

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 CAMPDEN 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 Campden 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 five locations in Campden 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, 183 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the five 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 Palace Gardens Terrace, Phillimore Place and Vicarage Gate 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
S523a Aubrey Walk	2 (14)	0 (2)	5 (12)	0	Proceed
S523b Palace Gardens Terrace	19 (31)	2 (4)	0 (7)	0	Do not proceed
S523c Phillimore Place	7 (19)	1 (3)	2 (9)	0	Do not proceed
S523d Pitt Street	2 (14)	1 (3)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S523e Vicarage Gate	34 (46)	1 (3)	2 (9)	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 – 7 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.

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.

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 narrow

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the street was too narrow and that there is a risk that the bikes would interfere with cars turning into the street.

Officer Response

- 5.8 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 a dockless e-bike bay 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.

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

- 5.11 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

- 5.12 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

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

Officer Response

- 5.14 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 e-bikes in circulation.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.15 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One respondent to the Aubrey Walk proposal suggested Campden Hill Square as it had more parking available.
- 5.16 Respondents to the Phillimore Place proposal suggested closer to Kensington High Street, Campden Hill, the entrance to or further inside of Holland Park, the Holland Park entrance from Duchess of Bedford's Walk, the south-east corner of Phillimore Place, flank wall of 42 Argyll Road or Upper Phillimore Gardens.
- 5.17 Respondents to the Pitt Street proposal suggested Dukes Lane or around Holland Street, with one respondent suggesting that officers had selected the proposed location believing it to be the flank of the property, but that the main entrance was not at the front of the building as might be expected, but at the back of the building next to the proposed location and that this would cause disruption.

Officer Response

- 5.18 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.19 There are already two rental e-bike parking bay very close to Campden Hill Square, across the junction on Ladbroke Grove, and there are two along Campden Hill Road. Similarly, there are already seven rental e-bike parking bays on Kensington High Street. Cycling is not permitted in Holland Park so it would be inappropriate to host a rental e-bike bay within its limits. The Holland Park entrance to Duchess of Bedford Walk is a narrow cul-de-sac unsuitable for parking of any kind. It is not clear why the south-east corner of Phillimore Place/flank wall of 42 Argyll Place would be more suitable than the proposed location to the north-west.
- 5.20 The aim of proposing rental e-bike bays is to locate them where the most people are more likely to use them. Therefore, the premise that relocating the proposal to a street where there are larger homes with fewer people overall (such as is suggested as Upper Phillimore Gardens versus Phillimore Place where it is perceived there are more people living in flats) does not make a good case for proposing the e-bike bay elsewhere in this case.
- 5.21 Dukes Lane is entirely marked with double yellow lines as it is too narrow to accommodate any type of vehicle parking. The location proposed to the flank wall of 17 Gordon Place (located on Pitt Street) 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 in any of the parking bays on Holland Street. Whilst there is a small side entrance to 17 Gordon Place on Pitt Street, the proposal is not directly outside of this entrance and there is no reason why it should cause disruption any more than any other proposal.

Other comments

- 5.22 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	One response approved of the plans, believing they helped create a coherent and reliable network of bays, enabling users to do short local journeys that may otherwise be done by a car. (Aubrey Walk proposal)	-
2	One respondent to the Pitt Street said that the bays would not benefit residents as and/or there was no demand for them. (Pitt Street proposals)	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.
3	Replace Santander stands with dockless rental e-bike parking as they are now obsolete. (Aubrey Walk proposal)	Santander Cycle Hire is managed by Transport for London and continues to experience demand trips, with the Campden Hill Road location seeing 347 hires and 296 docks in April 2024. The Council has no plans to remove access to Cycle Hire for residents and visitors.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr Catherine Faulks

I have now visited and spoken to residents about three proposed sites for new E-bike bays in Campden Ward. Below are the reasons as to why I, and residents I have spoken to, object to the following three proposals:-

