

Some people were concerned that the changes we are proposing to footways would impact the ability for restaurants or cafés to continue providing outdoor seating and that this would have an impact on the local ‘café culture’.

Pavement café licences are granted to food premises such as cafes, restaurants or bars to allow them to place tables and chairs on the public footpath to sell refreshments. In developing our designs, we have reviewed all locations where
licences are held. There are currently 33 premises along Chiswick High Road with such licences. Of these, 10 are not within the geographic scope of the scheme and would therefore not be impacted. Of the remaining 23, 15 are on the north side of the road where footway widths are not affected and six on the south side are also not affected. We are proposing to cut back footways outside two premises: Zizzi and Byron. In these two locations, the remaining footway widths have been reviewed and would leave space for pedestrians to pass. Overall, we hope our proposals will make dining outside at these restaurants more attractive than it currently is, helping to stimulate business as diners would be further away from motorised traffic and pollution that arises.

**Vulnerable groups**

Many people raised concerns about the proposals on Chiswick High Road and the impact the scheme might have on vulnerable people such as children, elderly and disabled people. See [Section 2.1](#) for our response regarding the impacts of the scheme on vulnerable groups.

**Conflict with cyclists**

Respondents raised a number of concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians such as the risk of pedestrian and cyclist conflict, cyclists on pavements, visibility of cyclists and crime such as theft by cyclists. Some suggested increasing the height of kerbs between footways and cycle tracks to encourage pedestrians to stay on the footway. A number of people said they were concerned the proposals would create confusion for pedestrians.

We promote the message that the Highway Code must be adhered to by all road users, and we are strongly in favour of promoting the ethos of ‘responsible cycling’ and mutual respect between cyclists and other users. This means working to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement and cycling at night without adequate lighting. By providing a segregated cycle track for cyclists, we hope to encourage a wider demographic of people to take up cycling including those who currently do not feel comfortable cycling on the road doing so illegally on the pavements.

We have designed the cycle track to be visually different from the footway so that space for pedestrians and cyclists is clearly defined. This includes measures such as colour contrast surfaces, road markings and a height difference between the footway and cycle track with either a kerb upstand or delineation strip. Where a level difference is provided, the cycle track would be below the level of the existing footway. This is far more practical than raising the level of the existing footway to suit due to requirements for drainage and access to adjacent property doors and thresholds. It also creates problems for cyclists as there is a greater risk of clipping pedals on high kerbs.
We are not aware of any increases in crime or thefts as a result of new cycle tracks or cycle routes.

**Crossings and severance**

People raised concerns that the proposals would make it more difficult for people to cross the road and were concerned about removal of crossings. Some people were concerned that pedestrians would not have enough time to cross the road and the cycle track and suggested minimising wait times and maximising crossing time for pedestrians or shortening crossing distances by reducing the number of traffic lanes. People also raised concerns about severance between the north and south sides of the road and the level of pedestrian priority to cross the cycle track between road crossings and the main footway.

There are currently 13 pedestrian crossings (10 signalised and three zebra) along the 1.2km section of Chiswick High Road within the scope of the scheme. This equates to a crossing roughly every 100 metres, or every minute and a half based on average walking speeds. All existing signal-controlled crossings would be retained at or near to current locations and we are proposing to convert all existing zebra crossings to signalised crossings. Pedestrian average wait times are not generally predicted to change and have been improved in some locations. Other improvements to crossings along Chiswick High Road include:

- Nine of the crossings would be widened which would improve capacity and decrease the potential for the rest of the footway to be blocked by those waiting to cross
- Four of the crossings would be shortened, reducing the distance pedestrians need to walk to cross the road
- Two of the crossings at Chiswick High Road and Heathfield Terrace junction would be simplified including reducing the number of crossing movements required to cross

Following feedback from the consultation, we have reviewed the design of crossings along the route and are proposing to make the following crossings signalised across both the road and cycle track rather than just the carriageway:

- Chiswick High Road between Mayfield Avenue and Thornton Avenue
- Chiswick High Road between Homefield Road and Airedale Avenue
- Chiswick High Road between Cleveland Avenue and Ravensmede Way

We do not expect the ability for pedestrians to cross the road to be compromised by the scheme or the inclusion of a cycle track and at some crossings, this experience would be improved. As noted in earlier sections of this report, the wide pavements, trees and cycle track would provide a buffer from traffic for pedestrians along this road, however there would still be plenty of opportunities for pedestrians to cross from one side of the road to the other safely.
See Section 2.1 for our response regarding crossing times for pedestrians.

**Seating**

Some people were concerned about a decrease in on-street seating. In some locations we are proposing to relocate benches or seating to accommodate changes to the road layout. We would look to relocate seating to nearby locations which do not impede upon pedestrian walking space. We would also look to install new seating in some locations where we there is space to do so. As such, we are not proposing an overall decrease in on street seating.

**Impact on motorists**

**Congestion**

Some people raised concerns about congestion in specific areas. See Section 2.1 for more information.

**Parking**

Some respondents said they were opposed to loss of parking on Chiswick High Road. People were concerned that shoppers would be forced to use resident parking on minor roads. Others were concerned that proposed parking bays would impact traffic flow.

Parking on Chiswick High Road is subject to controlled parking zone (CPZ) restrictions Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm. There are currently 27 pay and display bays where motor vehicles can pay to park during the day. Outside of these times, vehicles can park for free in these bays or on single yellow lines. Additional parking is found in the car park set back on the south side of the road or on nearby side roads where a mixture of single yellow line, pay and display bays and residents’ parking is found.

Businesses often over estimate the number of customers who arrive by car. A survey conducted with visitors in summer 2016 showed that on Chiswick High Road, the vast majority of trips are made from within 2 miles (77 per cent), and that the percentage of trips by visitors made by car is as low as eight per cent. This suggests that there is scope to redress the balance of road users locations like this in order to provide better facilities for cycling and walking, without unduly impacting residents and businesses.

To inform the design proposals we carried out parking surveys to understand the demand for parking along Chiswick High Road and nearby side roads. Our surveys show that only about a quarter of the current single yellow line provision is currently being used at any one time in the evenings, once the CPZ is lifted, with peak parking between 9pm and 10pm. Before 7am, demand for parking on single yellow lines is
very low. On Sundays, when the CPZ is not in operation, demand for parking on single yellow lines is highest in the middle of the day and surveys show that up to half of the capacity currently provided is vacant at any one time.

Demand for pay and display bays on the main road was found to be fairly consistent throughout the day and across different days of the week however we found that supply of bays outweighed the demand for at all times with at least ten bays vacant at any one time. The results of these surveys indicate that there is scope to reduce the provision of single yellow line and pay and display bays along the main road.

At consultation, we proposed to relocate a number of pay and display bays from the main road to nearby side roads to make space for the cycle track and proposed to remove sections of single yellow line and replace this with double yellow lines which would restrict parking at all times. We had also proposed to extend the restriction on single yellow line parking to 8pm throughout the week and to include peak times on Sundays, in line with changes we proposed to bus lane operational hours.

Following a review of the designs since consultation we have made some changes to the proposals for pay and display bays as follows:

- In addition to three existing bays, we proposed four additional pay and display bays on the south side of Chiswick High Road between Brackley Road and Cranbrook Road, making seven bays in total. Following a review of loading requirements, we are now proposing to provide a new loading bay here for the funeral directors and as a result will only be providing two additional pay and display bays, making five pay and display bays in total
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Thornton Avenue as a planter has been installed in this location
- We are no longer proposing an additional pay and display bay on Linden Gardens as this would have blocked access to Linden Passage
- We proposed four additional pay and display bays on the west side of Duke’s Avenue. Following feedback from the consultation and our discussions with Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church we are no longer proposing these bays and will instead retain the existing single yellow line which provides greater flexibility for parking and loading for the church
- We are proposing one additional pay and display bay on Upham Park Road and two additional pay and display bays on Ennismore Avenue.

We have also separately reviewed our proposals for bus lane operational hours and are now no longer proposing to extend operation to 8pm in the evenings or to Sundays. Bus lane operational hours will be 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm Monday to Saturday. As a result, no further restrictions on single yellow line parking, beyond the current CPZ hours are proposed. Evening and Sunday parking is perceived by
some to be important for local shops and restaurants and this change addresses these concerns.

In the revised designs, provision of single yellow line on the main road exceeds current demand for parking according to data from our surveys. Provision for pay and display bays on the main road and side roads is also in excess of observed current demand. As such, we do not anticipate that the changes proposed would increase the likelihood for people to park within residential parking areas instead. Moreover, we expect over time that more local shopping trips be made by foot, by bike or by bus, reducing the overall need for motor vehicle parking space.

All changes to parking restrictions will be subject to further statutory consultation (traffic orders).

See Section 2.1 for more information about impacts on parking and enforcement.

**Access and through traffic**

Some people raised concerns about rat running and suggested closing roads to through traffic. Other people were concerned that closing roads would reduce residents' access to Chiswick High Road. People were also concerned that the scheme would prevent deliveries to residents.

Our proposals aim to reduce through traffic on residential roads. For example, the scheme proposes no access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road or Stile Hall Gardens. Here, up to 75 per cent of vehicles travelling through the residential area are non-residential through traffic. Reducing traffic volumes on these roads would reduce congestion at peak periods, make it easier for pedestrians to cross roads and improve conditions for people who want to cycle. The impact of this closure will be monitored and further measures considered if deemed necessary.

