

OFFICER DECISION
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES

07 AUGUST 2024

**CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE STATUTORY
TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATIONS TO INTRODUCE RENTAL E-BIKE BAYS IN
ABINGDON WARD.**

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The number of trips made by rental e-bikes has increased greatly in RBKC over the last few years. However, the parking of rental e-bikes on narrow footways can cause a nuisance, particularly where the footway is obstructed for those using wheelchairs or buggies. In 2023, the creation of designated rental e-bike bays provided users with clearly marked locations in which e-bikes could be left without causing an obstruction.
- 1.2 Between 6 March and 17 April 2024, the Council consulted on the introduction of a new batch of designated rental e-bike bays. Each site that was proposed was selected by the Council to plug gaps in the network of existing bays, or to provide relief to those existing bays that have proved very popular for rental e-bike users and are experiencing overspill of e-bikes into adjacent parking bays, or onto footways.
- 1.3 This report sets out the consultation responses received to the proposals in Abingdon ward, with a recommendation on how to proceed for each proposal.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Following consideration of all comments received, officers recommend that the Director of Transport and Regulatory Services proceed as set out in Table 1.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The parking of rental e-bikes on narrow footways can cause a nuisance to residents, particularly where the footway is obstructed for those using wheelchairs or buggies. In June 2023, the Council made a Key Decision to implement rental e-bike parking bays, and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with operators to ensure that all rental e-bikes be parked in marked bays. In September 2023, the Council introduced its first designated rental e-bike parking bays for use by e-bike hire operators and their customers, in existing parking bays across the borough.
- 3.2 In general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. However, some users are still opting to end rides on footways and officers have observed that some of the new designated bays have proved very popular for rental e-bike users, leading to some overspilling of the capacity of the bay (typically ten bicycles). The Council wishes to plug gaps in the network of existing bays to help address footway parking, and reduce overspill from existing e-bike parking bays.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 From 6 March to 17 April 2024, the Council undertook consultation on introducing new rental e-bike parking bays at six locations in Abingdon ward. Residents living near the proposals received letters signposting them to the consultation and the consultation was available on the Council's online consultation and engagement hub. Local ward councillors, residents' associations and community groups were made aware of the consultations by email.
- 4.2 In total, 210 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the six proposals, officers did not agree with the objections in respect of two of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Allen Street, Cope Place, Iverna Gardens, Lexham Gardens and Scarsdale Villas proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed with these locations.
- 4.3 It is important to note that some respondents asked that their response be applied to every proposed location in the borough. This amounts to an objection to the principle of e-bike parking bays, and whilst people are free to express this position it is not strictly relevant to a consultation on specific sites. However, we have included responses from people who asked for their position to be applied to every proposal in the borough. This means that 12 objections, two 'support in part' and seven 'support in full' responses are not necessarily from residents local to each proposal. Total responses including these responses are indicated in brackets in Table 1. For administrative purposes, these responses and officer responses have been produced separately as Appendix 2. Some of the reasons for these whole-Borough responses also feature in the site-specific comments described in Section 5.

Table 1 – Summary of responses received.

| Scheme | No. Objections | No. Support in Part | No. Support in Full | No opinion | Recommendation |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| S521a. Allen Street | 23 (35) | 1 (3) | 1 (8) | 0 | Do not proceed |
| S521b. Cheniston Gardens | 6 (18) | 0 (2) | 2 (9) | 0 | Proceed |
| S521c. Cope Place | 5 (17) | 2 (4) | 2 (9) | 0 | Do not proceed |
| S521d. Iverna Gardens | 18 (30) | 0 (2) | 3 (10) | 0 | Do not proceed |
| S521e. Lexham Gardens | 11 (23) | 0 (2) | 2 (9) | 0 | Do not proceed |
| S521f. Scarsdale Villas | 2 (14) | 3 (5) | 3 (10) | 0 | Do not proceed |

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides comments received from ward Councillors to the proposals.
- 5.2 Appendices 2 – 8 list the responses received to each location in full. Officer responses to the objections or 'support in part' responses are detailed below:

Loss of parking space

- 5.3 Some respondents were concerned at the loss of car parking space to accommodate an e-bike parking bay. Some respondents believed the loss of a parking bay would mean less parking available for contractors and tradesmen.

Officer Response

- 5.4 The proposal has arisen following requests from residents to combat the nuisance and hazard that dockless rental e-bikes can cause on footways, particularly for people who have impaired vision or are using wheelchairs or buggies. In order to accommodate the number of bikes that are in circulation in the borough e-bike parking bays need to be at least the size of a car (one car parking space is five metres – providing space for ten dockless e-bikes). Most footways in the borough are not wide enough to accommodate a bay. Consequently, most e-bike bays need to be on the carriageway, usually in existing marked car parking bays (bikes parked on single yellow lines would normally risk causing an obstruction or affecting loading). This reduction in car parking is thus necessary in order for the e-bike operators and users to park the e-bikes in ways that do not obstruct pavements. There are just under 29,000 residents' parking spaces in the borough – far more than available pay-by-phone bays - so the 80 proposed bay conversions to dockless e-bike bays represents less than half of one per cent, if all proposals proceeded. In comparison, residents' permit numbers are around 14 per cent lower than they were in 2013. None of the proposals are to convert Pay by Phone visitor bays.

E-bikes left on footways/E-bike users do not return e-bikes to designated bays/There is no enforcement of e-bikes

- 5.5 Some respondents objected on the basis that e-bikes are often left on footways, even sometimes where designated parking bays are available, and this posed a hazard to pedestrians, particularly those using wheelchairs or pushchairs. Some commented that there is no enforcement of e-bikes, either against the operators or their customers.

Officer Response

- 5.6 The main objective of the e-bike bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, these riders are subject to increasing fines and in general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. The rental e-bike market is currently unregulated, and so, with the limited legal powers at its disposal to control this problem, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off pavements. The operators remain responsible for guiding customers to these bays - with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance - and for tidying of designated bays.

The road is too busy with numerous pedestrians and/or vehicles

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for pedestrians or vehicles already using the road. One respondent to the Cheniston Gardens proposal said the road was too narrow to accommodate a rental e-bike parking bay.

Officer Response

- 5.8 There is no reason to think that the proposals will add to congestion any more than their current use as a parking space. Whilst some cyclists may opt to pick up and drop

off from the footway side, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to congestion on the footway. As the proposed e-bike bays are proposed where a car can currently park, there is no reason to believe that e-bikes parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present.

There is already a hire bike bay nearby

- 5.9 Some respondents said that there was no need for another e-bike bay as there was already either a dockless e-bike bay or Santander Cycle Hire docking station nearby.

Officer Response

- 5.10 Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to therefore increase the network of available bays. In some cases, this means introducing additional bays close to existing bays, where those bays have proved popular than others and are sometimes leading to overspill.
- 5.11 Whilst some customers may use bikes from multiple operators, including TfL's Santander Cycle Hire, many are loyal to one operator – in order to reduce the number of apps on phones for example. There are far fewer Santander Cycle Hire stations across the borough than there are dockless e-bike bays, and in turn far more journeys are made by dockless e-bikes than Santander Cycle Hire bikes. It follows that more bays are required for those operators, and that they are likely to be desirable near Cycle Hire bays as these were proposed near desirable locations to start or end cycle journeys.

Rental e-bikes are an eyesore/ bays will generate noise and/or anti-social behaviour

- 5.12 Some respondents objected on the basis that rental e-bikes diminish the visual appeal of neighbourhoods, potentially lowering property values and detracting from residents' enjoyment of the area by introducing increased noise and litter and visitors to the street.

Officer Response

- 5.13 To a large degree, visual appearance is a matter of subjective taste. Some people may prefer a row of bicycles parked on-street than a car. Both types of vehicle are commonplace across London. There is no evidence that the presence of rental e-bike bays leads to lower property values, or an increase in litter. Whilst some increase in cyclists picking up or dropping off bikes can be expected, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to individuals loitering for a period of time.

Poor behaviour by cyclists

- 5.14 Some respondents objected on the basis that cyclists exhibit poor behaviour such as cycling the wrong way on one-way roads.

Officer Response

- 5.15 Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit poor cycling behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to install rental e-bike parking, in the same way

the Council would not refuse to provide car parking because a small minority of people who drive contravene traffic rules. In any case, whether or not the Council provides additional parking bays will not affect the number of dockless ebikes in circulation.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.16 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. Two respondents to the Cheniston Gardens proposal proposed alternatives, suggesting the bay should be on Kensington High Street, or the entrance to the gardens (either outside numbers 3, 4, 25 or 42).
- 5.17 Three respondents had suggestions to relocate the Cope Place proposed bay; by using the car club bay, outside the police station on Earl's Court Road either on the footway or converting one of the parking bays, inside or beside Holland Park's entrance from Kensington High Street or outside of the Design Museum, or by converting a pay-and-display bay on Cope Place or other nearby road or more generally using wider footways.
- 5.18 Lexham Gardens respondents suggested the end of Lexham Gardens next to the existing motorcycle, or on the Single Yellow Line (SYL) outside of no.5 Lexham Gardens whilst Scarsdale Villas respondents also suggested outside the Design Museum, anywhere that didn't involve using parking, and a suggestion that an additional bay should be proposed near Edwardes Square and Pembroke Square.

Officer Response

- 5.19 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.20 There are already seven rental e-bike parking bays on Kensington High Street. Most of the paved area outside of the Design Museum is private land and the Council has no power to create parking bays there. The footway adjacent to this land is not sufficiently wide to accommodate a rental e-bike parking bay. Holland Park does not permit cycling so it would be inappropriate to host a rental e-bike bay within its limits.
- 5.21 The location proposed to the flank wall of 11 Cheniston Gardens was chosen to provide e-bike parking with as little impact on residents as possible, being not directly outside of any doors or windows. This would not be the case if it were situated outside numbers 3, 4, 25 or 42.
- 5.22 Similarly, the car club bay on Cope Place is currently under consultation to return to a residents' parking bay, with officers proposing the e-bike bay adjacent to a flank wall. There is already a rental e-bike bay on the footway outside of the Police station on Earl's Court Road. The Council prioritises use of resident's bays over pay-by-phone bays, as per response at 5.4 above.
- 5.23 There is already a rental e-bike parking bay very close to the motorcycle bay on Lexham Gardens – just across Earl's Court Road on Logan Place. The SYL outside 5 Lexham Gardens is used to keep this cul-de-sac clear for turning vehicles.

Other comments

- 5.24 Table 2 lists comments received sitting outside of the above themes, alongside officer responses.

Table 2 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.

| | Comment | Officer Response |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | <p>One respondent to the Cheniston Gardens proposal said that the bays would not benefit residents as there was no demand for them. (Cheniston Gardens)</p> | <p>Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to encourage travel by more sustainable modes in line with Council policies relating to a cleaner, greener borough, improving air quality and reducing congestion. The locations have been chosen where officers consider there is demand, however the Council will have access to data on the use of each bay and will therefore be able to identify and consider removing any bays that are poorly used.</p> |

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr James Husband

General comment - support measures to reduce e-bikes being left on pavements causing obstructions but aware that residents parking is heavily used in Abingdon, so loss to this or any other use can only be limited.

Locations

Allen St - Oppose Parking is very difficult in this area. The High St, with many underused cycle spaces that could be converted, is a short walk away.

Cheniston Gardens - Support This is near the underground and in a location where many residents are younger and more likely to use e-bikes to start or complete a journey.

Cope Place - Oppose The e-bike parking by the police station is a short walk away.

Iverna Gardens - Oppose Parking is heavily used in this area and the Cheniston Gardens site is nearby.

Lexham Gardens - Oppose Residents parking is in high demand and the location encourages riders to use Lexham Walk (cyclists are supposed to dismount using walk but often don't) Know that there have been a number of unprompted objections to this location from residents.

Scarsdale Villas - Oppose There is an e-bike area by the Police station close by and bikes falling over into road would create a hazard on a busy junction. A possible alternative solution might be someone near the Scarsdale pub. The roads around Edwardes Sq are narrow and some residents prefer not to park there for fear of their car being damaged by passing traffic.

Appendix 2: Responses received from respondents wishing their responses to apply to all proposed locations in the Borough

Objection One

Thank you for your letter regarding e-bike parking bays and adding more of these to the area. However, I strongly feel this isn't going to stop people riding them just dumping the bikes and scooters and not returning them to the bays. Several times I have come out of my property to find Lime bikes just dumped right outside or under the Shepherds Bush underpass to name just two. It feels like it is a waste of money and resources to me.