1. Aubrey Walk (Flank wall of 1 Wycombe Close) – we have already reported a lot of issues in this street, especially this stretch. It is hard for cars to pass and there is often congestion around this junction, and the turning left down Hillsleigh Road. Placing ebikes at the entrance to the street with cars turning in, often at speed while finding a gap in the traffic coming up Campden Hill Road is an accident waiting to happen. Especially when in high winds, such as today, they may fall into the road on this busy junction. The Campden Hill tennis Club is complaining through about the number of ebikes that are currently left in the bike racks outside the club. I would suggest a safer and quieter location would be at the top end of Campden Hill Gardens.
2. Phillimore Place (outside flank wall of 32 Phillimore Gardens). Cllr North and I spent an hour walking this area with residents. The objection to the site proposed is that it is close to the entrance of a one-way street and could easily cause an obstruction or accident when cars turning into the street do not anticipate it. Residents are also resistant to losing a parking bay due to the recent loss of a further two to a recharging station. The road is on a slope which would make the bikes more vulnerable to fall over, potentially causing further hazards. The residents are not against an E-bike stand as such and suggest looking at the other end of Phillimore Place where cars are exiting the street. However, on our walkabout, we all agreed that the best, and most useful location would be at the Kensington High Street end of Holland Walk. There is a large grass verge there which is already used as an E-bike dumping ground and it would have an extra benefit in deterring pigeon feeding!
3. Vicarage Gare (Opposite 1/2 Vicarage Gate. Cllr North and I held surgeries at Winchester Court and Vicarage Court to ask residents views on this E-bike parking space. The view of most people was that to lose another 1.5 residents parking spaces, in an area where they are already in short supply, would be very detrimental. There are 90 flats in Winchester Court and 106 in Vicarage court. As well as several other large mansion blocks in the near vicinity. Many elderly and disabled residents live in these blocks and need to park close by. Suggestions were made to see if the bikes could be located further down Kensington Church Street on the wide east pavement, or further up just to the north of Vicarage Gare, also on the pavement.

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 resident 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 Hopsital 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 Aubrey Walk

Objection One

I am writing to object to this application for dockless bike parking at the eastern end of Aubrey Walk. The council is again using every excuse to whittle away at residents' parking which is full at most times along Aubrey walk and needs every space we have. There are also much better alternatives: Just to the south along Campden Hill Road there is a huge and increasingly obsolescent bay for docked bikes whose business has been lost to the dockless and electrically powered alternative. That could easily be cut to half its current length and the rest be used for dockless bike parking, or, very near to that to the north, there is some single yellow line that could also be repurposed. Take a look at the Boris bike space and you will see that it is largely empty.

Objection Two

I write respectfully to object to RBKC's proposal to introduce a dockless E-bike parking-bay in part of the existing Residents' Parking Bay on Aubrey Walk W8 adjacent to Wycombe Square.

My reasons are twofold:

(i) This parking-bay is fully occupied for the majority of the time, as are the other parking-bays nearby in Aubrey Walk and Campden Hill Gardens. If the Council does deem it necessary to introduce a dockless E-bike parking-bay in this locality, I would ask the Council kindly to look at potential alternative locations: for example, might Campden Hill Square be considered, as there are usually many unoccupied parking-spaces there, especially those on the internal side of the square?

(ii) More generally, whilst I am in principle supportive of E-bikes as a convenient and environmentally-friendly mode of transport - indeed I have used them myself - I object to the way they are so frequently left to clutter up our Public Space, often on pavements, where they are a hindrance to pedestrians, and most especially disabled people and parents with push-chairs, as well as on public highways. Any efforts by the private contractors such as Lime and Human Forest to arrange for their E-bikes to be parked and stored in an orderly fashion are clearly woefully inadequate, which leads me to assume that they are not fulfilling the obligations of their licensee service level agreements with the relevant regulatory and enforcement authorities: I do not know where the responsibility lies, whether it is with the offices of the Mayor of London, the London Assembly, TFL, the London Met or the local Borough Councils.

I find it very unsatisfactory that the main E-bike contractors - as private companies, primarily in pursuit of revenue and profit - are permitted the free run of our Public Realm. I have heard that some measures have been taken by RBKC to bring order to the parking of E-bikes, but given that this has plainly not been effective, I would urge the Council to bring to bear whatever powers it has - whether direct or indirect - to have the licenses revoked for any E-bike contractors who do not meet their responsibilities to a reasonable level, as I feel that this scourge of our Public Space has gone on for far too long.

Support in Full One

Good idea as long as big enough and is well indicated so can be useful

Support in Full Two

Fully support

1. Convenient, easy to find and accessible bays much needed in neighbourhood
2. Bays are essential to address anti social pavement parking
3. Bays reduce potential conflict between pedestrians and hire users
4. Increased availability provides better transport choices for people and supports councils stated aim to enable more active travel and reduce car journeys
5. More than half of households do not have a car in this area, a fairer approach to road space and kerb space is needed, 1 parking bay can accommodate up to 8 bike, this is a much better utility for 5 metre of suggested space
6. Suggested locations near junctions are very good and also increase visibility at junctions, all too often visibility is blocked by large vehicles parking too close to the junctions - this improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists
7. Close to busy high street, schools and other amenities thus enabling more alternatives to car journeys for short local trips

Support in Full Three

I have never seen the “bike hangar” in Sheffield Terrace used, or any of the others in the borough – brung used.