At consultation we proposed to ban the left and right turns into British Grove, the eastbound right turn onto Heathfield Terrace for general traffic and to make Duke Road / Duke’s Avenue one-way via Bourne Place.

Following feedback received regarding access to British Grove for local residents, we are no longer proposing to ban these turns and have revised the design and method of control at the junction to accommodate this. Cyclists and pedestrians will be separated from traffic in time and space with their own signals. As a result, British Grove remains unchanged.

The right turn from Chiswick High Road onto Heathfield Terrace is currently made by a low number of vehicles and banning it to general traffic allows the junction to be operated more efficiently for road users, including motor traffic. Alternative routes for traffic wishing to access Heathfield Terrace are via Town Hall Avenue and Sutton Lane North.
The changes at Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road do not prevent access to residential areas south of Chiswick High Road as entry is maintained at Duke’s Avenue. Further to the consulted design, we are proposing to introduce a banned right turn for traffic exiting Duke Road to reduce the likelihood of congestion, improve safety and simplify the movements at this junction. This would mean that traffic would only be able to turn left onto Chiswick High Road. Access to the east would be accessible via Annandale Road or Chiswick Lane. These changes are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

Our traffic modelling previously undertaken for the proposals showed that any displacement of traffic would likely occur away from the A315 towards the A4. Updated traffic modelling shows during the evening (PM) peak, westbound traffic is predicted to reroute westbound onto the A4 as an alternative to Wellesley Road. Traffic would also reroute from the northern side of Hammersmith Gyratory, including Beadon Road onto Shepherds Bush Road in the morning (AM) peak. No access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and from Stile Hall Gardens is predicted to reduce traffic in the westbound direction on Chiswick High Road and Wellesley Road while traffic would reroute partly via Oxford Road northbound and then Chiswick Roundabout. Smaller amounts of well-spread rerouting is also predicted in this area.

**Side roads**

Some people had concerns regarding the cycle track alongside side roads. See Section 2.1 for our response regarding the design of side roads along the route.

**Cycle Infrastructure**

**Location of the cycle track**

Some people suggested that the cycle track should be located on the north side of Chiswick High Road. See here for more information regarding the location of the cycle track.

**Segregation**

People raised concerns that the cycle track would not be wide enough for overtaking or that barriers should be put between cyclists, cars and pedestrians for safety. People were also concerned about proximity of the cycle track to car doors.

When designing the scheme, we have taken into account current and expected future cycle flows to inform the width of the cycle track. The two-way cycle track is proposed to be 2.5 metres wide, increasing to 3 metres in some locations which would allow cyclists of different speeds to overtake one another. According to LCDS, a 2 metre wide cycle track would cater for up to 300 cyclists in the peak hour and a 3 metre wide cycle track would cater for between 300 and 1000 cyclists in the peak hour. When flows are tidal, for example during peak times, two-way tracks offer a...
more flexible use of space, allowing cyclists to use the opposite side of the track for overtaking if free from oncoming cyclists.

As per LCDS recommendations, we have ensured that a buffer zone of at least 0.5m is provided between cyclists and parked cars in order to minimise the risk of collisions between cyclists and car doors.

The cycle tracks will be separated from the footway and carriageway with either a kerb upstand or raised delineation strip. Higher physical barriers reduce the effective width of the cycle track as cyclists cannot cycle too close to them for risk of hitting their handlebars or pedals. They also reduce the ability for cyclists to stop and dismount to access cycle parking and local amenities. Angled kerbs can provide greater effective widths for cyclists and will be considered at the detailed design stage.

**Access**

Some people asked how cyclists would join or leave the route at minor roads to or from the westbound segregated track including at Fishers Lane, Goldhawk Road and Prebend Gardens.

Despite two-way tracks being on one side of the road, local access is maintained at the majority of junctions and side roads. At junctions, for example Goldhawk Road, cyclists turning movements will be accommodated with separate signal staging, two-stage turns or cycle crossings.

At non-signalised side roads, there will be gaps in the segregation island for cyclists to wait to cross the road. These gaps are wide enough to accommodate waiting cyclists while not blocking the track for others continuing ahead. In some locations, for example Fisher’s Lane it has not been possible to provide direct access to or from certain side roads and cyclists would need to join or leave the route via a nearby side road.

Prebend Gardens is one-way southbound. Access to this road from the route would be possible by turning left at the Goldhawk Road junction and connecting to Prebend Gardens via a shared use connection along Goldhawk Road.

People raised concerns that westbound cyclists cannot continue straight on Chiswick High Road at Heathfield Terrace and about the sharp turns for cyclists crossing at Heathfield Terrace. Cyclists wishing to continue westbound on Chiswick High Road would do so via the advanced cycle stop line in the main carriageway. Cyclists following the route westbound along Heathfield Terrace, would do via a give way arrangement allowing cyclists to by-pass the traffic signals at the junction. The sharp turns and perpendicular layout of the cycle crossings at this junction are intended to increase visibility and reduce speeds.
Cycle parking

Some people were concerned that cycle parking may reduce pavement space. We are proposing to provide new cycle parking where there is demand for it and to encourage people to use the new cycle track to reach local shops and amenities. We would position cycle racks away from the main pedestrian desire lines and in line with existing street furniture so that it does not reduce the effective width of the footway. In some locations, we would install cycle parking on the islands between the cycle track and the carriageway, away from the pedestrian footway.

Economic impacts

Impact on local businesses

Some people said that the scheme would negatively impact the businesses of Chiswick or de-value properties. People felt that loss of pavement, parking and loading space would restrict access to businesses or for deliveries.

In the proposed design, loading can be undertaken on double or single yellow lines where there are single blips on the kerbside. There are also three loading bays proposed along the route for use by goods vehicles only.

As part of the development of our design proposals, we commissioned a survey to be undertaken with local frontages along the route to understand their requirements for loading and servicing. We used the information collected in this survey to inform locations where loading provision is proposed. Where businesses need access to the main road to unload goods, we have ensured that either a loading bay or off-peak loading opportunities where single yellow blips are provided in close proximity, in accordance with distances set out in TfL’s Kerbside Loading Guidance. In some cases, businesses told us that they use nearby side roads or have their own loading area and do not need to load from the main road and we have taken this into account.

Following a review of the designs and of the feedback received during the consultation, we made some changes to the location of loading provisions as follows:

- We are proposing 12 metres of single yellow line with single blips outside nos. 18 to 20 Chiswick High Road to provide space for the nearby supermarket to load
- We are proposing a new 7 metre loading bay on the south side of Chiswick High Road between Brackley Road and Cranbrook Road for the nearby funeral directors to load
- We are proposing to increase the size of the loading bay on the north side of Chiswick High Road west of Mayfield Avenue from 15 metres to 25 metres to match the length of the existing loading bay
In the consulted designs, we also proposed to increase restrictions on loading from 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm, Monday to Friday to 7am to 10am and 4pm to 8pm Monday to Sunday. This was in line with our proposals to increase bus lane operational hours to these times. We are now no longer proposing to extend weekday operation of bus lanes to 8pm so weekday loading restrictions would remain as existing. At weekends, loading would be restricted from 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm on Saturdays but unrestricted on Sundays.

All changes to loading restrictions will be subject to further statutory consultation.

See here for information about the impacts of parking of the local economy and here for impacts on pavement space on footfall and café culture on Chiswick High Road.

Some people suggested policies to support local businesses. We promote policies such as freight consolidation or retiming deliveries to reduce businesses’ reliance on road network space. This can also benefit businesses by sharing the cost of deliveries and creating a more pleasant street environment for their customers. Restrictions on loading during peak times reduces the interaction between deliveries and peak traffic, pedestrian and cycle flows, encouraging businesses to schedule their deliveries outside of these times. The route would also aid businesses in switching to using cycle freight for local or ‘last mile’ deliveries which can provide considerable competitive advantage with faster and more reliable deliveries and estimated cost savings of between 34 and 64% against the cost of using a van.

Parking revenue

Some people felt that the primary purpose of the scheme was to make money through parking fines. This is a TfL funded scheme being delivered in partnership with local boroughs as part of the Mayor of London’s Healthy Streets portfolio. As set out earlier in this report, the changes proposed at part of this scheme are not intended to decrease capacity below existing levels of demand for parking along Chiswick High Road. As such, we do not expect an increase in illegal parking activity or fines as a result.

Impact on Our Lady of Grace & St Edward Church

Many respondents commented on the implications of the proposals on Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church. People raised concerns about our proposals to narrow the pavement outside the front door of the church and the implication this would have on religious events, especially as the alternative side door has limited space. Linked to this, people had concerns regarding the cycle track in front of the church as they felt this would reduce access across the cycle track or introduce pedestrian and cyclist conflict and suggested barriers to protect pedestrians. Other concerns included impacts on the provision of parking and loading for the church and

---

for disabled people. Some people suggested re-routing the cycle track behind the church or cyclists mixing with traffic instead. Overall, people felt that the congregation of the church had not been consulted or accounted for.