Objection Two

I wish to object to these proposals which will reduce residents' parking in order to accommodate parking for ebikes.

This is further loss of amenity for residents and ratepayers, who are in real need of the use of vehicles and parking. We are a single car household and require a vehicle for business and family purposes. My partner's mother is 97 and immobile so requires a wheel chair and vehicle transport.

Please examine alternatives to accommodate bike parking such as the selective use of pavements and behavioural changes.

Objection Three

Please please stop spending any more money on bicycles – I am fed up with being nearly run over by the endless cyclists on the pavement along Holland Park Avenue. Why don't you spend the money on curtailing their dangerous route along a path supposedly for pedestrians. You are Always happy to promote the cyclists – why do pedestrians get so little support.

Objection Four (The Boltons Association)

I have been asked by the Executive Committee of The Boltons Association to contact you regarding both your general consultation for further rental ebike bays in RBKC and also your specific recent proposals for three further ebike bays in the Boltons Conservation Area.

Our view is that at least until RBKC and the rental ebike operators have managed successfully to control effectively the use of ebike riders, parking arrangements etc, we are opposed to the creation of any further ebike bays. We consider that creating new bays in the present highly unsatisfactory situation will merely promote further unwelcome externalities for local residents.

I should be grateful if our views could be taken into account when the respective consultation responses are considered.

Objection Five

As you are aware, electric vehicles present a serious health hazard.

For example, witness the E-bike explosion outside Buckingham Palace

E-bike 'explodes' outside Buckingham Palace

E-bike fires contribute to a long list of electric car fires, electric bus fires, and so on.

I strongly advise the Council to learn some basic battery chemistry and understand (a) the explosive potential of the ingredients of any Lithium ion battery and (b) the inherent instability of the internal battery membranes that prevent such thermal runaway.

Please keep E-bikes off the streets of Kensington.

Otherwise, it can only be a matter of time before the Council ends up with another type of "Grenfell Tower" problem on its hands.

Objection Six (Earl's Court Square Residents' Association)

We have reservations concerning this proposal.

This is due to issues with the existing ebike bay in Penywern Road.

We have been advised that ebikes are being left in and around the bay, i.e. on the pavement, in Residents' parking spaces including blocking an EV vehicle charging point.

In addition, we have been advised that one of the ebike companies arrive, move their competitors bikes out of the bay putting the competitors ebikes on the pavement etc. as above and then leaving their own ebikes in the designated bay.

It would appear there is no control or oversight on ebikes being dumped outside the designated bays.

Residents' are being told they will lose their Residents' Parking availability to an unruly ebike free-for-all nightmare.

Until reasonable oversight is in place we object to any further expansion of this scheme.

Objection Seven

I wish to object to any expansion of the e-Bike parking scheme until its efficacy is reviewed. People are not parking properly within them as there is no docking system as with the Santander bicycles, so the e-Bike parking area just becomes a jungle of toppled bikes which eventually spread into resident parking bays. I nearly tripped over a toppled bike which had ended up outside the bay over the weekend.

Objection Eight

In response to your consultation about installing multiple new e-bike Rental Bays across the Borough, I am totally opposed to the sheer scale of your proposals. I do not believe for one minute that this will help the problem of e-bikes scattered across pavements. The people who routinely dump bikes wherever they happen to finish their journeys will not be deterred from doing that by more rental bays, but more rental bays will vastly increase the number of people using these bikes and therefore misusing them. I have lost count of the number of times I have had to report bikes strewn across pavements near where I live in South Kensington, just metres from ample existing Rental Bays near the station. Even when a Rental Bay is available at the station, they still even dump bikes on the concourse, instead of parking them properly. In several cases that I have reported, it has clearly been the same offender, repeatedly leaving bikes in the same places, on side-street pavements in South Kensington, day after day. And this behaviour only appears to cease when I have apparently persuaded the relevant e-bike firm to block that user from renting their bikes.

Objection Nine

Reference your letter of March 6th you invited my thoughts on extended E- Bike Parking in London so here they are - based on living in Hans Road which already hosts too many Uber bikes!

In your note you indicated that additional parking is being considered for E bikes hopefully well away from Hans Road where we are more than fed up with their macho cycling behaviour and failure to park properly.

I experience their lack of consideration virtually every day whether it's riding down the pavements or not parking properly in the space provided behind Harrods. For whatever reason too many of them prefer parking individually across the entrances to the pavements of Hans Road or against the wall of the pavement leading to Hans Place - all of this in preference to the actual parking space even when space is available.

Almost every day I drag one of these bikes to the side to clear the pavement or crossing - otherwise it becomes too difficult for old folk or children to cross safely.

Some Uber riders clearly feel they are not subject to common standards and respect for other people which is why I am concerned about your plans to expand parking specially for Uber/e-bike users

I feel strongly that parking can only be increased if Uber can develop a financial system to ensure Uber riders have to pay for their parking space. I don't know how it can work but in today's techy world it doesn't seem impossible. Right now Uber riders apparently switch off when parked to avoid paying for the bike while not in use - perhaps a parking mode at a premium price can be introduced for e-bikes?

It seems to me that cars and motor bikes park in metered or designated areas and Red bikes have their numerous designated parking areas as well. But Uber riders seem to think they have the right to go anywhere and park anywhere without any consideration or responsibility to others.

I do feel strongly that Uber has to come up with ways to discipline/charge their riders with regard to parking before the Council offers further parking space - this must be a two way deal before anything further goes ahead

I hope this short note is helpful - it certainly encapsulates what my family and friends think.

Objection Ten

I object ebikes

Objection Eleven

Hello I do not agree on the addition of e-bike parking in this, or any location. Creating parking zones certainly encourages their use and their promotion by the e-bike companies. The consultation should first answer the question of whether residents want to encourage e-bike activity in the area! The answer would almost certainly be "no" given the way e-bikes are ridden and 'parked'. The parking designation does in no way prevent the e-bikes littering the surrounding areas.

Objection Twelve

I believe that these cycle hire boxes should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays as highlighted in some of the proposed locations, this is because the parking and poor management of these dockless bikes already causes much aggravation for people with disability and mobility issues as well as older members of our community. Given the large expansion we have seen recently of these dockless eBikes and the continued reckless nature with which they are used and parked in our communities the operators have not been held accountable enough and are not holding their customers accountable. I believe that the expansion of 80 more bays within our communities for these operators will lead to another expansion with more eBikes flooding our streets and creating hazards all for the gain of private companies, not our community. The borough should be ensuring that these companies are operating within clear rules and guidelines, controlling the size and placement of their fleet and reimbursing the community for the inconveniences caused by their operation. Only at that point should they be allowed to expand their reach further when it is clear they are responsibly and sustainably managing their current operation, otherwise the introduction of 80 new parking bays will not result in better distribution of their fleet but instead more bikes entering the streets of London and creating hazards and obstructions that local residents have to live with.

Support in Part One

Many users choose to park the bike they have just used in a place that is most convenient for them, so typically close to their home. This has the added advantage that if it is off the beaten track, there's a decent chance the bike will still be in situ when next required. In the Royal Hospital ward there have been many instances of e-bikes being parked inconsiderately for other pavement users.

I am a cyclist myself, and think that anything that boosts cycle usage in London is to be applauded, but I can't see the incentive for people to use the dedicated parking spaces. So long as there is no penalty for parking away from a dedicated area the problem will persist.

[Additional Comments]

It was a general point - not specific to a particular parking bay. In the absence of any incentive or penalty surely people will continue to park where it is convenient, rather than going to the trouble of seeking out a parking bay and then walking to the final destination.

I accept that in areas like the Kings Road people may choose to use the parking areas, but once in the sidestreets I can't see why they would bother.

Support in Part Two

I think it would be better to have this rental bike bay at The Earls Court road end of Cope Place and use a pay by phone bay and not a resident bay. If you go ahead will you create a replacement resident bay near by. The same goes for all proposed bays all round our borough.

Support in Full One (WestWay Trust)

Please accept this as organisational response from the WestWay Trust to the consultation on rental e-bike parking bays. Our general comments of support refer to all the dockless bays in the proposal and specifically we support the following proposed cycle bay locations for the reasons outlined below;

- S529a Appleford Road
- S529b Cambridge Gardens
- S529c Elkstone Road
- S529d Murchison Gardens
- S529e Southern Row
- S529f Telford Road
- S525a Arundel Gardens
- S525b Basing Street
- S525c Colville Terrace - No. 31 Colville Gardens
- S525d Colville Terrace - No. 101 Ledbury Road
- S525e Stanley Crescent
- S531b Ladbroke Road
- S531c Lansdowne Walk
- S531d St John's Gardens
- S531e Swanscombe Road

Environmental well-being in North Kensington is one of the 3 pillars of our long-term strategy at Westway. The Trust fully supports the stated aim within the Councils Air Quality Action Plan of RBKC to "reduce the need for cars by promoting and making active travel such as cycling accessible and enjoyable". As a general comment providing convenient locations of dockless bays across the borough is important for making cycling accessible and providing good alternatives to car journeys. This is one important part of reducing air pollution in North Kensington and enabling healthier and more active lifestyles. This is an important part of addressing health inequalities that are exacerbated by air pollution and inactive lifestyles.

In support of the specific locations referred above, the Trust fully supports the increased provision of bays in the local vicinity. Firstly, locating these on the road carriageway reduces the potential conflict with pedestrians. Not only does it reduce pavement obstructions this also avoids the need or temptation for cycle hires to mount/ ride on pavements to access bays. Where a parking bay is lost, the benefits hugely outweigh the small impact of losing one parking space which can accommodate six or more bikes.

It is right that the council has been addressing inappropriately parked bikes that cause obstructions to pedestrians and welcome the combined efforts to ensure dockless cycle hire remains convenient and enjoyable to use. For dockless bikes to remain a viable choice, it is good to see RBKC recognising bays

are only as good as their convenience/ availability. The further people must travel to a dock the more likely they are to park it somewhere inappropriately and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling. They are also an important part in meeting a clear need across neighbourhoods where most households do not have access to a car and do not necessarily have easy access to alternatives such as Santander docks for example. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and convenient dockless bays are a vital part of this.

We support the additional proposed locations especially around popular destinations such as Portobello Market, the WestWay estate, Notting Hill. It is an imperative to provide bays in and around popular destinations that are accessible and convenient especially for non residents who will not be familiar with local infrastructure.

These locations are much needed as local bays are noticeably congested with the existing bays evidently over subscribed and spilling over regularly into adjacent parking bays. They are also clearly regularly used with bays emptying in the morning and filling up towards the end of the day. Equally the continued instances of dockless bikes being left outside of designated bays indicates current provision is not meeting the growing need for conveniently located bays.

This proposal is the right thing to do in a borough striving to be greener, safer and fairer.

Thank you for taking the WestWays views into consideration

Support in Full Two (Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea)

Please accept this as organisational response from Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea

Better Streets fully supports all the proposed locations therefore please accept our response as applying to each individual proposed location in the consultation.

We support efforts to enable people to be more active when travelling in and around RBKC and making active transport as accessible as possible to everyone living, working, studying in or visiting the borough.

Locating these on the road carriageway reduces the potential conflict with pedestrians. Where a parking bay is lost, the benefits hugely outweigh the small impact of losing one parking space which can accommodate six or more bikes. In regards to the proposed Holland Park Avenue bay, we would suggest this ideally would be located on a nearby side street on the carriageway close to the junction with HPA to avoid increased pavement clutter.

Better Streets welcome the councils efforts to address inappropriately parked bikes that cause obstructions to pedestrians and welcome the combined efforts to ensure dockless cycle hire remains convenient and enjoyable to use.

The further people must travel to a dock the more likely they are to park it somewhere inappropriately and in the long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling

These locations also address important gaps in current provision and improve accessibility in neighbourhoods and wards where most households do not have access to a car and may not necessarily have easy access to alternatives such as Santander docks for example. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and providing convenient dockless bays is an important part of offering attractive alternatives.

These locations are much needed as local bays are noticeably congested with many existing bays evidently over subscribed and spilling over regularly into adjacent parking bays. They are also clearly regularly used with bays emptying in the morning and filling up towards the end of the day. Equally the continued instances of dockless bikes being left outside of designated bays points to a gap in current locations and indicates current provision is not meeting the growing need for conveniently located bays close to where people want to travel to.