Will these new parking areas lead to the bike hangers being removed or will they stay there, empty, forever?

Support in Full Four

Please make parking e-bikes anywhere other than designated bays illegal.

Support in Full Five

Strong support for the dockless e-bike bay on Aubrey Walk, W8. Great proposal !

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

Objection One

Too many cycle spots already, most not used, and very little parking for cars for residents

Objection Two

No need for more bikes - we already have many at the end of the road (only 2mins away)

Objection Three

palace garden terrace already has two dedicated cycling stations on the street, not counting ones on the surrounding street such as vicarage gate etc.

This E-bike parking proposal directly outside a residents house will contribute to:

- 1) nuisance bikes dumped around the street, which is already becoming a problem
- 2) bikes placed on pavements will limit mobility for people with wheelchairs, strollers and prams
- 3) increase in crime with bikes being stolen for anti social behavior.

There are already two parking stations in the street. Perhaps these should be optimised before the street is glutted with rental bike e-bays.

Objection Four

There is already a space used on Palace Gardens Terrace for bicycle storage and a space used for hire bikes at the junction of Palace Gardens Terrace and Vicarage Gate. The hire bike space frequently overflows into one or two more car parking spaces, which makes trying to find somewhere to park as a resident extremely difficult. The bikes often fall into cars parked nearby as well. The bike spaces are badly managed. Parking is difficult enough without more spaces being lost to bikes.

Objection Five

This will remove parking for residents which we need. Even before this there is often insufficient parking. We pay a lot for our parking permit - we need to be able to park without driving around for ages.

Also there is lots of place for e bike parking. The problem is that e bike users don't use it properly and the existing e bike parking bays are not well managed. Providing more bays will not solve those problems - it will merely compound the parking problem.

Objection Six

Already have one on Palace Gardens Terrace one block south and will take up another precious parking space

Objection Seven

Parking is already incredibly limited on this street. It is a mix of flats and houses, and has 200 properties, the vast majority have a car. Bike parking already exists at both ends of Palace Gardens Terrace, close to number 1 and opposite 104, and is under used as it is, so I don't understand why even more needs to be added. The solution to the bikes being dumped everywhere is not more parking bays but fines for people who abandon bikes.

Objection Eight

Strong objection. Two parking bays already exist at both ends of Palace Gardens Terrace. This has done nothing to reduce bikes being dumped. This street is purely residential. Most residents have cars and we already suffer from a lack of parking. The locations for parking should be around tube stations or sites frequented by tourists.

Objection Nine

This is a terrible initiative. Palace Garden Terrace suffers from a severe lack of parking for us residents. There are a lot of white vans / construction vans parked on residents bays as they would rather pay the parking fine. Furthermore, we most certainly do not need any e street parking space for bikes. There are already some further up on Palace Gardens Terrace and that is enough. Adding more would create more difficulties for residents car parking and the flow of the street that is already very congested. I vote against this initiative

Objection Ten

There is already significant pressure for on street parking in this area, given the density of the housing and a high number of residents with vehicles. There are already sizeable bicycle/e-bike stations further up on Palace Gardens Terrace and on Vicarage Gate, which have reduced the number of on street parking bays already significantly, as well as much needed pay and display bays for visitors and tradespeople. A new lock up bicycle store was also recently installed on Palace Gardens Terrace, removing several more resident bays. With excellent public transport options and bus connections in the area, I believe

the existing number of e-bike stations is more than enough and there is a legitimate and pressing need to preserve resident parking bays in this neighbourhood, particularly as no residents have off street parking available to them.

Objection Eleven

Impact on resident parking spaces. Too many cars already re number of spaces.