The responses we received during the consultation have provided valuable information to help inform our continued design development of the scheme in this location. We have also been working closely with representatives from Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Church to understand their concerns (and those of the local congregation) in more detail and to consider changes that can be made to our designs to address these.

The pavement width outside the church is one of many aspects we have been reviewing as part of our design changes in this location. The wide pavement serves a multitude of uses, allowing the congregation to gather outside the church after services or religious ceremonies. It also provides space for funeral directors to bring coffins into the church, processions to form and emergency evacuations to take place.

Following an extensive review of the design in this location, we are now proposing to maintain the existing footway width outside the church. In order to achieve this we have adjusted the layout of the junction of Chiswick High Road and Duke’s Avenue so that the cycle track is now within the existing carriageway space. We have needed to reduce the eastbound approach lanes for traffic from two lanes to one which reduces capacity at the junction for motor traffic. There would no longer be a separate right turn lane, but the junction still provides space for up to two right turning vehicles in front of the stop line while maintaining space for vehicles travelling eastbound, including buses, to pass waiting right turners. Predicted traffic volumes are low and this junction is expected to operate effectively. This change also requires one of the trees on the south side of the road to be in the centre of the cycle track with space for cyclists either side. This is a layout we have implemented on other cycle tracks before. We would highlight the location of the tree with different surface materials on approach.

Access to the church from the north side of Chiswick High Road would be possible via the two signalised pedestrian crossings on each side of Duke’s Avenue. We are proposing to improve these crossings by making them wider and installing pedestrian countdown technology. We previously proposed a footway build out on Duke’s Avenue which provides increased pavement space on this corner and shortens the crossing distance over Duke’s Avenue for pedestrians. We would retain this in our proposals.

We have discussed parking and loading requirements with representatives from the church and in our revised design, we are proposing to retain the existing single yellow lines on the west side of Duke’s Avenue where we had previously proposed pay and display bays. This would allow for parking and loading during off peak times.
and funeral cars would be able park as required with a funeral exemption that can be obtained from Hounslow Council. Blue badge holders would also be able to park here at any time of the day.

Environmental impacts

Greening infrastructure

Some people raised concerns regarding the proposed removal of trees along Chiswick High Road, some had specific concerns about the tree at Mayfield Avenue. We are proposing to plant nine new trees along Chiswick High Road alongside removal of just three with a net gain of six trees. We are proposing to retain all of the existing planters along Chiswick High Road. At consultation we originally proposed to remove a tree by Windmill Road however this has since been felled as part of local utility works. At Mayfield Avenue, the tree we are proposing to remove is currently on a section of the footway that protrudes into the main highway and would block visibility of traffic signals for eastbound drivers. Removing this tree allows us to straighten the alignment of the highway, provide safe visibility of the traffic signals and extend the eastbound bus lane.

Between Homefield Road and Chiswick Lane, we are proposing to remove a tree on the south side as it would otherwise be in the westbound side of the cycle track. Due to the size of the tree pit, it is not possible to adjust the location of the cycle track without removing traffic lanes on approach to the junction of Chiswick Lane. Between Chiswick Lane and Cranbrook Road, we are proposing to remove a tree on the south side to increase the width of the footway in this location by up to a metre.

Junctions

Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road

Some supported our proposals to make Duke’s Avenue one-way in from Chiswick High Road and Duke Road one-way out. Others had concerns about Duke’s Avenue being entry only and Duke Road being exit only with some people suggesting these be reversed as they were concerned about motorists needing to give way to the cycle track at Duke Road. Other people noted that the proximity of Duke Road to Fisher’s Lane raised safety concerns, with significant numbers of movements between the two roads occurring at present.

We are proposing to make Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road one-way north of Bourne Place to improve safety by reducing the number of turning manoeuvres at these junctions. Both roads would remain two-way south of Bourne Place. By making Duke’s Avenue entry only, traffic flow would move more freely through the area as the operation of the junction can be simplified. There is an existing pattern of collisions at Duke Road involving vehicles turning left into Duke Road from Chiswick...
High Road – sometimes having exited Fisher’s Lane, so removing this movement is intended to address this. The proposals also include tightening the turning radii of the junction to reduce speed at which turning movements can be taken.

Following feedback we received from the consultation regarding concerns about vehicles exiting Duke Road we have reviewed the design of this junction. We looked at the possibility of signalising Duke Road however this would require the removal of the nearby westbound bus stop (as there is not a suitable place to relocate it) to accommodate the junction layout, as Fisher’s Lane would need to be part of the junction due to its proximity to Duke Road. The resulting, wide and staggered layout of the junction would introduce an additional set of traffic lights along Chiswick High Road in very close proximity to the junction with Duke’s Avenue. This would introduce delay to all traffic including buses and cyclists and reduce the amount of road space for traffic to wait when held at a red light. As such, signalising Duke Road is not being proposed.

Under the previous proposals, vehicles turning right from Duke Road would need to give way to cyclists on the cycle track before proceeding to pull out onto the main road and giving way to traffic in both directions. While visibility of oncoming eastbound traffic is good, visibility of oncoming westbound traffic, especially approaching in the offside lane, is reduced due to the location of the westbound bus stop to the right of the junction. This means that right turning vehicles would need to wait for a long time to find a suitable gap and whilst waiting, would block the cycle track. The proposal to make Duke’s Avenue one-way in would result in an increase in vehicles wishing to exit at Duke Road which would compound this problem.

To address these issues, we have revised the design and are proposing to make Duke Road left turn out only, banning the right turn onto Chiswick High Road. Left turning traffic would be able to turn left more easily as they only need to give way to the nearside westbound traffic whereas right turning traffic would need to give way to all three lanes of oncoming traffic. In addition, if a bus is stopped in the westbound bus stop, traffic would be able to pull out in the shadow of this. Traffic wishing to travel east along Chiswick High Road from Duke Road or Duke’s Avenue could use alternative routes such as Annandale Road or Chiswick Lane. The proposals for this junction are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details.

**Chiswick Lane**

Some people were concerned that the proposed road layout at Chiswick Lane is confusing or complicated. The junction of Chiswick High Road with Chiswick Lane is an existing signalised junction. As part of our proposals we are introducing a two-way track on the south side and signalising cycle movements through the junction. For cyclists wishing to turn onto Chiswick Lane or Upham Park Road, two stage turns are proposed – similar to the layout used on other segregated cycle routes.
Pedestrian crossings are maintained on all four arms of the junction with the one on Chiswick Lane increased in width.

Other people opposed the use of shared use at Chiswick Lane. Due to low number of cyclists at Chiswick Lane, we are proposing shared use to help facilitate left turn movements for cyclists turning onto Chiswick Lane without the need to use the traffic signals. A shared use footway still maintains a high level of priority for pedestrians whilst reducing unnecessary delays for cyclists.

**Linden Gardens**

Some people raised concerns about the junctions of Chiswick High Road and Linden Gardens. Linden Gardens (west) is one-way in with relatively low flows of vehicles and therefore the risk of conflict at this junction is low. Linden Gardens (east) is exit only. We have proposed to raise the entry to reduce the speed of vehicles on approach. Traffic would need to give way to cyclists in the cycle track before pulling out onto the main road. Visibility at this junction is good and due to the proximity of it to a pedestrian crossing, it is likely that there will be gaps in the flow of traffic on the main road for traffic to pull out due to the nearby pedestrian crossing west of the junction. Additional keep clear markings will also be considered at the detailed design stage to assist vehicles exiting at this location.

**Impact on bus users**

**Stamford Brook Bus Garage**

People were concerned about congestion at Stamford Brook Bus Garage junction due to the relocation of the bus stop. We are proposing to relocate the bus stop in order to provide a bus stop bypass and ensure sufficient space for vehicles overtaking stationary buses at the bus stop.

**Bus lanes**

Some people opposed the proposed removal of westbound bus lane as they felt this would lead to journey time delays for bus passengers. See Section 2.1 for our response regarding changes to bus lanes and impacts on journey times for bus passengers.

**Bus services**

Some people suggested decreasing the number of bus services along this route. Buses form key links to town centres and other destinations in most parts of the city and are one of the most efficient uses of road space. Chiswick High Road forms a key bus corridor in the borough and more widely on London’s strategic bus network. Buses also play an important role in delivering the Healthy Streets Approach. More people using public transport instead of cars means more active travel. Buses can
move 70 people in the same amount of space taken up by about three cars. Many
trips that people make by car, which they may not want to or be able to make by foot
or cycle, can be switched to the bus. This frees up street space and reduces the
dominance of motor vehicles that can make streets unpleasant and discourage
active travel. It is therefore critical that we continue to retain bus capacity where it is
needed.

Impact on cyclists

Interaction with delivery vehicles
Some people raised concerns about the risk of cyclist interactions with delivery
vehicles. Facilities for loading and deliveries are provided throughout the route either
at the kerbside or within marked loading bays. Cyclists within the two-way cycle track
would be fully segregated from motor vehicles along Chiswick High Road and as
such the risk of interactions with delivery vehicles would be very low.

Complementary measures

Infrastructure
People suggested removing street clutter and resurfacing roads. As part of our
proposals we would look to reduce street clutter as much as possible by removing
redundant street furniture and combining remaining signs and posts where possible.
Where we are introducing new street furniture such as trees or benches, we would
position these in such a way to not impede clear space for walking along footways.
This will often involve aligning street furniture within existing street furniture zones
such as between existing tree lines. Where we are making changes to the highway
layout we would look to resurface the carriageway.