There remains a need to make dockless bays intuitive especially when not familiar with local area such as visitors. Increasing coverage is part of addressing this. We would suggest a dockless bay at every junction would improve how people use bays and reduce the need to hunt around for a bay when the apps prevent parking bikes outside of designated areas. There is also a need to improve mapping of these bays and visibility on map apps and in the real world (although regular bays at junctions would address much of this)

Support in Full Three

I have read the pdf with the proposed new docking bays. I have lived in Kensington for 41 years and know the majority of the streets where you are proposing docking stations. I am vehemently in favour of your proposals. It will encourage even more people to take up e-bikes and leave their cars at home. I use e-bikes all the time when they are near enough - they often are not. This will transform usage.

And there is a small chance that it will therefore the use of the ever-wider, ever-more polluting SUVs that blight our borough and our city. Whenever I pass Thomas's schools near me at arrival or departure time, at least one of them is idling its engine. Occupants are offended and aggressive when I tell them that is illegal. Every trip that one of them does not make is a small victory in the fight against air pollution, visual pollution, carbon emissions. (And entitlement....) Thank you for your work on this subject.

Support in Full Four

I wanted to provide a brief note of support for creating additional bays for e-bikes.

Weather permitting(!) I take an e-bike from the bay opposite #5 Cadogan Gardens frequently, as we currently live on Cadogan Gardens.

We also plan to move soon to [redacted]. We'd be supportive specifically of creating a bay [in] Victoria Road.

The only point of concern is that some users aren't as diligent in parking their e-bikes sensibly.

Some bays are also often overly full and have too many bikes parked together too closely. Particularly in windy weather, this can see e-bikes topple over and a full bay of them scattered like dominoes / litter on the ground.

Hopefully users and operators can do more to avoid this and the creation of more bays will alleviate this problem!

Support in Full Five

I am in favour of ALL of these proposals. Congratulations and thank you.

Support in Full Six

I favour any proposal which reduced the number of e-bikes clogging up our pavements. I support this and the other proposals in this consultation on condition that they will be accompanied by making it illegal to continue to leave e-bikes in the places in which they are currently being left.

Support in Full Seven

This consultation is rather odd! I'd like to make a general comment that there seem too few stations... and wonder why we can only comment on one location (or so it seems to now... the main thing is that one should easily be able when going from area to area to know where the nearest 'station is' and, as I have said, there seem to be too few!

Officer responses to objections

Loss of parking space / Use pay-by-phone bays instead of residents' bays

The proposal has arisen following requests from residents to combat the nuisance and hazard that dockless rental e-bikes can cause on footways, particularly for people who have impaired vision or are using wheelchairs or buggies. In order to accommodate the number of bikes that are in circulation in the borough e-bike parking bays need to be at least the size of a car (one car parking space is five metres – providing space for ten dockless e-bikes). Most footways in the borough are not wide enough to accommodate a bay. Consequently, most e-bike bays need to be on the carriageway, usually in existing marked car parking bays (bikes parked on single yellow lines would normally risk causing an obstruction or affecting loading). This reduction in car parking is thus necessary in order for the e-bike operators and users to park the e-bikes in ways that do not obstruct pavements. There are just under 29,000 residents' parking spaces in the borough – far more than available pay-by-phone bays - so the 80 proposed bay conversions to dockless e-bike bays represents less than half of one per cent, if all proposals proceeded. In comparison, residents' permit numbers are around 14 per cent lower than they were in 2013.

E-bikes left on footways/E-bike users do not return e-bikes to designated bays/There is no enforcement of e-bikes

The main objective of the e-bike bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, these riders are subject to increasing fines and in general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. The rental e-bike market is currently unregulated, and so, with the limited legal powers at its disposal to control this problem, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off pavements. The operators remain responsible for guiding customers to these bays - with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance - and for tidying of designated bays.

Rental e-bikes are an eyesore

To a large degree, visual appearance is a matter of subjective taste. Some people may prefer a row of bicycles parked on-street than a car. Both types of vehicle are commonplace across London. There is no evidence that the presence of rental e-bike bays leads to lower property values, or an increase in litter. Whilst some increase in cyclists picking up or dropping off bikes can be expected, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to individuals loitering for a period of time.

Proposals do not benefit residents

Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to encourage travel by more sustainable modes in line with Council policies relating to a cleaner, greener borough, improving air quality and reducing congestion. The Council will have access to data on the use of each bay and will therefore be able to identify and consider removing any bays that are poorly used.

Proposals should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays

None of the proposals are proposed in disabled parking bays.

Dangerous cycling

Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit poor cycling behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to install rental e-bike parking, in the same way the Council would not refuse to provide car parking because a small minority of people who drive contravene traffic rules.

E-bike/e-scooters are fire hazards

The article quoted relates to a privately owned e-bike. The Council is unaware of any fires caused by rental e-bikes, however it is important to remember that the Council currently has no choice whether to have dockless e-bikes in the borough or not. The Council has no powers to prevent operators operating. Regulation to improve ebike safety can only be introduced by the Government.

There is no docking system so the e-Bike can topple over and spread into residents parking bays.

The Council has no powers to prevent operators operating, and no powers to force operators to operate under a docked model. The Council has decided not to introduce infrastructure in ebike parking bays (such as Sheffield stands) for streetscape and financial reasons. The operators remain responsible for tidying of designated bays and ensuring they are not over capacity.

Opposed to the principle of providing designated e-bike bays

Provision of designated e-bike parking bays is Council policy following a Key Decision¹ in June 2023. The Council has no plans to revoke this policy at the present time. Even if the Council did not provide designated e-bike bays, the e-bikes would remain on the Council's streets as it has no powers to prevent the companies operating.

¹ Key Decision 06363/23/T/AB Dockless Rental E-Bike Parking Bays - <https://rbkc.moderngov.co.uk/Committees/mgIssueHistoryHome.aspx?IId=4599&Opt=0>

Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Allen Street

Objection One

the bikes are proliferating. users abandon them anywhere. they will not observe the discipline of dedicated bays - and more spaces will be lost for residents parking

Allen Street is not a suitable location. Surrounded by Mansion Blocks with a great shortage of Residents Parking (I frequently need to park three or four streets away). A care home a few yards away in Allen Street currently under construction - bikes lying around on the pavements a danger for the elderly.

huge number of resident parking bays and metre bays (required for visitors and tradesmen) already lost to bike sheds and restaurant/pub outdoor dining. Resident Permits are very expensive - you cannot charge for a facility and then take it away.

Objection Two

The proposed location is too close to the crossroad with Abingdon Villas, which becomes very busy several times a day. It would therefore pose a hazard not only to cyclists but also to pedestrians and motorists.

The proposed location would mean taking away already limited residents parking places from RBKC residents, whose interests should be the primary concern for RBKC, rather than e-bikers.

Objection Three

I have recently submitted comments to the Council on the way the borough is being desecrated by the uncontrolled dumping of e-bikes on pavements and residents' parking spaces .

This is destroying the appearance and environment of the borough.

Pedestrians are prevented from freely using the pavements having to navigate what have effectively become obstacle courses. Hardly desirable generally but clearly hazardous for families, the elderly and the infirm. RBKC have confirmed that they have no power to sanction dumping of e-bikes - they can not fine or seize nor in fact do anything to combat the menace.

Adding more designated bike parking places is unlikely to improve matters unless accompanied by powers to fine users and providers and impound improperly parked bikes.

Nothing in the Council's proposals suggests such powers will be available. Nor does it appear that it is proposed to introduce the requirement of docking stations.

It is therefore likely that the dumping of bikes on the road or pavements not only in the vicinity of the proposed new parking spaces but throughout the borough generally will simply get worse.

Turning specifically to Allen Street, this is an already busy two-way street in a predominantly residential area.

The traffic circle intersection with Abingdon Villas is particularly busy.

Many of the residents in the area are elderly or infirm or are families with small children.

A major development for a new care home facility is being built nearby. This will increase traffic and the number of elderly people dependent on safe and unobstructed pavements.

The area comprises a mixture of substantial mansion blocks and family homes.

All these need to be able freely to access unobstructed pavements.

They also need access to car parking spaces. Already the availability of residents' parking spaces is being heavily reduced with spaces being given over to charging spaces for electric vehicles, and outdoor catering facilities for local pubs, cafes and restaurants.

Mansion blocks owing to their age typically do not have car parking garages and not all houses have off street parking.

Adding a bike parking space will increase the concentration of e-bike users in the area, increase the risks of uncontrolled dumping of bikes on the road or pavement, reduce the availability of car parking spaces, and further undermine the quality of life in the borough generally.

The Council needs to assess the situation holistically and develop plans catering for the varied interests of residents before simply rushing to expand the e-bike parking areas without any counterbalancing powers to control the abuses currently so prevalent.

[Additional Comments]

I refer to our email exchanges in Feb concerning the unacceptable desecration of the Borough by the uncontrolled (and you said uncontrollable) dumping of ebikes by users on our pavements and streets.

I have since received and responded to the 'consultation' letter from Mr Neil Simpson, Road Safety Officer.

For all the reasons set out in my earlier correspondence with you I object most strongly to the apparent plan simply to flood the Borough with more designated parking spaces for ebikes without any plans to require docking facilities and impose penalties including fines and seizures of abandoned bikes on users and providers.

It is naive to think that merely providing more spaces will make bike users use them. In fact most do and will simply ride to their intended destinations and dump their bikes there.

Photos taken in recent days around the Borough demonstrate this behaviour. Note particularly the 3rd and 4th to last photos below taken today in Limerston Street. The designated space was full so bike users have simply dumped their bikes along the road in the adjacent residents' parking area.

Could you please add these observations and photos to my submission ?

[Additional Comments]

You comments are noted.

It is very depressing to hear you say that the Council is apparently powerless to control the burgeoning bike problem.

You are only too ready to fine and remove unlawfully parked vehicles

You would quickly get upset and act if we all dumped our garbage or building materials or old furniture and equipment on the streets and pavements, and owners who allow their dogs to foul the streets are threatend with fines - not that this seems to deter them.

So why is dumping bikes different ? Why did you let this happen ?

And notwithstanding what you say regarding designated bike parking areas , the scourge is just getting worse - as fully described in the recent Evening Standard features. The issues described accord exactly with our own experiences.

Who gave the bike operators carte blanche to inflict this misery on the public without reference to the relevant Councils ? In short who is to blame for this anarchy ? This looks like a potential issue for the forthcoming local and London mayoral elections.

At least it seems Westminster Council and their long serving and excellent member Paul Dimoldenberg are making an effort and it is hoped RBKC will take a leaf out of their book and co-ordinate with them and other boroughs to tackle this blight seriously too, and keep the ratepayers informed of their actions and progress.

Meanwhile even if you are powerless that is no reason why you can not collect information via your traffic wardens and others to compile a database with which to confront the operators.

[Additional Comments]

Following my email below your automated response refers to a link <https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/roads-and-pavements/e-bike-hire> for contact details of the main ebike operators .

Your site provides impressive descriptions of the measures being taken to ensure ebikes are parked in designated areas only, and the penalties which the operators will apply for transgressions. Nice window dressing but plainly these are simply being ignored by the operators.

Bikes are simply being dumped willy-nilly and en masse . Recently we were unable to walk the pavement from Kensington High Street to the library (ie right near your offices) for bikes parked at right angles across the pavement . My wife has recently had hip replacement surgery and did not take kindly to the need to divert. A traffic warden on the spot said it was not his concern.

Lime is by far the worst offender - their bikes are dumped everywhere, so much so that the sight of one inspires loathing - but dumped Forest bikes also proliferate. A few of both recently sat on the narrow pavement outside our block on Abingdon Villas/ Allen Street for nearly a week and are being dumped near us regularly. And you have the photo taken yesterday of the scene outside Abingdon Court.

I recently took the bus from trip from Phillimore Place to Hammersmith and was appalled by the multitude of bikes clogging the pavements, especially outside the office blocks as you approach Hammersmith.

If the bike operators are unconcerned what is the point of our complaining to them ? Surely this major curse must be managed - and the operators controlled and penalised - centrally by our Council on behalf of us all ?

As a start at least get your parking wardens to photograph each and every example they see on their rounds each day and submit these en masse to the relevant operators with appropriate penalties.