Objection Twelve

- 1 E bikes have become a menace on our local streets. They will continue to do so whether there is parking or not.
- 2 Older residents cannot use them.
- 3 Young children cannot use them.
- 4 Why do we have to have them at all?
- 5 They are not safe on the roads as there is no protection ie.. no user wears a helmet and the bikes are not registered to one user.
- 6 They are an unnecessary adjunct to our already cluttered roads and give other road users a real problem negotiating them.
- 7 I do not want to see them in the beautiful streets of London where we should be able to see the Spring and Summer blossom and the beautiful houses in Kensington in all it's glory without seeing ugly bikes parked in various streets of our borough.
- 8 We are destroying the safe nature and natural beauty of the London pavements with unnecessary clutter.
- 9 There is too much attention paid to these other forms of transport when we need to focus on making the routes through London easier for traffic (not residents cars as they have been relegated to second class in favour of Uber) to negotiate to speed up the process of traffic flow and therefore reducing carbon emissions.
- 10 When is it all going to stop! When can we live in peace in our beloved London homes with the pavements remaining as pavements for people.

Objection Thirteen

This is a purely residential street and trying to secure resident parking is dire at the best of times. People are not going to walk halfway along to hire a bike. There is already a bay at the Notting Hill Gate End and an additional is not required.
I strongly object to this proposal

Objection Fourteen

There is already another e bike parking space not far away at the south end of Palace Gardens Terrace. We have serious parking issues for residents in our street and another e bike space would further reduce available parking space.

Objection Fifteen

Bikes are left lying on the pavement and street. They will obstruct the turn from Brunswick Gds into PGT if a car is turning left to go north. This is an absurd location

Objection Sixteen

As residents, we already have difficulties to park our car so taking away more car parks is not fair, when there is already a bike park station on PGT opposite The Mall pub (with hardly any bikes used for 8 months of the year!)

Objection Seventeen

These bikes are a trip hazard - even when they have these bays they fall over onto the pavement, I have almost fallen on a number of occasions.

Furthermore they are often left with rubbish in the front basket that people have left and are often covered in graffiti.

I oppose this station and ask that you take it into consideration - there are plenty of Santander bikes in the area for people to use.

Objection Eighteen

I'm writing regarding the proposed parking change on Palace Gardens Terrace.

We understand there is a need for controlled ebike parking, rather than having them left on a pavement around the borough.

For the above proposed change, I would like to strongly oppose the Order as it is a danger and a hazard to pedestrians to trip, for vehicles turning left from Brunswick Gardens into Palace Gardens Terrace and for vehicles parked in the adjacent bays.

The selected location does not have enough wrap-around space for having bikes around the allocated bay. It has a thin pavement width, also taken up by BT cabinets which by having a single ebike on the pavement will block the entire pavement flow, plus ebikes in the bay - will force pedestrians to walk on to the road to go around the area which is unsafe and dangerous on PGT as there won't be any walking space on the pavement. Even a single ebike on the pavement will cause this blockage of thoroughfare and foot traffic. This also has the potential for liability claims against the council in the event of an accident to a pedestrian.

This example photo is from today, it is a result of an existing bay and what can happen when bikes are left around the allocated space. They are a mess and the space is not respected, overflowing on to the street and on to the pavement. If this occurs on the corner of PGT and BG, there will be major issues to pedestrians, drivers and parked vehicles.

There simply isn't enough space around the proposed space when there is an overflow of parked ebikes. The corner is used extensively by cars turning from Brunswick Gardens into Palace Gardens Terrace - having an overflow of ebikes, or ebikes left incorrectly not in the allocated space is a danger to drivers who would have to swerve out more to turn left into PGT to avoid the bikes, putting them on the right hand side of PGT which is where the bike lane is on PGT. This has the danger of having head on collisions with cyclists riding down PGT in the allocated bike lane.

There is no need for another bay on Palace Gardens Terrace, there is already one allocated on the corner of PGT and Vicarage gate, so there isn't a justifiable need to add an additional one on the corner of BG and PGT if one already exists and is used further down. The street isn't a major thoroughfare or on the main roads of the borough - so the need is quite minimal.

I would suggest for the council to place ebike lanes in more high volume areas with wider pavement space and with less turning traffic volume to encourage the drop off and pick up of ebikes in areas that are more suitable for dropping off near a major intersection or tube stop, similar to the ones on the wide pavements of bayswater road (near the corner of Kensington church st).

Objection Nineteen

Following a recent application for the erection of another e-bike scooter shelter to be erected on Palace Gardens Terrace, I write to lodge my formal objection to the application.

I fail to see why there would be a requirement for a second shelter so close to the first – Palace Gardens Terrace does not require a shelter at both ends of the street. Surely this tucked away location does not warrant such a high demand for ebike usage given the demographic of the area. They are an eyesore and not in keeping with the current local authority restrictions on other 'street furniture' allowed in this area. There is also the concern that ebikes would not be correctly racked, or abandoned thereby littering the street and causing further issues

Support in Part One

Think it should be included in the existing bike parking bay which is huge and not fully used.