Mode shift
Some people suggested policies that encourage walking. We want to encourage
walking in London and are working towards making London a better city for walking.
Aside from infrastructure improvements, we promote walking in a variety of ways
including providing tools and design guidance to planners, marketing activities such
as advertising, social media and events. We have also adopted the Healthy Streets
Approach which seeks to achieve a healthier, more inclusive city where people
choose to walk, cycle and use public transport.
Section G: Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road (between Chiswick High Road and Capital Interchange Way)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route as follows:

- Adding a raised table to the junction of Wellesley Road and Marlborough Road to provide a flush crossing for pedestrians and reduce vehicle turning speeds.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Impact on motorists

Through traffic, congestion and journey times

Some people were concerned that the proposals for this section would increase congestion including increased journey times on Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens. Some people were also concerned that Brooks Road would be the only entry and exit point to Chiswick Village and the surrounding streets.

In summer 2016, the London Borough of Hounslow carried out a survey on traffic issues with residents and businesses in the Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens area. The responses received indicated high levels of concern at the volume of through traffic – 73% responded that there is too much non-residential traffic in the area - and the impact of this on several issues including road safety, attractiveness of the road for walking and cycling and pollution. In late 2016, LB Hounslow consulted on proposals to reduce through traffic in the area. The majority of respondents (55%) were in favour of a closure or no entry to restrict access, and closing access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens was the favoured change option (48%, or 87% of all responses in favour of change). For further details about this consultation see here.

These measures form part of the design of this scheme and are expected to reduce traffic on roads through the area, including Wellesley Road, Stile Hall Gardens and Heathfield Terrace. According to surveys carried out in summer 2016, up to 75% of vehicles travelling through this residential area is non-residential through traffic. Reducing traffic volumes on these roads would reduce congestion at peak periods, improve access for residents, make it easier for pedestrians to cross these roads and significantly improve conditions for cyclists using them.

Some people were concerned that Brentford FC or other local developments would increase local congestion. The changes proposed as part of the Brentford FC development are subject to separate planning consent and transport assessments.
however we are working closely with the developers to ensure that our adjacent proposals are aligned.

**Parking**

Some people were concerned about parking restrictions or suggested new parking restrictions are introduced on Wellesley Road. Others were concerned about residents’ car parking. We are not proposing changes to any parking or parking restrictions along this section of the route as these are not considered necessary as part of the scope of the scheme.

**Road layout**

Some people said they were concerned about the removal of traffic lanes. We are not proposing to remove any traffic lanes within this section of the scheme.

**Emergency services**

People were concerned about emergency vehicle access. Though we are proposing some road closures as part of this section of the scheme, access to local streets via other routes will still be possible. We have liaised with emergency services such as the London Ambulance Service to ensure that they are aware of the proposed changes to the road network and that their requirements have been considered.

**Cycle Infrastructure**

**Segregation**

Some people suggested the route should be segregated in this section. Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road are local residential streets that provide a quieter and more direct route for cyclists between Chiswick High Road and the South Circular than via Chiswick roundabout. Our proposals to close off the junction of Wellesley Road and the South Circular to motor traffic are aimed at reducing the circa 75% of non-residential through traffic rat running traffic along this route which should make it a more pleasant route for pedestrians, cyclists and local residents. Lightly trafficked streets are suitable for cycling with general traffic and would not require segregated facilities. The London Borough of Hounslow is also committed to making all residential roads in the borough 20mph, including Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road to create more attractive environments for walking and cycling.

**Route of track**

Some people suggested links to and from Chiswick Business Park form part of the route. The route is not proposed to extend further west along Chiswick High Road to Chiswick Business Park as providing safe cycle facilities at Chiswick roundabout would require significant infrastructure changes that would likely cause widespread
increased congestion for general traffic and buses. Cyclists wishing to access Chiswick Business Park would be able to do so via local streets.

**Current conditions**

Some people said they were concerned about current pinch points, for example near to the roundabout at Sutton Lane North. We have proposed to reduce carriageway widths on approach to and through this roundabout to encourage cyclists to take a primary (central) position in the traffic lane to increase their visibility to other drivers. The roundabout will also be improved to better provide for large vehicles including fire engines from Chiswick Fire Station nearby.

Some people said that this area is unable to cope with increased volumes of cyclists. As noted above, we expect traffic volumes to reduce along this section of the route leading to quieter streets and a more pleasant environment for cycling. In addition, traffic lanes are wide enough to cope with increases in cyclists.

**Junctions**

**Access**

People opposed restricting access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and felt that this might force traffic onto Chiswick High Road and Chiswick roundabout. Others opposed restricting access to the South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens. Some people supported restricting access from both or suggested one each way. As noted above, the closure of these two roads was consulted on previously by the London Borough of Hounslow and was shown to be supported by local residents. Access would be possible via alternative routes. The impact of this closure will be monitored and further measures considered if necessary.

**Safety**

Some people felt that the mini roundabout at Sutton Lane North is inadequate or unsafe. As noted above, we are proposing to reduce the widths of the carriageway on approach to and through the mini roundabout to reduce vehicle speeds on approach and enable cyclists to take the primary (central) position for greater visibility. As a result, pedestrian footways will be wider and crossing distances shorter.

Some raised concerns that the junction of Sutton Court Road and Heathfield Terrace is dangerous and others raised concerns about the junction of Wellesley Road and Oxford Street North. We have proposed to provide new entry treatments at these junctions with a raised table to slow down vehicles on approach. Vehicles wishing to pull out at these junctions will need to give way to traffic and cyclists on Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road before they do.
Impact on cyclists

Current conditions
Some people were concerned that traffic levels on Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road make them unsuitable as quiet roads for cycling or that lorries and buses make them unsafe and unpleasant for cycling. As noted above, we expect the flow of through traffic to substantially reduce along these two roads with the associated closures at the west end. We are also proposing other improvements along these roads such as new entry treatments and improvements to the mini roundabout at Sutton Lane North to reduce vehicle speeds.

Safety around parked cars
People were concerned that parking cars pose a risk to cyclists. Cyclists using this section of the route would need to ensure that they allow space when overtaking parked cars to reduce the risk of conflict with car doors. Road markings throughout this section of the route are intended to help promote the primary (central) riding position to reduce this risk and increase inter-visibility with general traffic.

Impact on residents

Priority
Some supported the scheme as it would benefit residents. Others felt that the scheme unfairly prioritises resident’s wishes. Other alternative routes will be available for traffic wishing to reach destinations beyond these streets. The changes proposed would also improve the area for people walking or cycling through who may not be local residents.

Speeding
People were concerned about speeding along these residential roads. We expect that with wider implementation of 20mph speed limits on residential roads and through reducing the appeal of these roads as through routes, the speed of traffic will reduce. We have also proposed a number of measures designed to reduce speeds such as reducing the width of the road and raised tables at side roads.

Impact on pedestrians
Some people felt that widening the pavement at Sutton Lane North and Walpole Gardens is unnecessary. As noted above, these changes improve the pedestrian experience by providing more space and shortening crossing distances. The measures would also help to reduce vehicles speeds and improve the layout of the road for cyclists.
Some people suggested installing continuous pedestrian crossings. See Section 2.1 for our response regarding continuous crossings.
Section H: South Circular Road - Kew Bridge station (between Capital Interchange Way and Kew Bridge)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route. Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details. These include:

- We proposed with-flow segregated cycle tracks and a bus lane on the South Circular and Kew Bridge Road between Wellesley Road and Thames Row (including Kew Bridge junction). We are now proposing to make this a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road. This change provides full segregation for cyclists throughout this section and removes the requirement for two bus stop bypasses we proposed on the north side of Kew Bridge Road. The change also addresses cycle safety concerns at Kew Bridge junction, Green Dragon Lane and Lionel Road South.*
- We would maintain a signalised cycle crossing between Wellesley Road and Capital Interchange Way for northbound and southbound cyclists in response to concerns regarding access*
- We are proposing a zebra crossing across the cycle track at the raised crossing point on the east arm of Kew Bridge junction to provide pedestrian priority to all crossings at this junction. This is in response to engagement with local schools in the area*
- We would replace the proposed yellow box junction at Strand On The Green with Keep Clear markings in response to feedback from local residents*
- We are proposing a second southbound traffic lane on Kew Bridge to address an existing bottle neck and improve the efficiency of the Kew Bridge junction*
- We would reduce the width of the western footway on Kew Bridge and make this side pedestrian only, retaining shared use for cyclists and pedestrians on the eastern footway*
- We would retain the footway loading bay on the north side of Kew Bridge junction for use by local businesses.*

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Cycle Infrastructure

Safety

People supported segregated cycle tracks but suggested two-way cycle tracks instead of with-flow. Some people suggested that the whole route should be segregated and raised concerns about cyclist safety around the bus stop at Kew Bridge station and suggested a bus stop bypass be implemented. In the consulted designs eastbound cyclists were proposed to be with traffic for a short section. In
In light of concerns raised about this, we have reviewed the design of the route in this location and we are now proposing a two-way cycle track between Wellesley Road and Waterman’s Park on the south side of the road. This change means that cyclists no longer need to pass this bus stop and would now be separated from traffic through space or time throughout this stretch.