[Additional Comments]

This follows recent telephone calls (including today) to your offices by my wife [redacted] about the plague of uncontrolled dumping of ebikes on the pavements and streets of our Borough. We are long time residents of Kensington.

Unfortunately we don't have the names of the people she spoke with. But she expressed our deep concern about the bikes increasingly strewn across our pavements and streets. Traffic wardens tell us it is not their concern notwithstanding the fact that entire residents' parking spaces are getting occupied with dumped bikes even when there are designated ebike parking spaces nearby. Marloes Road is a prime example.

The pavements are frequently high impassable even for able bodied pedestrians and impossible for the disabled or elderly or people with baby carriages.

And the entire effect is one of unsightly and slum-like chaos, hardly befitting a supposedly well managed Borough.

The baskets of the dumped bikes are also increasingly being used as receptacles for litter , while the increasing proliferation of dog faeces on the pavements adds further to the impression of urban decay.

My wife was told by the first person she spoke with a week or so ago that the Council is receiving numerous complaints and that hers would be noted . But he argued that the ebikes projects are seen as a 'green initiative' . Hardly green to despoil the environment and endanger residents.

It is also most unfair on those who pay for the increasingly reduced residents' parking bays to find these filled with heavy ebikes parked with impunity - and with cars parked legitimately close to them risking damage from falling bikes.

Meanwhile while we pay our Council taxes and parking fees the ebike companies like Lime and Human Forest make money hand over fist without apparently taking any responsibility for their bikes or their users.

We were therefore pleased last week to read the extensive coverage of the ebike curse which appeared in last Thursday's issue of the Evening Standard. A link to the editorial is included below. For full coverage we suggest you access the online issue concerned - but assume you have seen it ?

End the Wild West era of dockless e-bikes

It seems that Westminster Council at least is trying to tackle the problem. We hope you will support them .

In the meantime please tell us what RBKC is doing to tackle the problem before we descend further into complete anarchy.

One immediate measure must be for all ebikes to be registered with details appearing on each bike so that these when improperly dumped can be identified and ticketed and/or preferably immobilised and taken to a pound to be released on payment of a substantial penalty. Easy to do surely ?

And why can't the ebike companies be required to set up and pay handsomely for proper docking stations like London transport does for their Santander bikes?

For an example I attach from yesterday afternoon a photo of multiple bikes filling an entire residents' parking space outside Abingdon Court on Abingdon Villas near corner with Allen Street. And this is a mild example.

We look forward to hearing from you urgently with details of the measures you are taking to end this abominable behaviour.

Objection Four

Placing a cycle parking bay on Allen Street, close to the junction with Abingdon Villas, will create more congestion in an already-congested area, particularly in view of the fact that there will be considerable and lengthy disruption to traffic in Allen Street when construction of the new care home on Allen Street begins. I have noticed that bikes with no docking requirements are frequently dumped without any consideration for pedestrians or car users, causing hazard and inconvenience for both pedestrians and car users. I do not have confidence that this will change with the provision of parking bays: when these fill up, as they inevitably will, the bikes will be left on nearby pavements or car parking spaces.

The alarmingly large number of planned bike parking bays throughout the borough will seriously reduce the number of residents' parking bays available for which car owners pay a considerable and constantly increasing amount. In particular, the Allen Street parking bay is close to several large mansion blocks and will further increase the difficulty of parking for the many car owners in the area - already reduced by the introduction of dedicated charging bays for owners of electric cars - a very small majority.

Whilst I am in favour of cycling being available to those who wish are able to cycle, it should be understood that it is not an option for a considerable number of people - e.g. the elderly, parents with children.

[Additional Comments]

I have already registered my objection to the ebike parking bay proposed for Allen Street, on the corner of Abingdon Villas, for the same reasons as above.

As regards the number of ebike parking bays proposed for the entire borough, I am outraged that the council would even consider such a reduction in the availability of car parking for residents. I am in favour of creating some ebike parking bays when due regard is paid to congestion and safety issues, but such a huge number is totally unacceptable and the needs of individual locations should be examined further.

Objection Five

I am writing to object to the proposal to have a dockless bike hire bay on the corner of Abingdon Villas and Allen Street. The reference for the proposal is Dockless Bikes II/NS/S521a.

Frankly I am very surprised after the strong opposition to convert this very resident parking bay into a cycle hangar, that now the council are trying to convert it into a dockless bike station - without a formal consultation. It is concerning that this is being done by simply putting up a notice on a lamp post, hoping nobody will see and object to it. I have not received a letter surrounding this proposal and happened by chance to walk past the notice.

My objections for the Dockless Bike Station in this location are for the same reasons as for the cycle hangar:

-This location is a very poor fit. It is on the approach to a busy round about. The street is already a narrow one requiring one side of traffic to wait for the other to pass. A dockless bike area would make traffic even more difficult, let alone safety considerations to pedestrians and traffic on this busy street.

-Loss of resident parking space. It is already incredibly difficult to find parking in the area, and it sometimes takes 20 mins of driving around to find a space nearby. Could you please find more a more appropriate location using pay & display areas?

-I understand the decision has been made to have Dockless Bike Stations in 4 locations in Abingdon Ward, namely: Lexham Gardens, Logan Place, Marloes Road and Pembroke Gardens. Why do we need yet another one at this suboptimal and precarious location on Abingdon Villas/Allen Street?

Please have a proper consultation AND please find an alternative more suitable location.

Objection Six

I object to the siting of a two dockless bike hire bays in Allen Street adjacent to the intersection of Allen Street and Abingdon Villas for the following reasons:

- There is already a shortage of car parking bays in the street.
- Allen Street has private houses but also several blocks of residential mansion blocks of flats, namely Allen House, Wynnstay Gardens, Allen Mansions and Abingdon Court. All these are multi-occupied and there is already great demand for parking spaces for these residents. During daytime hours, this demand is increased by the visitors (especially tradespeople and building and repair firms) to the street. We can ill-afford to loose another two bays.
- Increased Allen Street traffic build-up

There are frequent traffic jams at the north junction of Allen Street and Kensington High Street, when vans and heavier traffic attempt to pass each other. Build-up of traffic in the street are now usual, especially as it is increasingly being used as “a cut-through road” for those who want to avoid the daily traffic congestion at the north end of Earls Court Road.

Siting Dockless Bike Hire Bays in Allen Street will only increase congestion. The traffic will have to slow down to allow (1) bikers to manoeuvre the bikes from the bays into the road in front of oncoming traffic, or (2) bikes to be turned round and put into the bays.

- Bad driving at this road junction.

The bays in question are adjacent to the intersection of Allen Street and Abingdon Villas. This is a very busy junction where I frequently see (as a near neighbour) that vehicles go unnecessarily fast and too often do not take the mandatory white circular route round the roundabout. It is already a vulnerable site for an accident to happen. By siting the two dockless bike hire bays so near the intersection, there are greatly increased chances that, when using a bay, a cyclist (with no crash-helmet) will be hit by a passing careless vehicle.

- Allen Street has a narrow pavement.

One reason for dockless bays is to lessen bikes being abandoned on pavements. However when the bays are full, bikes are left on the pavement. The pavement on the east side of tree-lined Allen Street is very narrow and there are already difficulties for a couple of passing buggies. Abandoned bikes near the bays would only lead to even more inconvenience.

Objection Seven

I would like to OBJECT to the siting of this bicycle docking station in Allen Street (ref. 11/NS/S 521a) for the following reasons:

1. Site is too near a busy roundabout with a danger to cyclists taking out and parking bicycles. Cars and commercial vehicles sometimes travel across and round the roundabout at speed which could be dangerous to cyclists on the road taking out and leaving bicycles at the docking bay.
2. The adjoining pavement is narrow and is likely to be blocked by people taking out and returning bicycles as well as by bicycles not properly parked. In addition, the large nearby tree will make access difficult.
3. Site is directly outside a block of residential flats. Residents, especially in the basement flats, are likely to be disturbed by the sight and noise of cyclists taking out and returning bicycles.

Objection Eight

I am a resident in [redacted] and I want to object on the proposed dockless bike bays on our door steps. The reasons for my objection are as follows;

1- there are not enough resident parking spaces in the area. This is a residential area with a lot of families. Parking spaces near the building are needed for safety reasons due to families loading and unloading shopping/groceries while having to look after children while crossing the street and walking long distances because there are not enough resident parking near the building.

2- Dockless bike companies still haven't come up with a solution to force their customers to park the bikes properly and within the allocated bays. We've seen the mess these bikes are causing near Gloucester road station on Harrington gardens.

3- Both Abingdon Villas and Allen street are narrow streets and often one car has to wait for the other in the case two cars are approaching each other in the opposite direction. When the dockless bikes are literally thrown on the ground by the customers in a reckless way they take large portion of the already narrow street which will cause further congestion and frustration.

Objection Nine

As a resident in [redacted] I completely object to e-bike parking in your suggested zones with many small children and elderly living on this street, my concerns are as follows.

- a) As RBKC has no legal authority to fine providers and users or impound abandoned bikes they are unable to protect against dangerous behaviour and speed along roads and pavements
- b) Users will likely just abandon the bikes on the pavement as is frequently seen elsewhere making life difficult for those with prams, disabled equipment and the general public and elderly. We already see regular dumping of supermarket trolleys which no one in the council seems bothered about.
- c) How will these bikes be stored there is no mention of this whatsoever
- d) There is already in this area of Abingdon Villas, Allen Street and Iverna Gardens a severe shortage of parking available. I have to park regularly almost at High Street Kensington to carry my shopping home despite exorbitant parking permit charges
- e) The roundabout on the corner of my building at Allen Street and Abingdon Villas is a regular site of road crashes, drivers seemingly not stopping at the junction to pass over the roundabout. If you add a bike area I guarantee a death before very long
- f) There already seems to be a glut of e-bikes in this area, they are badly kept, frequently just jumped and whatsmore a bad safety record of battery incidents which again adds an element of fire and hazard close to residents
- g) This is not a popular action pending an election.

Objection Ten

I live in [redacted].

I have a child with special needs and I feel the pavements will not be safe for him to use, we are already suffering from bike users who dump the bikes on the pavements, which make them unsecure, to have a dockless bikebay is even worse.

I am raising this point to make you aware that if anything happens to my child, I will not tolerate this and take it further.

I hope you understand my point.

Objection Eleven

OPPOSITION TO PLANNED RBKC DESIGNATED E-BIKE PARKING BAYS:-

1. BOTTOM OF ALLEN STREET BY CROSS ROAD WITH ABINGDON VILLAS &
2. ON IVERNA GARDENS JUNCTION WITH ABINGDON VILLAS

OBJECTIONS:-

o RBKC has no power to fine providers and users or impound bikes abandoned. In short, they are devoid of any means to control the menace inflicted on the elderly, young and not so young, when they try to traverse the streets of Kensington.

o Users will continue to dump regardless of any designated parking facilities because most providers have no interest in fining bikers, nor protecting non-bike users.

o No mention is made of a docking facility which the Boris bike has.

o Within the triangular location of Allen Street, Abingdon Villas and Iverna Gardens mansion blocks abound, few with any parking facilities, thus residents will find it even more difficult to park if the two large, designated sites come to fruition.

Kensington residents, not E-bikers many of whom are passers-by should be the council's foremost concern.

o The locations identified, one of which is very near the cross roads (Allen

Street/Abingdon Villas the other a T junction (Iverna Gardens/Abingdon Villas) are particularly busy areas and parking/dumping e-bikes will simply bring hazard and congestion to the locality for both motorists and pedestrians.

o Without the requisite powers RBKC will grievously aggravate the plague of e-bikes dumped and cause more problems for the electorate who they represent and who should be their first priority.

Objection Twelve

With due respect, ebike facilities are a nuisance for the neighbourhood. they tend to be messy, since docking facilities are not used many times.

Objection Thirteen

I am writing to object to the proposed Dockless Bikes, specifically to 2.g.i (on the north-east side of Allen Street, opposite the flank wall of No. 45 Abingdon Villas, situated in Allen Street).

Apart from the general littering caused by reckless parking and usage of ebikes, this location is especially a vulnerable spot because the proposed location will be very close to the pavement ramp and with the regular overflow of ebikes on parking spots, this poses a real risk of blocking access.