Support in Part Two

I am responding to the proposal for Palace Gardens Terrace, but in truth the rental bikes litter all the surrounding streets - Brunswick Gardens, Berkeley Gardens and Kensington Church Street. The residents have already lost some Residents' Parking spaces to electric car charging vehicles, and car clubs - and with the rental bikes also taking up space, the pressure on local residents' car spaces will further be increased. Whilst some e-bike users will act responsibly, it is sadly likely that others will not. Until some form of licensing for ALL cyclists is devised, trying to regulate the sector as a whole will continue to fail.

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

Objection One

This street is very residential, not a through road. It is not on the path of people from outside the area. There are lots of nearby bays at the entrance of Holland Park and the bottom of Phillimore Gardens. There doesn't seem to be much spillage in nearby bays that would justify the creation of a new one.

Objection Two

We really see any e-bike in Phillimore Place. This is a residential only street. There are no businesses nor shops. Better spots, with higher frequency of use, must exist, maybe closer to High Street.

Objection Three

I am rather surprised that the council is considering locating an e-bike parking at this location, for the following reasons.

1/ Lack of demand for e-bike bay on Phillimore Place from residents.

As a working-from-home resident on Phillimore Place, I note that only one resident in one property on the street seems to use an e-bike, and even then it seems to be less frequently than once a week, mainly in one direction (coming home). This results frequently in one or two e-bikes being left on the pavement at the South East corner of the street for extended periods of time. I note this is at the opposite end of the street from where the proposed bay is situated. I also note that an e-bike which was left outside 11/13 Phillimore Place two weeks ago is still sitting on the pavement there today. This (rental bikes sitting on the pavement for extended periods of time) is far from uncommon.

2/Where the demand for places really is.

As far as I can tell, the main areas in the ward where e-bikes are used and left are:

High Street Kensington (The bay at West end of Phillimore Walk addresses this)

Campden Hill

Holland Park entrance from Duchess of Bedford's Walk.

I note that there are regularly 3-4 e-bikes left sitting on the pavement near the Duchess of Bedford's Walk entrance to Holland Park. This makes sense. It is a natural drop off and pick up area for people who use the park and the facilities there, whether it is tennis, football or simply meeting to go for a walk. There is also a cycle lane there running from Notting Hill to Kensington, and a Santander Bike stand. Surely the most obvious place to put an e-bike bay is either next to the Santander Bike stand, right next to the cycle lane, or at the very top end of Phillimore Gardens/ West end of Duchess of Bedford's

Walk, just by the park entrance. I assume that the Phillimore Place stand is meant to address this demand. In practice, i find it hard to see the average e-bike user cycling 100m downhill to park it in the stand, in order to then walk the same 100m uphill to come back to where they started. As for Campden Hill users, a bay close to the existing Santander bay is much more convenient than Phillimore Place.

3.Safety Issues.

Phillimore Place is a quiet street because it is one way, and the direction of traffic doesn't lend itself to short cuts. For any e-bikes coming from the East, a bay on Phillimore Place will necessitate either approaching legally via Essex Villas, or via Duchess of Bedford's Walk. Most other routes will necessitate going the wrong way down one-way streets. We are already seeing a number of e-bike users going against the one way system, particularly going up Argyll Road, and East to West along Phillimore Place, both against the traffic, on their way to Phillimore Gardens and assumedly to either Holland Park or the cycle lane going up to Notting Hill. Placing a deposit bay at the West end of Phillimore Place is only going to encourage more of this behaviour. What is even more worrying is that we are also seeing a pick up in e-bike users using the pavement to traverse Phillimore place the wrong way. Placing the bay on Duchess of Bedford's Walk doesn't create these issues as both DBW and Phillimore Gardens are 2-way streets.

4. Phillimore Place specifics.

Phillimore Place is a pretty narrow street. Unless the e-bikes are stored very neatly, there is a real risk that the bikes will interfere with cars turning into the street from both North and South directions from Phillimore Gardens. The immediate area has already lost two residents parking bays due to the electric chargers on the North side of the Phillimore Gardens/Place corner. This, together with the fact that a number of properties on the North side of the street are now apartments, means that there is already a squeeze on parking midweek for residents.