Access to Kew Bridge

Some people asked for more consideration for cycling safely on and off Kew Bridge. In the revised designs for this junction, there would be two ways cyclists would be able to access Kew Bridge from the cycle route; either with traffic in the carriageway or via the eastern footway which is shared use for pedestrians and cyclists. Access would be via a cycle lane at the southbound stop line in the carriageway or via a dropped kerb leading to the shared use footway. We are proposing to introduce a second southbound traffic lane on the bridge to address an existing bottleneck at Kew Bridge junction. As such the lane widths are proposed to be narrower, encouraging cyclists in the carriageway to adopt the primary (central) position meaning that they would be more visible to vehicles. Our revised proposal for two-way track in this location also removes the need for eastbound cyclists to turn right onto Kew Bridge with traffic as they would have done in the previously consulted designs under a with-flow arrangement. Cyclists joining the route from Kew Bridge would also be able to do this from the shared use footway, via a dropped kerb or the northbound carriageway, via toucan crossings at the junction.

Impact on motorists

Congestion and journey times

Some people raised concerns about congestion between Kew Bridge, and Chiswick roundabout, Lionel Road South and Chiswick High Road. Our revised proposals include a second southbound traffic lane on Kew Bridge and two-way cycle tracks instead of with-flow. As a result of these changes, our models show an improvement in predicted journey time for five bus routes compared to the previous proposal. The new design also addresses the existing southbound bottleneck over Kew Bridge and increases capacity which would improve journey times for all vehicles travelling southbound.

Some people were concerned that Brentford FC or other local developments would increase local congestion. The changes proposed as part of the Brentford FC development are subject to separate planning consent and transport assessments however we are working closely with the developers to ensure that our adjacent proposals are aligned.
Road layout

Some people were concerned about the removal of traffic lanes on Kew Bridge Road or were concerned that the proposed road layout at Kew Bridge junction is confusing. The designs would retain two traffic lanes on Kew Bridge Road on the approach to Kew Bridge junction. As described above, we expect that the changes we have made to the designs since consultation will improve journey times for traffic and buses as we have addressed an existing bottleneck at the junction. Making the cycle track two-way rather than with-flow also simplifies the layout of Kew Bridge junction which means that it is more intuitive for cyclists and more efficient to operate for traffic movements. Changes to the layout also provide improvements for pedestrians, reducing the number of stages required to cross and providing more options to cater for pedestrian desire lines.

Yellow box junctions

Some people suggested that the yellow box junction proposed at Strand on the Green is not necessary. Following engagement with local residents, we are now proposing to make this a Keep Clear making instead, as per existing working arrangements.

Some people were concerned about vehicles blocking Kew Bridge junction and suggested more extensive use of yellow box junction markings. We are proposing to include a yellow box junction within the main Kew Bridge junction to ensure that queuing traffic does not block other movements.

Junctions

Lionel Road South

People were concerned about the potential for left hook risk type collisions between traffic and cyclists at Lionel Road South. Other people were concerned about this junction due to levels of traffic and suggested banning the westbound right turn into Lionel Road South. Following the changes we have made to the design to include a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road rather than with-flow tracks, the left hook risk at this junction is removed as the cycle track no longer passes it. As Lionel Road South is a key access route for the Brentford FC development, we are not proposing to ban any turns here. There are however some planned improvements at this junction as part of the proposals for the Brentford FC development including tightening the entry and shortening the crossing distance for pedestrians.

Strand on the Green

Some people felt that the Strand on the Green junction is dangerous. As set out above, we are proposing to include Keep Clear markings at this junction instead of a yellow box junction as originally proposed. This would assist vehicles wishing to pull
out of this junction to find a gap in traffic on the bridge. Our proposals would also increase the width of the footways around this junction and introducing a raised entry treatment.

**Motorist access**

Some people supported our proposals to close the junction of Wellesley Road and Capital Interchange Way and make Stile Hall Gardens one-way in. Others were concerned about lack of access for motorists.

See [Section G](#) for our response regarding these proposals.

**Cyclist access**

People felt that access should be provided for cyclists to and from Capital Interchange Way. As part of our review of the designs in this location, and inclusion of a two-way track, we are proposing to provide access for cyclists to and from Capital Interchange Way via a signal controlled cycle crossing.

**Signals**

People asked that cyclists have priority at traffic signals. Cyclists will be separated from traffic at this junction with a two-way cycle track and separate cycle signals. It is not possible to provide cyclists with priority over traffic all of the time as time at junctions needs to be carefully balanced between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians to reduce congestion.

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Crossings**

Some people supported the new pedestrian crossings proposed at Kew Bridge station and said that the current layout is confusing. Some people were concerned about the location of the new crossing. Others were worried that staggered crossings leave pedestrians stranded or were concerned about wait times at crossings.

Currently, the crossings at Kew Bridge junction require pedestrians to cross four separate crossings to get from one side of the road to the other. These crossings are fairly narrow, have small waiting islands between and can be intimidating to use. In our proposals, we have reduced the number of crossing movements required to three for each arm and have also proposed an additional crossing on the east arm by Kew Bridge station. The new crossings would be wider, with more space for pedestrians waiting on islands. Providing a new crossing on the east arm would cater for pedestrians wishing to access Kew Bridge station. As part of our traffic modelling, we reviewed pedestrian average wait times and these are not generally predicted to change.
Some people suggested new crossings at Lionel Road South. We have not proposed a new crossing in this location as this would require a new junction to be implemented on the South circular which would likely have significant impacts on local traffic and congestion. As set out above, there are improvements proposed at Lionel Road South as part of the Brentford FC development.

Safety for schools

We received some concerns about pedestrian safety for local schools in the area. We have undertaken further engagement with local schools including Kew House School on Capital Interchange Way to understand how their pupils travel in the area. With improved crossings at Kew Bridge junction and Capital Interchange Way, we hope to support pupils walking to and from school and alleviate concerns around pupil safety. In particular, we would increase space on traffic islands at pedestrian crossings which would cater for the peaks in the demand during school arrival and leaving times, reducing the risk of conflict with traffic. The proposed point closure of Wellesley Road has been well received by local schools as it would bring about local improvements to pedestrian safety by reducing the number of vehicle movements at this junction.

Pavements

Some people were concerned about reduction in pavement space. Others felt that bridge pillars reduce pavement width and collect rubbish. We are proposing to increase footway space in a number of locations in this part of the route. At Kew Bridge junction, footways would be much wider on the south arm, reducing the length of some crossings. Traffic islands between staggered crossings would also have much more space than they do under current conditions. On Kew Bridge, footways are relatively free from street clutter and lamp columns are generally set back within recesses reducing their impact on usable walking space.

Access to the Thames Path

Some people asked whether access to the Thames Path under Kew Bridge would be made available as part of this scheme. We are aware of the need to make this part of the Thames Path more accessible to the local community, in particular to disabled people and those with buggies or prams. Until recently the archway was leased to a private company. TfL is discussing the terms of a lease with the London Borough of Hounslow, who are looking to progress a scheme to convert the archway into a fully accessible walking route along the river. The terms of the lease are still being worked up, but both parties are keen to move forward with this as soon as practicable.
Impact on bus users

People were concerned about the removal of bus lanes and increases in bus journey times. We undertook detailed traffic modelling on the consulted proposals to understand how the route would affect journey times for all road users, including bus passengers. Pre-consultation modelling predicted that journey times for bus routes would change, with the proposals resulting in a reduction in journey time on some routes, while other routes would see an increase. In particular, routes that run east along Kew Bridge Road from Ealing Road to Kew Bridge would have been affected. Following feedback received from the consultation and local stakeholder engagement, we are proposing a number of changes in the Kew Bridge area which we expect to reduce the impact of the scheme on local bus routes. It is expected that five bus routes will experience journey time improvements in the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peaks.