I also object to the expansion of ebike parking spots on the grounds of research showing that providing too many parking spots for ebikes results in very short trips to be taken on a bike rather than by foot. This proposal with an overwhelming number of proposed locations completely disregards the fact that there is already ample parking spots available on Kensington High Street. Also there are a considerable number of docking stations in Wrights lane for Santander Bikes so the area is definitely already well served by the current infrastructure.

This blanket expansion of locations by the council is more of an exercise in virtue signalling than providing actual services for the residents of the area. The council should cease and desist from any further blanket expansion of ebike docking stations and first provide a cost-benefit analysis of every single location proposed.

Objection Fourteen

I oppose the following two suggested locations for e-bike parking:

(1) on the north-east side of Allen Street, opposite the flank wall of No. 45 Abingdon Villas, situated in Allen Street

&

(2) on the east side of Iverna Gardens, outside the rear of Nos. 47 to 60 Cheniston Gardens, situated in Iverna Gardens

My reasons are as follows:

- I have seen on various occasions e-bikes dumped on pavements, in undesignated areas including streets, private properties including front gardens or drive ways.

- I have witnessed a disabled lady trying to manoeuvre her mobility scooter around discarded e-bikes thrown across the pavement; by the time walkers rushed to assist this lady, she was in tears in frustration.

- I have myself moved ebikes from footpaths just because these were dumped without concern to pedestrians.

- I have witnessed local residents unable to park in residential parking bays because ebikes were discarded in these bays.
- Clearly there are no practical and implementable rules that can prevent ebike users from being inconsiderate and selfish when parking these bikes.
- I question whether this proposal for e-bikes serves the local residents or the general public who may randomly be in the area and may on occasion use the parking bays. 'Boris' bikes are within very close proximity to these two suggested locations and these seem to serve the local residents well - there is no need to add further ebike parking bays.
- Very importantly, the two suggested locations (Allen Street & Iverna) are on busy corners that on a daily basis cars/Vans/Delivery trucks/ etc try to navigate around the mini roundabout/corner with daily instances of cars squeezed in these corners, cars having to reverse or yield in tight pockets of space. It is predictable that ebike parking on these corners will clog up free flowing traffic even further causing further noise and air pollution; ebike dumping is the new environmental pollution imposed on local residents.

Unless the council deals with this new ebike dumping problem, I suggest you do not proceed further with this ebike parking initiative.

Objection Fifteen

I strongly oppose the following two suggested locations for e-bike parking:

(1) On the north-east side of Allen Street, opposite the flank wall of No. 45 Abingdon Villas, situated in Allen Street

(2) On the east side of Iverna Gardens, outside the rear of Nos. 47 to 60 Cheniston Gardens, situated in Iverna Gardens

My reasons are as follows:

- I have seen on various occasions e-bikes dumped on pavements, in undesignated areas including streets, private properties including front gardens or drive ways.
- I have witnessed a disabled lady trying to manoeuvre her mobility scooter around discarded e-bikes thrown across the pavement; by the time walkers rushed to assist this lady, she was in tears in frustration.

- I have myself moved ebikes from footpaths just because these were dumped without concern to pedestrians. It should be noted that many older people reside in Abingdon court and a new care home is currently being built by the corner of Allen Street and Abingdon Villas, these residents are particularly vulnerable when it comes to obstructions to their mobility which these bike docs would inevitably cause.

- I have witnessed local residents unable to park in residential parking bays because ebikes were discarded in these bays.

- Clearly there are no practical and implementable rules that can prevent ebike users from being inconsiderate and selfish when parking these bikes.

- I question whether this proposal for e-bikes serves the local residents or the general public who may randomly be in the area and may on occasion use the parking bays. 'Boris' bikes are within very close proximity to these two suggested locations and these seem to serve the local residents well - there is no need to add further ebike parking bays.

- Very importantly, the two suggested locations (Allen Street & Iverna) are on busy corners that on a daily basis cars/Vans/Delivery trucks/ etc try to navigate around the mini roundabout/corner with daily instances of cars squeezed in these corners, cars having to reverse or yield in tight pockets of space. It is predictable that ebike parking on these corners will clog up free flowing traffic even further causing further noise and air pollution; ebike dumping is the new environmental pollution imposed on local residents.

Unless the council deals with this new ebike dumping problem, I suggest you do not proceed further with this ebike parking initiative.

Objection Sixteen

I hereby register my strong objection to the proposed dockless e-bike parking bays that are proposed.

RBKC have no legal authority over e-bike providers such as Lime which are hardly regulated. Frequent incidents with pedestrians, other cyclists and motor vehicles do occur and Lime, DOTT and others will accept no liability for damage despite the rider being at fault. Ignoring traffic signs and crossing on red lights is a regular sight which endangers other traffic participants.

These parking bays will only grow their business and legitimise the current setup. They will not help clean up our pavements. Despite new bays in other boroughs the number of bikes left on pavements has not reduced overall.

From personal experience as a rider many of these bikes are potentially unsafe as they are heavy with very poor balance.

The parking spaces proposed will only lead to more issues, bikes dumped on the road and pavement and endanger other traffic participants as well as cause damage to vehicles.

Objection Seventeen

As a resident in Abingdon Villas I am writing to object to the proposal to install no less than two dockless bike bays between Iverna Gardens and Allen Street.

Objections are based on the following grounds:

1. Bikes are currently abandoned recklessly wherever a rider finishes their journey. There is no incentive for the rider to deposit a bike in a bay – whether nearby or not. The bays are likely to be ignored at the cost of reducing the parking available.
2. Bikes are not always secured upright. They can fall over - either into the road or onto the pavement - causing obstruction.
3. There is already plenty of bike parking space available in High Street Kensington – not 200 yards away. If a rider cannot be bothered to park it there then they are unlikely to care and will drop the bike anywhere it suits them.

I object to this proposal.

Objection Eighteen

I've been a resident here for 20 years and strongly object to the proposed designated ebike parking bays for the following reasons:

1. Ebikes will get dumped all over the street and pavement blocking an already busy junction.
2. Bikers will be at risk as they dock their bikes due to the volume of traffic.
3. Bikes often damage cars and riders leave.
4. No proposal on type of docking station or operator have been given so we don't know how many bikes will be in use. If we don't know the detailed information how can you suggest this is a good and safe proposal?
5. There are already too few residents parking spaces. This will reduce the number and I suspect dumped bikes will often be left in other bays reducing the amount of resident spaces even more.
6. When there is an overflow of bikes it will be us residents who have to either move them or have to walk around them.

7. RBKC has no power to fine bike riders and they are a known nuisance when riding and also when bikes are left dumped on the street and pavement.

8. Docking stations aren't mentioned, just ebike parking bays which are always poorly managed, overly busy and inefficiently used. Surely docking stations are a better idea?

Objection Nineteen

I strongly object to the planned proposal of Dockless Bike bay Allen Street.

As a resident on Abingdon Court, I strongly object that you are depleting the already limited parking available to both Abingdon Court and Iverna Gardens mansion blocks. There are 60 apartments alone in Abingdon Court, we have no off street parking and it is all ready extremely hard to find a parking space near are home. You should put your residents first and not non residents of RBKC, we don't need these dockless bays, we also don't need the anymore bike storage units, the existing ones are largely empty. The place for dockless bikes can be expanded in the centre reservation on the high street or streets which don't have high density apartment blocks, we cannot afford to loose anymore car parking spaces. Put your residents (council tax payers) first.

Objection Twenty

As owner and resident of [redacted], I strongly object to the planned RBKC Designated E-Bike Bays.

1. It is generally known that these types of e-Bike Bays very quickly become dumping grounds for e-bikes that are then abandoned. Most providers of e-bikes have no interest in penalizing bikers (i.e. their customers) and they certainly have no interest in doing anything to protect non-e-Bike users.

2. RBKC does not have power to fine providers and users or impound abandoned bikes. How can they protect the legitimate interests of Kensington residents (many of them elderly) who should be the first priority of the council.

3. The locations identified, one of which is very near the cross roads (Allen Street / Abingdon Villas), the other a T Junctions (Iverna Gardens / Abingdon Villas) are busy at all times and parking as well as the to be expected dumping of e-bikes will certainly create a hazard for both pedestrians and motorists.

4. In short, without the necessary powers, RBKC will only aggravate the pervasive "plague" of these e-bikes caused by negligent and indifferent riders as well providers of those services. Due to the elimination of precious few parking spaces in the area, residents will find it even more difficult to park near their homes.

Objection Twenty-one

I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed installation of two dockless bike hire bays near our residence. Placing bike bays in these areas could lead to increased noise, congestion, and safety concerns for residents and pedestrians. Additionally, it could disrupt the character and aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood.

I urge you to consider alternative locations for these bike bays that are less intrusive to residential areas. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Objection Twenty-two

I refer to the above 2 references. The proposal is for 2 new Dockless Bike Hire bays. I object to them in these particular locations because:-

- 1) This will use up valuable parking spaces. Residents of Abingdon Court already find it difficult at times to find a parking space close to home.
- 2) The locations proposed are very busy, and narrow with parking on either side of the road. Dumping e bikes will be a hazard for both pedestrians and motorists in my view.
- 3) These will be Dockless, unlike the Santander Cycles which are much better controlled

I just think it would be dangerous for these locations to be used for this purpose.

Objection Twenty-three

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas **if** they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Part One

I agree that we need more parking areas for e-bikes, but I would have thought that a better place would be the top end of Allen Street where it meets Kensington High Street. The road is wider up there and it's further away from residential properties.

Support in Full One

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Cheniston Gardens

Objection One

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed installation of rental e-bike cycle parking bays in our street. While I am a strong advocate for sustainable transportation solutions, I believe this particular initiative poses several challenges that may outweigh its benefits.

Firstly, the installation of rental e-bike cycle parking bays could significantly reduce the available parking space for residents. With the increasing number of vehicles in our neighborhood, parking is already a scarce resource, and dedicating space to rental e-bikes might exacerbate this issue.

Secondly, the introduction of rental e-bikes could lead to increased congestion and safety hazards on our streets. Rental bikes may attract inexperienced riders who are unfamiliar with traffic rules, potentially increasing the risk of accidents for both cyclists and pedestrians.

Bikes taking away from the aesthetic of the street. The addition of rental e-bike cycle parking bays could clutter sidewalks and diminish the visual appeal of our neighborhood, potentially lowering property values and detracting from residents' enjoyment of the area.

Lastly, The presence of rental e-bikes may contribute to noise pollution, particularly during peak usage times, disrupting the peace and quiet of our community and causing discomfort for residents seeking a tranquil living environment.

Instead of focusing on rental e-bikes, I believe we should prioritize improving existing cycling infrastructure and promoting personal ownership of bicycles, which encourages a sense of responsibility and accountability among riders.

Objection Two

Given that it's a residential area and not a high street, it seems that the installation of e-parking would cause nuisance and would be a waste of resource as placing such parki on th high street would attract more people / cause less disruption to residents in the area.

Objection Three

Strong Opposition to Proposed E-Bike Parking on Cheniston Gardens

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed installation of e-bike parking on Cheniston Gardens, based on several critical concerns that impact the well-being and convenience of our residents.

1. Limited Demand Among Local Residents: The usage of e-bikes by the current residents of our street is notably minimal. This observation suggests that the utility of the proposed e-bike parking will be limited, raising concerns about the effective use of such an investment in our neighborhood. It seems imprudent to allocate resources and space to a facility that is unlikely to be utilized to its full potential by the residents.

2. Reduction of Vital Car Parking Spaces: At the same time, our neighborhood already grapples with limited car parking spaces. Introducing e-bike parking will exacerbate this problem, taking up valuable space that is essential for the residents' vehicles. This will likely lead to increased parking congestion and could inconvenience many residents who rely on car parking close to their homes.

3. Disturbance in a Quiet Residential Area & Increased Security Concerns: The introduction of e-bike parking is expected to attract significant additional foot traffic to our normally peaceful street that otherwise will not present. This increase in footfall could disrupt the quiet and serene environment that we currently enjoy, potentially leading to increased noise levels and a general nuisance for residents, especially those with young children or those who work from home, which makes up significant proportion of the current residents.

4. Proximity to Kensington High Street Parking Facilities: It's important to note that there are already several e-bike parking bays located at nearby Kensington High Street. This close proximity of existing facilities questions the necessity of introducing additional parking in our area, especially when the existing infrastructure appears to suffice.