In summary, my objection to the Phillimore Place bay is because to my mind, it is pretty obviously being sited in the wrong place. The natural demand for places there will be very limited but the location at the end of a narrow one-way street will, if anything, have the effect of encouraging more cyclists to cycle the wrong way along one-way streets. This will endanger both cyclists themselves and pedestrians. It seems particularly odd that this location has been mooted rather than a much more obvious location next/close to the Holland Park entrance/cycle lane which is served in both directions by wider two-way streets.

Objection Four

Having seen the way e bikes are already left on the pavement and the designated parking places are ignored. This idea will only lead to more e bikes being left haphazardly on our quiet street and they are a dangerous obstacle. Most people hiring these bikes will come from Kensington High Street not the residential streets further north. Use a space in the park near to Kensington High Street.

Objection Five

Already difficult to park a car without adding bikes to the limited street parking.

Objection Six

I do not object to the principle of having an E-Bike bay in Phillimore Place.

However:

Your proposal is to have a new bay at the north-west corner of Phillimore Place which I do not believe meets your criteria of best serving the customers of E-Bikes. We believe the better location to be at the south-east corner of our street.

We have lived here at [redacted] throughout the development of E-Bikes on our streets and pavements, and the only location hereabouts where we constantly must walk around them on the pavement is at the south-east corner of Phillimore Place, where it adjoins Argyll Road. There are often E-Bikes on the pavement there, close to the street posts in that location, making getting past even more constricted.

We have also noticed regular users of E-Bikes at [redacted], although they are usually much more considerate when parking them on the pavement outside their house. They would materially benefit from a new bay being at their end of the Phillimore Place, so they did not have to walk the full length of the street to use the new bay.

Also, there is a separate two-car parking bay right next to the flank wall of 42 Argyll Road (in Phillimore Place) which would better suit this E-Bike parking arrangement, noting that it should not affect the [redacted].

The same is not true of [redacted] which only have on-street parking and an E-Bike bay outside their houses would squeeze the parking of their cars along the western end of Phillimore Place. As the map here shows those houses also have residents parking bays withdrawn from regular residents parking due to them being a double electric car charging station in the two parking bays outside the front of 32 Phillimore Gardens.

Map courtesy of Google: https://www.google.com/maps/place/Phillimore+Pl,+London/@51.5014454,-0.1994086,18.56z/data=!4m6!3m5!1s0x48760ff1b45b6ee1:0x35d00b426a2aa574!8m2!3d51.5014555!4d-0.1981339!16s%2Fg%2F1tdvd1t_?entry=ttu

I note all this for Phillimore Place, while also noting there are many more houses in the terraces that make up Argyll Road than the larger mansions along Phillimore Gardens, yet I note there are no proposals in the draft Order to provide an E-Bike bay anywhere in Argyll Road, Essex Villas etc. Would my suggestion not be a solution for those living in Argyll Road who might use these E-Bikes? Where else are they to drop their E-Bikes

Please consider the comments here carefully and assess fully where the users of this facility would prefer to have a parking bay for their E-Bikes in this street.

Objection Seven

I am writing with reference to the above proposal.

Phillimore Place is a street where several of the properties have been converted into flats, with each occupant having the right to park their car(s) in the Residents Parking bays. There is always enormous pressure to park here. In addition, the e charging point around the corner on Phillimore Gardens has taken away 2 Residents Parking bays. Could the dockless bikes not be designated in an area where there is less pressure on residents to park? There are several streets with very large homes, where just one family lives (eg Upper Phillimore Gardens) where there would be little difference to the residents, were they to have the bays requisitioned for the council's proposal.

I would like to add that I have tried several times to call the number on the application, to speak with you, but have been put off every time, and been unable to speak with you on this matter.

Support in Part One

Can you clarify whether this would mean taking away residents parking which is usually well occupied - there are some sites nearby which would mean NOT taking away residents spaces

I very much favour these sites and have seen in other boroughs that you actually provide bike stands so that they don't all tip over, one bike tipping over another - which we have all seen

These are not as sophisticated as the "Mayor's bike stands" but do mean that the bikes do not fall over and encourage people to leave them standing up in a stand and not tipped over or on the pavement

Thank you,

How do I find out whether these schemes are on single yellow lines or take away residents parking?