Scope of the scheme

Some people suggested we extend the cycle tracks beyond Kew Bridge. While extending the cycle tracks over the bridge does not fall within the scope of this scheme, cyclist connectivity throughout the route has been considered in detail to ensure that local access to residential areas and amenities is provided. The route would connect to planned cycle routes at Beavor Lane and Bridge Avenue along King Street providing cycle links to Putney Bridge (providing connections to Hammersmith Bridge, the Thames riverside) and Chiswick station. A further cycle route connection to this scheme is planned between Brentford and Twickenham at Syon Park. In addition to these schemes, TfL’s recent Strategic Cycling Analysis identified 25 top potential future cycling connections across London to investigate further.
Section I: Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street East (between Kew Bridge and Pottery Road)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route. Changes marked * are subject to further consultation. See tfl.gov.uk/kew-duke for more details. These include:

- We proposed with-flow segregated cycle tracks and a bus lane on the South Circular and Kew Bridge Road between Wellesley Road and Thames Row (including Kew Bridge junction). We are now proposing to make this a two-way cycle track on the south side of the road. This change provides full segregation for cyclists throughout this section and removes the requirement for two bus stop bypasses we proposed on the north side of Kew Bridge Road. The change also addresses cycle safety concerns at Kew Bridge junction, Green Dragon Lane and Lionel Road South. *

- We proposed to relocate an informal crossing island west of Green Dragon Lane to the east. In the revised proposals we are proposing to remove this informal crossing island in response to safety concerns. A new signalised pedestrian crossing is proposed further east which provides an alternative crossing point for pedestrians (see below). *

- We would provide a new signalised cycle crossing on Brentford High Street at Thames Row to facilitate cyclists switching between with-flow and the two-way cycle track. This would include a new signalised pedestrian crossing. *

- We are proposing to remove eastbound bus stop W – Kew Bridge Station which serves the route 65 from the north side of Kew Bridge Road *

- Following localised traffic modelling, we would no longer propose a bus lane eastbound on approach to Kew Bridge junction. *

- Where we had previously proposed for eastbound cyclists to be in a widened bus lane on the north side of Brentford High Street, between Thames Row and the approach to Kew Bridge junction; we are now proposing a segregated cycle track. The bus lane is proposed to be retained on the outside of the cycle track. *

- We previously proposed to merge the existing loading bays on the north side of Brentford High Street east of the petrol station into a single 20 metre loading bay. We are now proposing to move the existing loading bays, to the outside of the segregated cycle track. *

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.
Cycle Infrastructure

Waterman’s Park

Some people supported plans to route the westbound cycle track through the park while others were concerned that the track would not be used, about the difference in elevation or aesthetics of this. Some people suggested that the track is instead cantilevered over the park to remain level with the road. Some people also suggested improvements to make the park route usable at night.

We looked into the possibility of cantilevering the cycle track over the park, level with the road, however this would require the highway to be built out by several metres over a distance of approximately 250 metres. This would have required significant structural works in the park including changes to numerous utilities and was not considered to be a viable option in terms of value for money.

Our proposals to route the cycle track through the park are part of wider improvements the London Borough of Hounslow are undertaking within the park and adjacent Marina, separate to this scheme. These proposals include re-profiling of levels within the park and the provision of new paths to enhance accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians. We would also look to include suitable lighting so that the cycle track could be used in the hours of darkness.

Although we expect the majority of current and new cyclists to use the signed, traffic free, westbound route via Waterman’s Park, we understand that some cyclists may choose to continue on the main road.

Segregation

People were concerned about the need for eastbound cyclists to go from segregated to unsegregated facilities and suggested segregated tracks for eastbound cyclists for the whole route between Kew Bridge and Waterman’s Park. Some people suggested a two-way cycle track on south side.

Following feedback from the consultation regarding safety of cyclists within unsegregated facilities, we have reviewed the designs for the area. Instead of with-flow segregated cycle lanes and bus lanes, we are now proposing a two-way cycle track from Wellesley Road to Thames Row, approximately 150 metres east of Waterman’s Park. With-flow segregated cycle tracks on both sides of the road are proposed between Thames Row and Waterman’s Park. This means that this section of the route will now be fully segregated from traffic and cyclists will not need to travel from segregated to unsegregated facilities.
Local access

People were concerned about the lack of access to or from minor roads from the cycle track at a number of locations including Pump House Crescent, North Road, Holland Gardens, Pottery Road and Green Dragon Lane.

At Green Dragon Lane, which is opposite the two-way cycle track, there will be a dropped kerb in the segregation for cyclists to leave the cycle track and cross the road. Along the rest of this section, the eastbound cyclists will be segregated from traffic, while westbound cyclists would be directed through Waterman’s Park. As such, eastbound cyclists would have direct access to / from the side roads however westbound cyclists would not. Cyclists wishing to reach local destinations would need to join or leave the route via other nearby side roads or remain on the main road for this short section.

Track

People were concerned about reallocation of pavement space to cyclists while others suggested maximising cycle track widths. From Kew Bridge junction west, the highway narrows significantly, reducing space available for protected cycle facilities which is why we have proposed that the westbound route should be through Waterman’s Park where fully segregated facilities can be provided. We have attempted to keep footway cut backs along this stretch to a minimum while also ensuring that the cycle track widths are wide enough to accommodate expected flows of cyclists with an appropriate level of service. Where we have proposed reductions to the existing footway, we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to assess whether the design of the footways are appropriate to the volume and type of users within the street environment.

Impact on motorists

Some people raised concerns about congestion in specific areas. See Section 2.1 for more information and Section 2.2 for more information.

Principles of the scheme

Consideration of local developments

Some people asked whether new developments had been considered such as Waterman’s Marina. As noted earlier in this section, our proposals for a westbound cycle track through the park are being developed alongside the London Borough of Hounslow’s plans to redevelop Waterman’s Park. We are also aware of upcoming development to the nearby Waterman’s Centre which would see a relocated access point on Brentford High Street. This change would be taken into account within our designs as appropriate.
Impact on pedestrians

Some people raised concerns about interactions between pedestrians and cyclists in Waterman’s Park including children, elderly and disabled people. As noted earlier in this section, the London Borough of Hounslow is proposing improvements in the park separate to this scheme. These changes would provide new pedestrian paths through the park along with other features such as new trees, landscaping, seating, play areas and new pedestrian accesses. We are proposing for the cycle track to be separate from pedestrian footways in the park to reduce interactions between pedestrians and cyclists. In some locations, pedestrians would need to cross the cycle track and tactile paving will be provided in these locations. Cycle and pedestrian areas will be clearly marked.

Some people suggested proposing a continuous crossing at Pottery Road. See Section 2.1 for our response regarding where we have proposed continuous footways.

Impact on cyclists

People were concerned about the risk of cyclists coming into conflict with motor traffic or vehicles loading. With our revised proposals for this section, cyclists would now be separated from traffic in a two-way cycle track. This would also separate them from vehicles in loading bays where previously they would have been in a bus lane.

Some people were also concerned about cyclist safety at bus stop and loading bay bypasses. We have proposed for the cycle track to run behind bus stops and loading bays along this section of the route to reduce conflict. At bus stop bypasses, pedestrians would cross the cycle track at a marked zebra crossing where cyclists would need to give way. At loading bays, dropped kerbs would be provided to enable goods to be carried across the cycle track to the footway.

Impact on bus users

Some people were concerned about proposed relocation of bus stops.

There are currently eight bus stops along this section of the route. We are proposing to make some changes to the road layout which impacts the location of some bus stops and we are proposing to introduce bus stop bypasses at others.

Proposed changes to bus stops in this section of the design include:

- Removing eastbound bus stop W – Kew Bridge Station which serves the route 65. These services would instead stop at bus stop Y – London Museum of Water and Steam, which would be relocated east by 63 metres
• Consolidating westbound bus stops S – Kew Bridge Station and bus stop T – Kew Bridge Station which are currently next to each other into one bus stop
• Relocating eastbound bus stop BF – The Musical Museum 135 metres east so that a bus stop bypass can be provided
• Adding bus stop bypasses to the following eastbound bus stops alongside the cycle track:
  o Bus stop T – Kew Bridge Station
  o Bus stop BF – The Musical Museum
  o Bus stop BE – Waterman’s Centre

In locations where we are proposing changes, we have considered the impacts carefully and are satisfied that minimum spacing between stops and access to local services would be maintained.

Some people were opposed to our proposals to reinstate the bus lane between Green Dragon Lane and Kew Bridge. Our revised proposals would no longer include this section of bus lane however we would retain the bus lane to the west of Green Dragon Lane.
Section J: Brentford High Street West (between Pottery Road and Alexandra Road)

Following feedback from the consultation, we are proposing changes to the design of this section of the route. These include:

- Changing a short section of segregated cycle track to mandatory cycle lane to facilitate access to a new loading bay on the south side of Brentford High Street, west of the junction with Ealing Road.

Our detailed response to the issues commonly raised and any design changes made in this section are set out below. Some respondents raised concerns about the wider scheme within this section. Responses to these topics can be found in Section 2.1.

Impact on motorists

Congestion and journey times

Some people raised concerns about congestion in specific areas such as Brentford High Street. See Section 2.1 for more information.

Some people were concerned that local development would increase congestion. We undertake traffic modelling to understand the impacts of our scheme on local traffic and congestion. This would include changes proposed as part of any local committed developments and schemes.

Road layout

People were concerned about removal of traffic lanes in this section. We are not proposing to remove any existing traffic lanes along this section of the route and cycle tracks would replace existing cycle lanes.

Some people suggested restricting traffic such as vans and lorries. This type of traffic reduction measure is not proposed as part of this scheme due to the need to maintain these roads for access. The A315 forms part of the strategic road network, a network of strategically important roads connecting major town centres and destinations, and, as such, restrictions on the use of the route as a means of access by larger vehicles is not considered appropriate.

Cycle Infrastructure

Segregation

Some people suggested that the westbound cycle track should be fully segregated across Ealing Road. Cyclists will be separated from traffic through Ealing Road junction with a separate stop line on approach and cycle signals separating them
from general traffic flows. This includes a ‘hold the left’ arrangement for eastbound cyclists. Westbound cyclists wishing to turn onto Ealing Road would be able to do so via the proposed toucan crossing and shared use area.

**Current conditions**

Some people were concerned that the road and pavement are currently too narrow. From Kew Bridge junction west, the highway narrows significantly, reducing space available for protected cycle facilities. We have attempted to keep footway cut backs along this stretch to a minimum while also ensuring that the cycle track widths are wide enough to accommodate expected flows of cyclists with an appropriate level of service. Where we have proposed reductions to the existing footway, we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to assess whether the design of the footways are appropriate to the volume and type of users within the street environment.