In conclusion, while I appreciate the efforts to promote eco-friendly transportation options, the proposed e-bike parking does not seem to align with the needs and preferences of our community. I strongly urge reconsideration of this initiative, taking into account the above points to ensure that any future developments truly benefit the residents of our street.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Objection Four

I strongly disagree with the installation of rental e-bike cycle parking bays in our street, it's crucial to consider the potential drawbacks. .

The parking of rental e-bikes on the street will poses a significant nuisance to residents, hindering pedestrian passage and potentially obstructing access to homes. This congestion could lead to frustration among residents and visitors alike, detracting from the livability of our street.

The proximity of the rental e-bike parking bays to the underground station is likely to attract a higher volume of people to our street, resulting in increased noise levels for residents. The bustling activity near the station, combined with the comings and goings of cyclists accessing the rental bikes, could disrupt the peace and quiet of our residential area.

There are concerns about a potential rise in antisocial behavior and nighttime noise associated with the introduction of rental e-bike parking bays. Increased foot traffic, particularly during late hours, may attract individuals engaging in disruptive activities, such as loitering or excessive noise-making, further impacting the quality of life for residents.

Cheniston Gardens, although residential, already experiences heavy foot traffic. The addition of rental e-bike facilities will only exacerbate this issue, intensifying congestion and potentially leading to conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. This overcrowding diminishes the safety and comfort of our street for residents and visitors alike.

In conclusion, while I maintain my opposition to the installation of rental e-bike cycle parking bays in our street, it's essential to acknowledge the multifaceted concerns raised. Preserving the livability and tranquility of our neighborhood requires careful consideration of the potential nuisances and disruptions these facilities may bring.

Objection Five

Cheniston Gardens is a short, narrow, high-density residential one-way street, altogether unsuitable to act as a terminus for ebike rentals from all over the capital.

If, nonetheless, RBKC were to decide to locate an ebike parking space on Cheniston Gardens, they could not pick a worse location within the street than the one they have picked out at present, outside No 11/13 Cheniston Gardens.

Cheniston Gardens is a rectangle, so that no time at all is saved to get to Wrights Lane & High Street Kensington from Marloes Rd by cycling the wrong way round the Gardens. Nonetheless, the problem of push-bikes ignoring the 'No Entry' signs at the junction with Marloes Road in order to take this imaginary short-cut, is persistent, serious and dangerous.

The danger to pedestrians posed by ordinary push-bike cyclists ignoring the one-way direction of traffic through Cheniston Gardens is bad enough at present. It would only be made far worse by cyclists, riding far heavier ebikes, travelling far faster, coming up Marloes Road, taking what would be an obvious and visible short-cut to an ebike parking bay located outside No 11/13 Cheniston Gardens, ignoring the 'No Entry' signs in the process.

If RBKC do insist on installing an ebike parking space in Cheniston Gardens, the only safe place for one would be at the entrances to the Gardens: either outside Nos 3 or 4; or Nos 25 or 42 - but certainly not in the middle - and certainly not one that is bound to tempt cyclists on ebikes into ignoring the one-way system in force in Cheniston Gardens.

(I write as one with degrees in urban geography from Oxford, UBC (Canada) and the LSE)

Objection Six

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas *if* they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Two

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Cope Place

Objection One

Cope Place suffers from a lack of parking spaces because the Police from the local station in Earls Court road park between 2-4 vans on our street, every day of the week. We need more residential parking, not less.

The second reason is that there is no recourse if they are parked (or thrown) without consideration. I have seen so many bays in which the bikes overflow onto the pavement and the road which for Cope Place, it would be a disaster, especially when at least two of the residents are infirm and have trouble walking.

I have taken a picture that I am happy to share, which illustrates this last point.

Objection Two

I own and live at [redacted] and I strongly object to the conversion of resident parking space for the use of e-bike parking.

The road currently already has insufficient parking spaces for existing residents. We often have to go round the neighbourhood several times to find parking. Apart from wasting fuel and polluting, we have two small children who benefit from being able to park close to their home (safety, inclement weather conditions, etc).

The road suffers from a useless car club bay (which is unused by the rental companies) and by police bays which eat into resident space.

In addition, the decimation of police stations means we now have several more police cars and vans using our resident and pay and display bays.

All the bays also serve people dropping off children at st Barnabas school, Churchgoers at Our Lady of Victories, nearby restaurant and Holland Park users. It will also get worse once the cinema is operational again.

How much do you want to squeeze the residents in the pursuit of virtue signalling motorised bikes that should frankly require licences and insurance? This proposal is utterly ludicrous and clearly not thought through.

If you need bike bays put them in the parks or in places that are not already massively struggling with parking spaces.

Objection Three

I have seen the notice proposing the provision of dockless e-bike parking on Cope Place. I am supportive in general as the bikes often block pavements. However, I object to the position of this particular proposed parking for the following reasons:

- There is already limited residents parking on Cope Place
- Pressure on residents parking generally given Waitrose shoppers and for St Barnabas and St Philips COE school drop off and collection
- Cope place often loses multiple residents parking to police vans
- The corner of Cope Place and Abingdon Road is not very prominent
- Expected further pressure on residents parking once the old Odeon cinema redevelopment opens again

I would suggest the following alternative nearby areas:

- Outside the police station on Earl's Court Road on the pavement or converting one of the parking bays, which is much more visible to passers by
- Inside or beside Holland Park entrance from High Street Kensington
- Outside the Design Museum as there is plenty of space
- Converting a pay-and-display bay on Cope Place or other nearby road

Please let me know should you wish any further information.

Objection Four

I have seen the notice proposing the provision of dockless e-bike parking on Cope Place. I support this as often bikes are left in the middle and block pavements, but in this case I object this proposed parking for a few reasons;

- Residents parking is quite limited on Cope Place, there are a lot of pay and displays in the street already reducing the resident parking.
- Waitrose shoppers and for St Barnabas and St Philips COE school drop off and collection take a lot of the resident parking spaces during the day, I often spend 10 minutes driving around searching for a space to finally park 10 min walk away.
- Cope place often loses multiple residents parking to police vans.
- When the new cinema opens in Kensington High Street it will reduce the spaces once more.

I believe there are other roads with more Resident Parking and wider pavement where this could be installed without impacting the residents.

Objection Five

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas *if* they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Part One

While it is important to resolve the scourge of ebikes abandoned throughout the Borough we can ill afford the loss of residents' parking. There is a car club space in Cope Place which is never used for its proper purpose. If it is ever occupied it is by a Police vehicle. That space could be used for ebikes with no negative consequences for other road users.

Support in Part Two

While in favour of all initiatives to encourage cycling I am very much aware that those who hire e-bikes are too often less than thoughtful or careful about where they leave them. Like others who are in Holland Park each morning it is irritating to often have to negotiate 'abandoned' e-bikes. It is not unknown for one of the park entrances to be blocked by them and they are a number at the end of Holland Walk every day. In addition e-bikes are often left on the pavement, sometimes for several days.

Support in Full One

Much needed in the area, I have cycle to Our Lady of Victories Church community centre and struggle to find somewhere to park and then struggle to find a bike at times having to walk half way up the high street. Fully support the development of a coherent and reliable network of bays to enable me and other to do short local journeys that may otherwise be done by a car - this is healthier for me and better for everyone's environment.

Support in Full Two

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Iverna Gardens

Objection One

Busy area for resident parking and most time. Is full. Need to keep bays for residents.

Objection Two

There is already a massive bike rank at the top of Iverna Gardens, by the side of Boots on Wrights Lane - it also blocks pedestrians ability to cross the roads. There are always bikes there and unless there's a tube strike they are seldom empty.

This proposed rank is also close to the play area of the Iverna Gardens Montessori nursery - so I would raise the issue of child safety as new bike ranks could draw more strangers to the vicinity and unwanted attention to the pre-school aged kids. There are kids there almost all day Monday to Friday.

This road is also very narrow and there is a massive density of households from mansion blocks on all sides - Iverna Mansions, Iverna Gardens, Abingdon Gardens, Abingdon Mansions, Cheniston mansions ... and parking bays are already at a stretch. I urge you to reconsider the proposals for a rank in this road. For the record. I am a frequent cyclist and I don't own a car.

Objection Three

I do not support losing any resident parking space. Changes for shared cycle scheme bays have already eaten space on Marloes road yet they are barely used. Resident parking is shrinking and driving through RBKC is increasingly difficult yet many residents such as my community rely on cars.

Objection Four

In my opinion, the selection of this location would be irresponsible. The location which is at a T-junction and near the T-junction with Marloes Road, becomes very busy several times a day and is already a hazard for cyclists. The proposed e-bike parking space will undoubtedly increase the hazard for not only cyclists but for pedestrians and cars as well. There are considerably less busy spaces elsewhere, e.g. in Cheniston Gardens.

The primary concern of RBKC should be its residents and not e-bikers. Most of the residents at the end of Abingdon Villas where the e-bike parking space is proposed live in mansion flats and therefore need to park in the street. The number of residents bays is already limited. Taking more away for parking/dumping e-bikes would go directly against the interests of most residents.

Objection Five

I would like to register my objection to the proposed dockless bike bay II/NS/S521d on the basis of safety for pedestrians and other road users on Iverna Gardens/ Abingdon Villas.

I would also like to register a complaint that installing these bays on an essentially clandestine basis with a small notice on one lamppost is not how an elected council with effective governance should be operating.

We should have been notified by letter. By contrast a one day parking restriction gets more prominence and airtime.

It is a fact that existing dockless bays for bikes and scooters do not work effectively, with users dumping them only in the vicinity of the bay. It is not unusual to see four or five times the space allocated as a dumping ground. On many occasions the user does not even use the stand when parking, and simply drops the bike or scooter on its side.

To prove my point, I attach two photographs taken earlier today outside the town hall.

In trying to solve this issue the proposal is creating a bigger hazard, in this instance by a junction. How long until a car or truck smashes into one and it catapults into a pedestrian. Does someone need to be seriously maimed for this madness to stop?

The same is true in every other dockless bay that has been created adjacent or right next to a road.

Whilst being a complete mess and eyesore outside the town hall concourse, and right in front of a property I own, at least it's not endangering lives and is away from traffic.

I would therefore urge an urgent rethink in putting these bays adjacent or right next to roads given the above.

There are many other options available. It will stop endangering people's lives.

Objection Six

I am writing to object to the proposed bicycle docking station. This is very close to where I live in a built up area at a well-used junction where there is already a severe shortage of parking spaces. Taking away even more parking space for bicycle stations would further worsen the situation for local residents. Please do not take away even more parking!

Objection Seven

With due respect, ebike facilities are a nuisance for the neighbourhood. they tend to be messy, since docking facilities are not used many times.

Objection Eight

I oppose the following two suggested locations for e-bike parking:

(1) on the north-east side of Allen Street, opposite the flank wall of No. 45 Abingdon Villas, situated in Allen Street

&

(2) on the east side of Iverna Gardens, outside the rear of Nos. 47 to 60 Cheniston Gardens, situated in Iverna Gardens

My reasons are as follows:

- I have seen on various occasions e-bikes dumped on pavements, in undesignated areas including streets, private properties including front gardens or drive ways.
- I have witnessed a disabled lady trying to manoeuvre her mobility scooter around discarded e-bikes thrown across the pavement; by the time walkers rushed to assist this lady, she was in tears in frustration.
- I have myself moved ebikes from footpaths just because these were dumped without concern to pedestrians.
- I have witnessed local residents unable to park in residential parking bays because ebikes were discarded in these bays.
- Clearly there are no practical and implementable rules that can prevent ebike users from being inconsiderate and selfish when parking these bikes.
- I question whether this proposal for e-bikes serves the local residents or the general public who may randomly be in the area and may on occasion use the parking bays. 'Boris' bikes are within very close proximity to these two suggested locations and these seem to serve the local residents well - there is no need to add further ebike parking bays.
- Very importantly, the two suggested locations (Allen Street & Iverna) are on busy corners that on a daily basis cars/Vans/Delivery trucks/ etc try to navigate around the mini roundabout/corner with daily instances of cars squeezed in these corners, cars having to reverse or yield in tight pockets of space.

It is predictable that ebike parking on these corners will clog up free flowing traffic even further causing further noise and air pollution; ebike dumping is the new environmental pollution imposed on local residents.

Unless the council deals with this new ebike dumping problem, I suggest you do not proceed further with this ebike parking initiative.