Support in Full One

Fully support

1. Convenient, easy to find and accessible bays much needed in neighbourhood
2. Bays are essential to address anti social pavement parking

3. Bays reduce potential conflict between pedestrians and hire users
4. Increased availability provides better transport choices for people and supports councils stated aim to enable more active travel and reduce car journeys
5. Many households do not have a car in this area, a fairer approach to road space and kerb space is needed, 1 parking bay can accommodate up to 8 bike, this is a much better utility for 5 metre of suggested space
6. Contributes towards a reliable borough wide network of bays

Support in Full Two

I can't see an objection.

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Pitt Street

Objection One

E-bikes are an eyesore no matter where they are. They benefit the owners of large e-bike rental companies and not the residents of this area. We all have cars or use public transport. Please do not blight our ward further with more of these hideous e-bike dumps. If this goes forward we shall eject new councillors - and we all vote!

Objection Two

I strongly object to this location on four counts:

1. I understand the and support rationale to place these locations away from main entrances and next to walls. I suspect the reason RBKC have chosen this location is because it appears to be such a space. However, the main entrance to our property is not at the front of the building as you may expect but at the back of the building next to the proposed location for this ebike parking space. This will cause us the disruption you are trying to avoid.

2. Rubbish problem. This corner has become a dumping ground for rubbish by people from the surrounding streets. This results in piles of bags on that corner. We have reported this on more than one occasion however the situation is yet to be resolved. This problem is made worse by the foxes that live in the garden opposite who break open the bags. There is frequently rubbish strewn around the area. Adding an ebike parking space to this corner would result in a combination of rubbish and bikes which would create a real eyesore for the borough and a further deterioration of the area. We would much prefer you address the rubbish issue.

3. Lack of parking. The whole of RBKC and W8 has a lack of parking spaces however that particular corner is multiple times more in demand than the average as it is in the centre of an area with a large number of buildings that have been converted into apartments.

4. Residential area

This is a quiet residential area with little through traffic. Creating a transport hub in the middle will change the nature of the area for the families that live there.

Support in Part One

The one in Pitt Street is a rather good idea because it is on the way to the cycle lane of Holland Street. However, it is too close to Gordon Place (we have a bay already in Gloucester Walk). It should be further to Dukes Lane or even better around Holland Street

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Vicarage Gate

Objection One

Because street parking for residents is already extremely limited in this area and should this project go ahead, the residents will have even more difficulty finding a parking space. Therefore, I strongly oppose this project. I own two flats, [redacted], at number [redacted] Vicarage Gate.

Objection Two

There are only @ 38 parking bays for the hundreds of residents within 50 yards of the proposed bay.

There is a fixed bay within 20 yards which always has unused bikes. ebikes will still be left wherever the rider wants. It is not an obligation to use a fixed point. It is a 'dead-end' road with limited parking and already has been used for a 'bike shed' 50 yards away. I appreciate a need to 'de-clutter' the streets from dumped ebikes but this location specifically would make Vicarage Gate a visual mess and dangerous for people crossing the road.

Objection Three

We have already lost parking space in Vicarage gate with a bike shed installed last year.

There is already a large Santander bike park opposite Winchester court.

There are bike rails outside Croft estate agents ready.

There is a high percentage of older and retired people in Vicarage Gate, who are already impeded by bikes and scooters just randomly abandoned.

Objection Four

My mum is elderly and disabled, and it is already very difficult to find Residents Parking for our car, which is her sole means of transport.

We have already lost several car spaces, which have been sacrificed all in the name of endlessly expanding e-bike parking. It's just not fair. We pay a lot for our Residents Parking permit, and we are receiving less value and more inconvenience than ever before.

The e-bike bays are an eyesore. They are just disorganised messy street detritus. The cyclists are not careful and they sometimes cause light impact scratches to the parked cars.

There are already dozens of bike spaces within a 3-minute walk of this street.

To have yet another bike bay would be totally unnecessary, unwanted and disrespectful to the local residents

Objection Five

It will be disruptive and cause mess on the street. There's so little parking on this road for residents as it is... also there's one already just around the corner. Why do we need another one?

Objection Six

Will not bring any benefit to my flat

Objection Seven

The area is a relatively quiet residential area there is enough noise already. There are a number of disabled people living in [redacted] Vicarage gate as well as families with young children, Placing a ebike parking space there will result in more footfall outside the entrance and will make it harder for families with children in buggies and pushchairs to have easy access to the entrance.