**Crossings and priority**

Some people were concerned that the toucan crossing for cyclists’ access to Ealing Road is inadequate. Due to the limitations of space at this junction and requirement to maintain flow of traffic through the area, it is not possible to provide a separate signal stage for cyclists to turn right without being in conflict with traffic. The proposed, wide toucan crossing provides a safe facility for cyclists to make this movement. Our surveys show that the number of cyclists expecting to make this movement is low (less than 10 during the peak hour) and as such this facility is considered fit for purpose.

Some people suggested clear cyclist priority across side roads. See Section 2.1 for more information about cyclist priority at side roads.

**Impact on pedestrians**

Some people raised concerns about a reduction in walking space leading to pedestrian congestion with concerns for children, the elderly and disabled. We have tried to keep footway cut backs along this section of the route to a minimum. However, in locations where footway cut backs were necessary we have undertaken pedestrian comfort level assessments to ensure that remaining footway widths are adequate for local footfall. See Section 2.1 for more information about vulnerable pedestrians.

**Impact on cyclists**

Some people said that the proposed level of segregation in this section would be ineffective. We have proposed segregated with-flow cycle tracks along this section which separates cyclists from general traffic.
Some people were also concerned about cyclist safety at bus stop and loading bay bypasses. We have proposed for the cycle track to run behind bus stops and loading bays along this section of the route to reduce conflict. At bus stop bypasses, pedestrians would cross the cycle track at a marked zebra crossing where cyclists would need to give way. At loading bays, dropped kerbs would be provided to enable goods to be carried across the cycle track to the footway.

**Junctions**

A few people suggested that more thought was needed for the entry treatment at Alexandra Road. We have proposed for the cycle track to run continuously across the junction, alongside the footway. We have also proposed to raise the entry to this junction and tighten the radius of the kerbs to reduce vehicles speeds. See Section 2.1 for more information about junction treatment at side roads.

**Economic impacts**

Some people said they were concerned about the economic impact of the scheme on shops and businesses on Brentford High Street. See Section 2.1 for more information about how cycle schemes can have a positive impact on economy.
Section K: Future proposals to extend the route from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre

Comments received during the consultation on the future proposals to extend the route from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre will be taken into account when developing the detailed proposals for this section of the route which would be subject to a separate public consultation.
2.3 Issues raised by individual stakeholders

Our responses to concerns raised by individual stakeholders that are not addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 are set out below.

Local authorities and statutory bodies

London Borough of Ealing

With regard to access to the route from Southfield or Acton areas; from Acton the route can be accessed using Acton Lane or Emlyn Road and from Southfields, Putney Embankment can be used. Connectivity is discussed further in Section 2.1.

The borough also expressed concern about the route ending at the west end of Brentford High Street, with cyclists entering high volumes of motor traffic on a narrow road. Due to the length of the route, it has been split into two delivery phases. The consultation included an indicative alignment for the second phase of the route which would connect Brentford High Street to Hounslow. Detailed proposals for this section of the route are due to be consulted on next year.

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Regarding concerns about consistency of lane widths, the designs aim to provide clear and consistent road layouts which minimise confusion for users. The design must also be tailored to provide space for bus stops, bus lanes and parking bays which can mean lane widths need to be varied in places however we have ensured that these will still accommodate expected traffic movements.

London Borough of Hounslow

They called for retaining motorcycle parking on Linden Gardens (east), and adjusting the proposed build-out on Linden Gardens (west) to avoid compromising the loading bay. Both of these are accommodated in the latest proposals.

They called for the proposed night-time taxi rank in the loading bay opposite Brackley Road to operate from midnight to 7am only to retain loading capacity. We are currently in discussion with the London Borough of Hounslow regarding the proposed timings of this taxi rank which will be subject to statutory consultation (traffic order) prior to implementation.

They also called for the eastbound bus stop at Morrison’s to be retained in its current location, as the bus stop is key to serving Brentford town centre both now and in future. This was investigated however it was found that the maximum bus cage width possible, while providing a bus stop bypass and adequate remaining footway would only provide for one bus at any given time. This would not sufficiently cater for the number and frequency of services using the stop.
A short stop here would therefore be likely to result in buses waiting beyond the stop, leading to delays for buses and general traffic, and blocking of the new pedestrian crossing at the western end of the stop. In addition, the stop would directly overlap with the western stop which, given the volume of buses, would likely to lead to frequent delays for general traffic and potentially result in unsafe overtaking manoeuvres.

The proposed relocation of this stop to opposite Ferry Lane has therefore been retained. This has the additional benefit of improving spacing between bus stops, providing a better level of access to bus services to the wider residential area.

**Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea**

The borough expressed regret that modelling had not isolated the impacts of the proposed new lane on Kensington High Street for bus journey times, as opposed to other changes related to the proposals. It is important that our traffic modelling takes into account all proposed changes along the route. This is because changes to bus journey times are measured according to the impact on the entire bus route rather than impacts at the specific location in which the physical changes are proposed.

The borough reiterated its opposition to blue surfacing at some junctions. Coloured surfacing is proposed in some locations to highlight points of interaction between cyclists and general traffic. The specification of this surfacing will be discussed and agreed with relevant highway authorities, including the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea prior to implementation.

**Politicians**

**Caroline Pidgeon (Joint-chair of the London Assembly Transport Committee)**

All concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Chiswick councillors**

Gerald McGregor, Robert Oulds, John Todd (Chiswick Homefields)
Sam Hearn, Paul Lynch (Chiswick Riverside)
Samantha Davies, Adrian Lee, Peter Thompson (Turnham Green)

All concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Southfield Conservatives (Part of Ealing Central & Acton Conservative Group)**

They stated that the Department for Transport (DfT) does not recommend shared-use schemes in this area. The scheme proposes some small sections of shared use facilities for pedestrians and cyclists where flows are considered appropriate. This is supported by the DfT under Local Transport Note 1/12.

**Tony Arbour, London Assembly Member**

Concerns are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.
Turnham Green ward councillors  
(Samantha Davies, Adrian Lee, Peter Thompson)

Concerns are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Emergency services**

**Metropolitan Police Service**

They asked why there is an internal stop line in Chiswick High Road on the east side of the junction with Heathfield Terrace. This stop line is to hold cyclists turning from the cycle track onto Heathfield Terrace while the pedestrian crossing is in use.

They asked that the dropped kerbs in Annandale Road be removed to discourage informal crossing in ahead of stationary traffic. The informal crossing is provided to enable pedestrians using the footway at this point to cross without a significant diversion.

They raised concerns that the left-turn arrow on the cycle track between Beadon Road and Shepherd’s Bush Road may be misinterpreted to mean cyclists should join the road to their left. We have reviewed this location and a clearer road marking will be provided.

They requested clarity on measures proposed to discourage drivers exiting Shepherd’s Bush Road from blocking the cycle track in heavy traffic. There is currently a yellow box junction at this location which we would look to retain in the proposals.

**Accessibility groups**

**Middlesex Association for the Blind**

No concerns raised.

**National Federation for the Blind / Pocklington Lodge**

All concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Wheels for Wellbeing**

The organisation asked about the operation of the proposed right turn pockets for cyclists exiting the route onto Russell Road and Radnor Terrace and called for a safe facility for cyclists here. Gaps are proposed in the central reservation to provide cyclist access to these side roads. The gaps are designed to be deep enough for cyclists to wait for a gap in traffic before crossing the road to reach the side road.
They also called for cycle access into King’s Mall and cycle parking within the Mall. Access to shops and businesses, including those within King’s Mall will not be restricted. Cyclists would need to dismount when leaving the route and find a nearby location to park their bicycle. While cycle parking is proposed along the highway as part of this scheme, changes to cycle parking within the Mall is not within the remit of this scheme.

They raised concerns that turning radii for cyclists seems tight at the two-stage right turn pocket at Annandale Road. The design of the two-stage turn at this junction is in line with other two-stage turn facilities implemented across the network as part of segregated cycle routes and is considered to be fit for purpose.

**Transport and road user groups**

**Alliance of British Drivers**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Brent Cyclists**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Brewery Logistics Group**

Expressed concern about three metre road widths having an adverse effect on large vehicles. Swept path analysis has been undertaken on the proposed designs to ensure that large vehicles can be accommodated.

**Cycling Embassy of GB**

They called for the effective width of the cycle track to be maximised through the use of low, angled kerbing between track and footway. We have installed angled kerbs across segregated cycle routes to increase the effective width of the track and would look for opportunities to do so for this scheme at the detailed design stage.

They called for centre-line markings continuously along all two-way sections of cycle track to improve clarity for cycle traffic and other users, and said cycle symbols and arrows could also be used to improve recognition of the two-way facility. Cycle logos and centre line markings will be implemented in a number of locations throughout the route to increase the conspicuousness of the cycle track. This includes locations where the cycle track passes side roads and junctions or crossings. Road markings, such as centre-line markings are kept to a minimum in other locations to reduce visual clutter and allow cyclists of different abilities to overtake one another.