Objection Nine

I strongly oppose the following two suggested locations for e-bike parking:

(1) On the north-east side of Allen Street, opposite the flank wall of No. 45 Abingdon Villas, situated in Allen Street

(2) On the east side of Iverna Gardens, outside the rear of Nos. 47 to 60 Cheniston Gardens, situated in Iverna Gardens

My reasons are as follows:

- I have seen on various occasions e-bikes dumped on pavements, in undesignated areas including streets, private properties including front gardens or drive ways.
- I have witnessed a disabled lady trying to manoeuvre her mobility scooter around discarded e-bikes thrown across the pavement; by the time walkers rushed to assist this lady, she was in tears in frustration.
- I have myself moved ebikes from footpaths just because these were dumped without concern to pedestrians. Its should be noted that many older people reside in Abingdon court and a new care home is currently being built by the corner of Allen Street and Abingdon Villas, these residents are particularly vulnerable when it comes to obstructions to their mobility which these bike docs would inevitable cause.
- I have witnessed local residents unable to park in residential parking bays because ebikes were discarded in these bays.
- Clearly there are no practical and implementable rules that can prevent ebike users from being inconsiderate and selfish when parking these bikes.

- I question whether this proposal for e-bikes serves the local residents or the general public who may randomly be in the area and may on occasion use the parking bays. 'Boris' bikes are within very close proximity to these two suggested locations and these seem to serve the local residents well - there is no need to add further ebike parking bays.

- Very importantly, the two suggested locations (Allen Street & Iverna) are on busy corners that on a daily basis cars/Vans/Delivery trucks/ etc try to navigate around the mini roundabout/corner with daily instances of cars squeezed in these corners, cars having to reverse or yield in tight pockets of space. It is predictable that ebike parking on these corners will clog up free flowing traffic even further causing further noise and air pollution; ebike dumping is the new environmental pollution imposed on local residents.

Unless the council deals with this new ebike dumping problem, I suggest you do not proceed further with this ebike parking initiative.

Objection Ten

I hereby register my strong objection to the proposed dockless e-bike parking bays that are proposed. This objection is for location S521D RBKC have no legal authority over e-bike providers such as Lime which are hardly regulated. Frequent incidents with pedestrians, other cyclists and motor vehicles do occur and Lime, DOTT and others will accept no liability for damage despite the rider being at fault. Ignoring traffic signs and crossing on red lights is a regular sight which endangers other traffic participants.

These parking bays will only grow their business and legitimise the current setup. They will not help clean up our pavements. Despite new bays in other boroughs the number of bikes left on pavements has not reduced overall.

From personal experience as a rider many of these bikes are potentially unsafe as they are heavy with very poor balance.

The parking spaces proposed will only lead to more issues, bikes dumped on the road and pavement and endanger other traffic participants as well as cause damage to vehicles.

Separately, please consider that this is a conservation area which RBKC tend to ignore in planning matters rather frequently.

Objection Eleven

As a resident in Abingdon Villas I am writing to object to the proposal to install no less than two dockless bike bays between Iverna Gardens and Allen Street.

Objections are based on the following grounds:

1. Bikes are currently abandoned recklessly wherever a rider finishes their journey. There is no incentive for the rider to deposit a bike in a bay – whether nearby or not. The bays are likely to be ignored at the cost of reducing the parking available.
2. Bikes are not always secured upright. They can fall over - either into the road or onto the pavement - causing obstruction.
3. There is already plenty of bike parking space available in High Street Kensington – not 200 yards away. If a rider cannot be bothered to park it there then they are unlikely to care and will drop the bike anywhere it suits them.

I object to this proposal.

Objection Twelve

I object to the planned proposal of Dockless Bike bay Iverna Gardens

As a resident on Abingdon Court, I strongly object that you are depleting the already limited parking available to both Abingdon Court and Iverna Gardens mansion blocks. There are 60 apartments alone in Abingdon Court, we have no off street parking and it is all ready extremely hard to find a parking space near are home. You should put your residents first and not non residents of RBKC, we don't need these dockless bays, we also don't need the anymore bike storage units, the existing ones are largely empty. The place for dockless bikes can be expanded in the centre reservation on the high street or streets which don't have high density apartment blocks, we cannot afford to loose anymore car parking spaces. Put your residents (council tax payers) first .

Objection Thirteen

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to install a bike parking bay in this location. This area is already congested due to the proximity to the junction of Abingdon Villas and Marloes Road. Without any docking requirement, ebikes are frequently dumped at random, creating a hazard for pedestrians and car users and I suspect this will continue regardless of bike parking bays, particularly when bays become full. Furthermore, there are several large mansioth blocks in this area and it is already difficult for the residents with cars to find a parking space - for which they have paid through residents' parking permits.

Objection Fourteen

As owner and resident of [redacted], I strongly object to the planned RBKC Designated E-Bike Bays.

1. It is generally known that these types of e-Bike Bays very quickly become dumping grounds for e-bikes that are then abandoned. Most providers of e-bikes have no interest in penalizing bikers (i.e. their customers) and they certainly have no interest in doing anything to protect non-e-Bike users.

2. RBKC does not have power to fine providers and users or impound abandoned bikes. How can they protect the legitimate interests of Kensington residents (many of them elderly) who should be the first priority of the council.

3. The locations identified, one of which is very near the cross roads (Allen Street / Abingdon Villas), the other a T Junctions (Iverna Gardens / Abingdon Villas) are busy at all times and parking as well as the to be expected dumping of e-bikes will certainly create a hazard for both pedestrians and motorists.

4. In short, without the necessary powers, RBKC will only aggravate the pervasive “plague” of these e-bikes caused by negligent and indifferent riders as well providers of those services. Due to the elimination of precious few parking spaces in the area, residents will find it even more difficult to park near their homes.

Objection Fifteen

I am writing to object to the proposal to have a dockless bike hire bay at location Dockless Bikes II/NS/S521d

Frankly I am very surprised that the council are trying to convert a resident parking bay into a dockless bike station - without a formal consultation. It is concerning that this is being done by simply putting up a notice on a lamp post, hoping nobody will see and object to it. I have not received a letter surrounding this proposal and happened by chance to walk past the notice. There is also another proposal for a dockless bike around the corner from this location on the corner of Abingdon Villas and Allen Street - quite why we need two dockless bike stations in two suboptimal positions within 200metres of each other is quite unclear.

My objections for the Dockless Bike Station in this location are the following:

-This location is a very poor fit. The street is already a narrow one requiring one side of traffic to wait for the other to pass. A dockless bike area would make traffic even more difficult, let alone safety considerations to pedestrians and traffic on this busy street which many use to bypass the traffic on Marloes Road to High Street Kensington.

-I am concerned that people who already dump ebikes on pavements will now dangerously dump their bike on the road and pavement endangering traffic and cause damage to vehicles.

-Loss of resident parking space. It is already incredibly difficult to find parking in the area, and it sometimes takes 20 mins of driving around to find a space nearby. Could you please find more a more appropriate location using pay & display areas?

-I understand the decision has been made to have Dockless Bike Stations in 4 locations in Abingdon Ward, namely: Lexham Gardens, Logan Place, Marloes Road and Pembroke Gardens under a PUBLIC CONSULTATION. Why do we need yet two more within 200m of each -both at very poorly thought out, suboptimal and precarious locations?

Please have a proper consultation AND please find an alternative more suitable location.

Objection Sixteen

I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed installation of two dockless bike hire bays near our residence. Placing bike bays in these areas could lead to increased noise, congestion, and safety concerns for residents and pedestrians. Additionally, it could disrupt the character and aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood.

I urge you to consider alternative locations for these bike bays that are less intrusive to residential areas. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Objection Seventeen

I refer to the above 2 references. The proposal is for 2 new Dockless Bike Hire bays. I object to them in these particular locations because:-

- 1) This will use up valuable parking spaces. Residents of Abingdon Court already find it difficult at times to find a parking space close to home.
- 2) The locations proposed are very busy, and narrow with parking on either side of the road. Dumping e bikes will be a hazard for both pedestrians and motorists in my view.
- 3) These will be Dockless, unlike the Santander Cycles which are much better controlled

I just think it would be dangerous for these locations to be used for this purpose.

Objection Eighteen

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas **if** they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Full One

Yes but.....it only makes sense if e-bikes which are parked outside parking bays are fined and/or removed.
Parking bays are good, but responsible parking must be enforced.

Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Three

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Lexham Gardens

Objection One

The bikes in the borough are a nuisance. They're dangerous on the roads, break the road rules constantly and are left all over the place. The last thing I want is to encourage more people to use them. People ride on the footpaths and show no respect to pedestrians. I object to the council spending money on bike parking and bike lanes.

Objection Two

Not a good idea.. uses up already small amount of resident permits parking spaces.. people leave these bikes all over the places not neatly in the bike racks so this is also rather dangerous for walkers.. In Lexham Gardens we already have more than our fair share of large linen lorries delivering linen to hotels in the square.. they take up 2 or 3 parking spaces every evening for an hour or so.. it's just a very busy square already!
Please no bike parks...

Objection Three

This is a formal objection to creating a new e-bike parking bay in Lexham Gardens. There is currently a shortage of parking spaces in the area, especially at night which means that cars are parked on yellow lines or sometimes double parked. The existing parking bays are already full at all times during the day and there is a shortage of both metered and resident parking bays.
Existing ebikes are often left obstructing the pavements being a danger to the public or are left in the adjoining mews obstructing the highway and they have to be moved to allow access. If you insist on having an e-bay parking bay, it would be better located at the end of Lexham Gardens next to the existing motor cycle parking bay or opposite outside No. 5 Lexham Gardens where there are single yellow lines and where there is more passing pedestrian traffic likely to use the e-bikes.

Objection Four

I have seen many ebike parking areas and invariably people leave ebikes outside of the parking area and into the road and in the resident parking areas. (this is already an issue on the east side of Courtfield rd near Gloucester station. Ever since the ebike/scooter parking area has been installed a back up of traffic happens during peak periods at the traffic circle because the ebike/scooters are left out in the road leaving only a single lane (or 1-half) free. I have also been unable to park there several times because I could not move the ebikes/scooters parked in the resident bays. The area in question at Lexham Gardens also has a fair amount of traffic and vehicles turning at that corner which will have difficulties when the bikes are left outside the designated parking area. I already sometimes need to wait when a large vehicle is coming down the road, ebikes in this area will make that much worse.

When you consider that the hotels often have large vehicles parked at that corner and then add ebikes further interfering in traffic flow this will have a very negative impact on noise pollution and the general positive lives of the residents in this area. This will also have a negative effect on an already crowded resident parking as ebikes/scooters will invariably be left in vehicle parking bays.

Objection Five

I hope this message finds you well. As a resident of the Abingdon Ward, I am reaching out to express my concerns and those of fellow residents regarding the proposed addition of ebike bays in our area. While I understand and support the council's efforts to promote sustainable and eco-friendly transportation options, I believe that the current proposal may have unintended consequences for a significant portion of our community.

My primary concern is that the additional ebike bays will occupy valuable parking space that is currently used by residents. Many of us, especially the elderly and those with mobility issues, rely on personal vehicles for essential travel. It is crucial to recognize that these residents often face difficulties in walking or cycling long distances, making car travel not just a convenience but a necessity.

Moreover, I have observed that the ebikes occupying these bays do not contribute to the costs associated with resident parking or insurance, yet they diminish the availability of parking for residents who do pay these fees. This disparity raises questions about the equitable use of shared community resources.

Additionally, I have noted an increase in space allocated for electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. While I acknowledge the importance of supporting the transition to electric vehicles, the reality is that not all residents can afford EVs at this stage. This situation creates a scenario where the infrastructure changes favor a select group, potentially at the expense of the broader community's needs.

Given these concerns, I kindly request that the council reconsider the allocation of additional ebike bays in our area. I urge the exploration of alternative solutions that balance the promotion of sustainable transport options with the needs and realities of all community members. Options could include the placement of ebike bays in less congested areas or the development of a more comprehensive parking strategy that accommodates both current and future transportation modes.

I believe that through open dialogue and thoughtful planning, you'll can achieve a balance that supports sustainability goals while also respecting the needs of all residents. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response in due course.

Objection Six

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal for an E-bike Bay on Lexham Gardens on the North West corner opposite number 38 ref: II/NS/S521e as per your communication to nearby residents of 6 March and notice on the lamppost at the location, for the following reasons:

1. Proximity to the Lexham Gardens Garden Gate: As you recognise in your communication of 6 March and I also personally witness, when e-bike bays become full, the bikes are then left next to them spilling onto the road and pavements, they are also often knocked over or blown over in the wind causing the same issue. The proposed location of this bay will cause e-bikes to be left in front of our Garden gate, and make access to the Garden difficult for all resident key holders and contractors, and particularly effect the young nursery aged children from The Lexham Gardens Playhouse on Lexham Gardens Mews who enter and exit the garden with their teachers twice a day. At the moment the present car parking arrangements and the yellow line maintain clear access to the gates but there are no guarantees that e-bikes will maintain or respect this, as they are not subject to control or oversight.
2. Present E-Bike Bay on Lexham Gardens: There is already an E-bike Bay by the wall between 86-88 Lexham Gardens and 14 Marloes Road. This is no more than a minutes walk away from the proposed bay. It seems that our square is being targeted with an unfair ratio of e-bike bays. Surely it is not a priority, or sensible planning to have another one so close by, and it is not needed to help fill the gap in your existing e-bike parking bay provision in the borough.
3. Loss of Parking spaces: This will result in another loss of a parking space to add to those we have already lost due to the encouragement of cycling and electric vehicles. I agree with these in principle, but again it seems that Lexham Gardens is being asked to sacrifice more parking spaces than our fair share. We have lost one space due to the E-Bike Bay in point 2, which is across the road from the three lost bays that are now home to Santander bikes. Next week two bays will be lost to electric charging points which I had objected to offering sensible alternatives and compromises. Additionally as per point one e- bikes may also spill out across their bays into any empty space in the bordering Residents parking bay. These together with the necessary dedicated disabled bay, motorbike bay and the consistent suspended parking bays are already causing unnecessary difficulties for resident permit holders to be able to park safely in the nearby vicinity of their homes, another bay lost will only add to this problem. This particular bay is also used by and suspended for contractors working for long periods on that end of the garden as it is the most suitable space for their needs. This will result in daytime suspension of the very in demand paid parking on the other side of the gate, which is not as convenient for their needs.
4. Proximity to Lexham Gardens Walk: There has been a long term problem and a losing battle for many years with cyclists, riding at speed and without consideration, on the pavement on Lexham Gardens Walk between Lexham Gardens and Cornwall Gardens, despite the sign posts at either end. This is not only upsetting to the many pedestrians, as well as the residents of the walk who step out directly onto the pavement, but also endangers them. There has been at least one child with broken bones and many near misses. The position of this e-bike bay will only encourage the start and finishing of journeys using Lexham Gardens Walk as a shortcut and not dismounting from their bikes.
5. It is understandable that with the increased popularity of e-bikes as a mode of transport and the growing number of users, that the council wishes to provide accessible and contained designated e-bike parking bays, in order to prevent the bikes being left indiscriminately, and inconsiderately causing obstructions on our pavements. This proposal however as I have outlined above is neither suitable or necessary in this location. I hope therefore hope that after seriously considering these objections the proposal will not proceed from consultation to fruition.

Objection Seven

I live in Lexham Gardens opposite the garden square.

I was sent a form asking me, as a resident, to give my priority concerns regarding the area of Lexham Gardens.

I was very happy to do so, because my major concern apart from the alarming rise in burglaries, was, and still is, the amount of cyclists using Lexham Walk. I am very disappointed that nothing has been done.

It cannot be overstated how dangerous this has become. Unfortunately they seem to have no regard for the safety of pedestrians, mothers with children, dog walkers, the elderly and groups of people strolling through. All seem to be treated as stationary objects to be used as some kind of obstacle course. Most of the time you are not aware of their presence until it is too late.

I would like to see on the spot fines for this reckless behaviour, I have witnessed many very near misses and try not to use the walk unless absolutely necessary, which is very inconvenient .

The proposed sighting of this bay, which by the way would be the third around the square, is highly undesirable, it would definitely encourage more people to cycle through this designated pedestrian walkway. Also it is highly undesirable as the local kindergarten use this gate to the square for their playtimes.

Objection Eight

I am writing to object to the proposal for an E-bike Bay on Lexham Gardens on the North West corner opposite number 38 ref: II/NS/S521e as per the notice on the lamppost at the location.

The principal reasons for my objection are that:

1) Objection to specific location: the proposed location is adjacent to the garden entrance used by the local nursery school (Lexham Gardens Playhouse). As you are doubtless aware, present designs of e-bikes are not entirely stable when propped, and mixing such parked e-bikes with young children will create the situation where “a significant-injury accident is waiting to happen”.

It is essential either that there be child-proof railings to separate the bay from the access route to the gardens, or that the e-bike bay be spaced by at least one motor vehicle’s length from the garden’s entrance

2) Objections to locating the bike in the general are of the proposal:

2a) I doubt the need for cycle bay in this general location when there are others so close by.

2b) Judging by the number of e-bikes left on the pavements within 80-metres of the bay at the corner to Marloes Road (even when the bay is nearly empty), the provision of bays does not appear to be effective under present circumstances. Provision of additional bays is unlikely to solve the problem of stray e-bikes without there being some sort of policing.

2c) The location is as close to Lexham Gardens Walk, a nominally no-cycling pedestrian passageway, whose status appears to be routinely ignored. The provision of an electric cycle bay so close could be seen as encouraging this dangerous activity (which has already resulted in at least one significant injury to a pedestrian)

Objection Nine

I refer to the above proposal to locate an e bike bay in the residents parking bay opposite no 38 Lexham Gardens.

I live at [redacted] Lexham Gardens and my purpose in contacting you is to strongly object to this proposal .

Firstly In my opinion the location of e bikes here will be a Health and Safety hazard in view of the close proximity of the bay to the gated entrance to Lexham Gardens Garden gate – particularly in view of the number of little children coming and going in the Gardens from the nearby nursery. I do not think the two uses are compatible.

Secondly , I can foresee that more e bike riders will then use and cut through Lexham Gardens Walk to and from Cornwall Gardens adding to a continuing problem of cyclists ,and Deliveroo moped riders going through(and paying no attention to the no Cycling signs) this pedestrianized area endangering the walking public.

Thirdly , there is already an e bike bay at the Marloes Road end of Lexham Gardens – why do you need another. I notice occasionally they bike in e bike areas get know over and for a unsightly mess .

Lastly the loss of a residents parking bay here will ,with all the pay and display parking bays in from of 40 – 44 Lexham Gardens make it all the more difficult to find a resident parking bay to use – which is paid for .

Accordingly I hope you will reconsider the sue of this location for e bike and focus your search for a more user friendly position.

Objection Ten

I object to the proposal for an e-bike bay in Lexham Gardens (on the garden square side, east of Marloes Road), on the north-west corner, across from number 38 Lexham Gardens.

1. No need for an additional e-bike bay: There is already an existing E-bike Bay at the entrance to Lexham Gardens, between 86-88 Lexham Gardens and 14 Marloes Road. Lexham Gardens is a small square, compared with most others in the borough, and there is absolutely no need for 2 e-bike bays so close to each other in this small square. Not only is it a small square, but it is very densely populated with multi-storey buildings, all containing numerous flats. The existing e-bike bay is less than a minute away by foot from the additional bay you now propose. This makes no practical sense for E-bike users, and is disproportionate and unfair to Lexham Gardens residents to have so many parking spaces taken up by bike-related space (see below) .
 2. 2 other existing bike bays in Lexham Gardens: In addition to the existing e-bike bay, there is also already a large Boris/Santander bike bay, just across from the existing e-bike bay. Moreover, there is yet another bike area right next to the existing e-bike bay for storage of bikes.
 3. Yet another e-bike bay just around the corner from Lexham Gardens, in Marloes Road: As if there were not already sufficient e-bike and other bike bays in Lexham Gardens, there is yet another e-bike bay just around the corner in Marloes Road, just a 1-2 minute walk from the existing Lexham Gardens bay.
 4. Loss of too many parking spaces: The proposal will result in another loss of yet another parking space, adding to those already lost to cycling and electric vehicles. Lexham Gardens is being disproportionately affected, given its small size, the large number of multi-occupancy flats and the consequential need for on street parking. Already we have lost one space due to current e-bike bay, which is just across the road from the three bays lost to the Boris/Santander bikes. And we are will lose imminently yet two more parking bays for electric charging points. The residents of Lexham Gardens objected to this, but alternatives and compromises were rejected. And e- bikes regularly spill out across other adjacent parking bays, with means residents are further inconvenienced when trying legitimately to park their cars near their homes. Moreover, together with the necessary dedicated disabled bay, motorbike bay and the often suspended parking bays for building, garden maintenance and road works, resident permit holders already find it difficult to park safely and securely near their homes.
 5. Obstruction of the Lexham Gardens Garden Gate: As you yourselves pointed out, e-bikes and other rental bikes are regularly dumped onto the road and pavements and knocked over by passers-by. Yet another bay will not alleviate this problem, but rather it will make it worse. The proposed location of this bay will inevitably obstruct at times the entrance gate to Lexham Gardens Square, which is used constantly, including several time daily by very young children from The Lexham Gardens Playhouse in Lexham Gardens Mews.
 6. Too close to Lexham Gardens Walk: There is already a serious health and safety issue, with cyclists not dismounting and having to dodge other cyclists and pedestrian on the pavement on Lexham Gardens Walk between Lexham Gardens and Cornwall Gardens, despite the clear sign posting to the contrary. There have been recorded accidents here due to this ongoing issue, and you are now on notice that your proposal will put residents at risk. Your proposal will encourage riders to start and finishing their journeys here, using Lexham Gardens Walk as a shortcut.
 7. I am not bike unfriendly, but this is the wrong spot for yet another e-bike bay. Lexham Gardens and the immediately surrounding area already generously cater to cyclists.
- Please take this objection, and others of a similar nature, seriously, and find another spot for yet more e-bike bays. Lexham Gardens is already doing more than its fair share in this regard.

Objection Eleven

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas **if** they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Full One

Overall, I very much support this scheme to give a limited number of vehicle bays to E-Bikes. I would also like other areas (eg extra wide pavements) to E-Bike bays, so as not to use too many resident bays. EG I support giving space outside police station where we have an extra wide pavement Also, Kensington Church Street W8 (Campden Ward) where there is extra pavement areas

Support in Full Two

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.

Appendix 8: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Scarsdale Villas

Objection One

Alternative locations that do not require surrender of car parking spaces should be used. There is already insufficient car parking for residents in RBKC who pay rates.

Objection Two

I absolutely support the creation of e-bike parking areas *if* they are made mandatory. It makes no sense if the designated bays are additional to riders being allowed to continue to abandon their bikes at will as they do today, blocking pavements etc.

However, all the selected locations in the Abingdon ward do not make sense. As you walk around the whole area either side of Kensington High Street you can see the evidence of where users of e-Bikes are leaving their e-bikes. Surely it makes sense to locate the parking bays where people evidently want to use them? You are proposing locations where I rarely see a deposited e-bike. For example, there is one person who tends to leave an e-bike 1-2 times a week anywhere near the Cope Place/Abingdon Road intersection. Same for Allen Street and Abingdon Road.

Where do you see dozens of abandoned e-bikes? At all the major junctions with Kensington High Street (especially close to the tube station), at access to Holland Park (opposite Waitrose/Ramsays street burgers), Town Hall/library, and close to building sites.

If you don't put the parking where people want it - they won't use it. And there are only occasional single bikes left where you are proposing - and many dozens a day at the places I mention. And if the proposal is not going to alleviate the issues we are having with these e-bikes, which it will not in these locations, then I cannot support it.

Support in Part One

I live in Pembroke Road and several bikes are left on the pavement near the junction with Warwick Road. I note there are no parking spaces planned near to this location.

Support in Part Two

I like the location but it would be good to have one more parking area to the west as there aren't any around Edwardes and Pembroke Squares.

Support in Part Three

I don't want the e-bikes to end up on the corner blocking the footpath it needs to be in a proper stand like the red bikes. Can you please also add one more space where the design museum is there is so much space there.

Support in Full One

Good as long as only one parking bay is given up (not more as parking already a struggle - otherwise why not a pay at meter bay?)

Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Three

Although I hold a resident's parking permit, I support the conversion of a parking bay in Cope Place, and all six bays in Abingdon Ward. Cycling infrastructure should be prioritised to meet climate goals, improve local air quality and reduce congestion. Nevertheless, priority should be given to dock-based systems such as "Santander" bikes, over the dockless systems.