They asked for measures to make it clear that the cycle tracks do not continue south at Hammersmith Gyratory. Signs and road markings will be in place to indicate the
direction of the cycle route. Where other facilities or routes connect with the route, these will also be marked on wayfinding signs.

They called for a contraflow protected cycle track on Beadon Road. As Beadon Road is not part of the route alignment, segregated facilities are not proposed. Cyclists will be able to travel west via King Street.

They noted plans did not make it clear whether access would still be permitted between Chiswick High Road and Devonshire Road. Devonshire Road is one-way entry only beyond the service road that runs parallel to Chiswick High Road. As such, access will be permitted from Chiswick High Road.

**Freight Transport Association**

They expressed concern about three metre wide lanes being too narrow for large vehicles. Swept path analysis has been undertaken on the proposed designs to ensure that large vehicles can be accommodated.

They called for loading bays to have a waiting time of 40 minutes, instead of 20 minutes, to account for additional time to load across cycle lanes. They said that loading bays should be at footway level to make loading easier and safer and for rumble strips on cycle tracks to notify cyclist of loading bays. The association also objected to sharing loading bays with disabled drivers because these vehicles can legally occupy bays for several hours, disrupting deliveries.

Loading provision is provided throughout the route either with loading bays or at the kerbside where there are single yellow blips. Where inset loading bays are provided (off-carriageway), these are proposed to be at footway level. Loading bays within the carriageway need to be at carriageway level. The timing and use of loading bays for disabled users is determined by the availability of disabled parking in the area to ensure that disabled drivers are catered for and local parking policies set out where disabled badge holders can park on single yellow lines. It is not expected that loading bays next to the cycle track would take significantly longer to load or unload from than those next to the footway.

**Hammersmith & Fulham Cycling Campaign**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Hounslow Cycling Campaign**

They called for the route to continue on Chiswick High Road and take a parallel route across Turnham Green to avoid the junction of Heathfield Terrace and Sutton Court Road. The closure of the west end of Wellesley Road is expected to reduce the amount of traffic on Heathfield Terrace making this route suitable for a with traffic cycle route.
They called for the removal of the central island at pedestrian crossings at Sutton Lane North to remove a perceived pinch point. The designs consulted proposed to remove this island at Sutton Lane North.

**Licensed Taxi Drivers Association**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Living Streets**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**London Living Streets**

Endorsed concerns from Living Streets.

**London Cycling Campaign**

The organisation called for filtering of a number of roads connecting to the route. Due to local access requirements, we are not proposing to restrict motor traffic beyond the measures already proposed.

They asked for removal of the left hook risk at Strand-on-the-Green. It is not possible to separate cyclists going ahead from traffic turning left into Strand-on-the-Green as this junction is not signalised and access must be maintained for local residents. Cyclists not wishing to travel over the bridge in the carriageway could use the shared use footway on the east side of the bridge where they would cross Strand-on-the-Green at an informal crossing point.

**London TravelWatch**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Road Haulage Association**

Endorsed concerns from freight transport association.

**Stop Killing Cyclists**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Sustrans**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Vision Zero London**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Business groups**
Hammersmith London BID

They supported safety improvements to the Hammersmith one-way system, as well as calling for enhanced counter-terrorism measures to protect the station. These measures are outside the scope of this scheme.

West London Business

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Businesses, employers and venues

Active360 (Bedford Close, W4 2UE)
No concerns raised.

Arrow Electrical (Chiswick High Road, W4 2ND)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

ASD Properties
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Barbed (King Street, W6 9NJ)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Bathrooms etc (Hammersmith Road, W6 9JP)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Bedford Park Estates (Sandbanks Road, BH14 8HY)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Bookcase Chiswick (Chiswick High Road, W4 1PD)
All concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

C Brewer & Sons (Hammersmith Road, W6 7JP)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Clarke Associates (Seymour Road, W4 5ES)
No concerns raised.

Cyclehoop (Burnham Way, SE26 5AG)
No concerns raised.
Cycledelik (Jeddo Road, W12 9EE)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

DHL (Horton Road, SL3 OBB)
Endorsed comments from Freight Transport Association.

Dogtown (Chiswick High Road, W4 2EF)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Douglas Rackley & Partners (The Avenue, W4 1HR)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Devstars (Church Street, TW18 4EP)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Eco Cycle (SW11 1QB)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Foster Books (Chiswick High Road, W4 2DR)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Glaxo-SmithKline (GSK) (Great West Road, TW8 9GS)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Heathrow Airport (Nelson Road, TW6 2GW)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

Lausten-Lehrmann (Nevern Place, SW5 9PR)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

London Bike Hub (Springfield Road, TW2 6LG)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

L&Q Housing Association (Grove Crescent Road, E15 1BJ)
No raised concerns.

Now Communications (Barley Mow Passage, W4 4PH)
No raised concerns.

Olympia London (Hammersmith Road, W14 8UX)
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Outsider Tart (Chiswick High Road, W4 2EF)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Pascall and Watson (Eyot Gardens, W6 9TR)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Planning Design Partnership (Chiswick Road, W4 3HH)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**RATP Dev London (Wellington Road, TW2 5NX)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Saferoading (Church Lane, WD3 8PX)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Sky UK (Grant Way, TW7 5QD)**
No concerns raised.

**The Beauty Know It All (Brackley Terrace, W4 2HJ)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**X-Electrical (King Street, W6 9JG)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Local interest groups**

**Argyll & Glyn Co-operative (Hammersmith Road, W14 8QG)**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Bedford Park Society**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Brackenbury Residents’ Association**
Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Brentford Chamber of Commerce (Hamilton Road, TW8 0QF)**
They expressed concern the scheme would stop in Brentford High Street at a point that is narrow and congested. Due to the length of the route, the scheme has been split into two delivery phases. The consultation included an indicative alignment for the second phase of the route which would connect Brentford High Street to Hounslow. Detailed proposals for this section of the route are due to be consulted on next year.

**Brentford Community Council (Brook Road South, TW8 0NP)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Brentford Towers Residents’ Association (Green Dragon Lane, TW8 0DF)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**British Grove Group (British Grove, W4 2NL)**

The group called for resurfacing of British Grove. Where significant changes to the highway layout are proposed, or where current conditions are deemed sub standard carriageway resurfacing will be included as part of the scheme.

**Chiswick High Road Action Group (Chiswick High Road, W4 4EU)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Cambridge Grove and Leamore Street Residents' Association (Cambridge Grove, W6 OLA)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Digby Mansions Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Bridge Road, W6 9DF)**

Endorsed comments from the Hammersmith Society and the Hammersmith Mall Residents’ Association.

**The Fulham Society (Rosaville Road, SW6 7BN)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Glebe Estates Residents’ Association (Duke Road, W4 2DE)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Grove House Residents’ Association (British Grove, W4 2NL)**

They called for resurfacing British Grove and measures to prevent U-turns at the British Grove / Chiswick High Street / King’s Street junction. The proposed design of this junction would remove the current island which encourages u-turns. Where significant changes to the highway layout are proposed, or where current conditions
are deemed sub standard carriageway resurfacing will be included as part of the
scheme.

**Grove Park Group Residents’ Association (Grove Park Road, W4 3SD)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Hammersmith Broadway Safer Neighbourhoods Panel**

The organisation said the two crossings between Hammersmith Broadway and
Hammersmith Road (via an island) should be marked as pedestrian-only, not shared
with cyclists. These crossings are proposed to be pedestrian only green man
crossings and cyclists would not be allowed to use them.

The organisation called for changes to shared pedestrian-cycle crossing near
Hammersmith Apollo and the junction at the Fulham Palace Road. This location is
outside the scope of this scheme so no changes are proposed here.

**Hammersmith Grove Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Grove, W6 0NP)**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Hammersmith Mall Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Bridge Road, W6
9DF)**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Hammersmith Society (Becklow Gardens, W12 9EU)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Holy Trinity Hounslow (Lampton Park Road, TW3 4HS)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Kew Bridge Owners Association (Kew Bridge Road, TW3 4HS)**

They expressed concern about egress on to Kew Bridge Road asking if Keep Clear
signs would be retained at the car park access opposite Green Dragon Lane. Keep
clear markings are proposed on Kew Bridge Road at Green Dragon Lane and at the
car park access opposite.

**Linden Gardens Residents’ Association (Linden Gardens, W4 2EQ)**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies**

They expressed concerns that a mature tree in Waterman’s Park would be removed.
We are not proposing to remove any mature trees from the park.
They also objected to the proposed advanced stop line for cyclists at Turnham Green Terrace. This advanced stop line is proposed to provide space for cyclists to wait ahead of motor traffic when joining the route from Turnham Green Terrace junction.

**Mornington Avenue Mansions Freehold (Mornington Avenue, W14 8UW)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**St Paul’s Church, Ealing (Elers Road, W13 9QE)**

No concerns raised.

**St Peter’s Residents’ Association (St Peter’s Square, W6 9AB)**

Concerns raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Thornton-Mayfield Residents’ Association (Thornton Avenue, W4 1QG)**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Winslow Road Amenity Group (Winslow Road, W6 9SF)**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Schools**

**Latymer Upper School / West London Free School**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.

**Ravenscourt Park Preparatory School**

Comments raised are addressed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this report.