Objection Eight

GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION

Lack of Parking Spaces on Vicarage Gate

1. The lack of parking spaces on Vicarage Gate is a serious problem. On Vicarage Gate there only 54 parking spaces on the whole street. Of these just 38 are on the section that runs south to north from Kensington Church Street to the junction of Brunswick Gardens/Vicarage Gardens and the south-east spur that runs from the aforementioned to St Mary Abbot's Vicarage. One of the 38 spaces on that spur is the proposed e-bike bay.
2. Altogether, those 38 spaces serve 271 units: Vicarage Court (106), Winchester Court (95), 1-7 Vicarage Gate (54), 18 Vicarage Gate (7), St. Anthony's Court, 17 Vicarage Gate (7) and 15-16 Vicarage Gate (2). That is a ratio of one parking space per seven units.
3. It is a very common problem that residents who have parking permits issued by RBKC cannot find a parking space within the immediate vicinity of their home. I have known residents to drive around for considerable lengths of time to find a parking space, often without success and having to risk getting a parking ticket by parking on yellow line, despite having a parking permit and being right outside their own home.

4. Lack of parking is especially challenging for those with small children, the disabled and the elderly, for whom parking any further away than the immediate vicinity of their home can cause difficulty.

5. Contractors (plumbers/electricians etc) responding to emergencies and carrying out other essential works in homes across Vicarage Gate often have considerable difficulty finding a parking space. It is very common for contractors to abandon jobs because they cannot find parking within a reasonable distance.

Unnecessary on Vicarage Gate

6. One of the reasons given by RBKC is “that parking of rental e-bikes on narrow footways can cause a nuisance to residents” . This has never been a problem on Vicarage Gate.

7. Consequently, allocating an e-bike bay will be creating a problem that does not already exist: inviting e-bikes and their users to the area will inevitably lead to the creation of hazards. Please see below.

Potential Hazard

8. There is considerable evidence to suggest that designating an e-bike bay will create obstructions on the road and the pavement, causing health and safety hazards for pedestrians, motorists and other road users.

9. Where e-bike bays already exist, there is often overspill onto the pavement and onto adjacent parking spaces and the road where e-bike stations are already in place. I have taken photographs of existing e-bike bays which show the problems that can be caused. I can provide these to RBKC if requested.

10. Because of the lack of parking spaces, at the proposed location any overspill is likely to be to the right of the bay (as seen from the road) towards the corner with the main spur of Vicarage Gate. Turning from the main spur of Vicarage Gate onto the south-eastern spur is a hard right turn and an overspill of e-bikes on that corner is likely to lead to accidents.

Un sightliness in a residential and conservation area

11. Vicarage Gate is within the Kensington Palace conservation area and all addresses listed for Winchester Court, Vicarage Court, 1-7 Vicarage Gate etc are listed on the RBKC website as such . This area includes the location of the proposed e-bike station .

12. Placing an e-bike bay will create an unnecessary eyesore that will be intolerable to residents and not in keeping with the character of the area.

Objection Nine

The area is already very congested for parking. The ebike parking will make this worse and reduce parking spaces yet further.

The tree lined space with a wide pavement provides a small area of calm away from the noise and activity of Kensington Church Street and The High Street.

The ebike parking will result in mess and disorder from bikes and their users where none currently exists.

Objection Ten

1) Vicarage Gate already has a bike shed which has reduced the ability to get into our building and removed a much needed residents parking spot

2) The Santander bike parking are just across the street

3) The proliferation of unused e-bikes left just lying around well outside of the areas designated will be repeated by the council's proposal

4) There are other more suitable locations such as outside the Croft estate agent

5) The failure of the e-bike initiative should not be used to spoil further our local area

Objection Eleven

I personally have objected as

a) we have already lost a residents' parking spot to the bike shed outside Hamilton House

b) we already have a Santander parking bay across the street and

c) there are public bike rails just outside Croft estate agents (across from Vicarage Court) so put it there where the sidewalk is wide.

d) There are already bikes and scooters randomly abandoned on our pavements that are obstacles for the older residents in Vicarage Gate

Objection Twelve

The opposite corner already has a Santander bike parking area and residents parking on Vicarage Gate is already scarce. Across from Vicarage court entrance there is already a bike park : the new e-bikes can go here, where the sidewalk is wider

Objection Thirteen

I am a resident of Vicarage Gate and regularly struggle to find a park. 1 bay at the end of the street was removed and made a bike storage locker, in Brunswick Gardens, 2 bays are now designated as Electric cars only and in Vicarage Gardens, an additional disable park has also been added. These reduce the number of resident parking bays.

Objection Fourteen

There are 3 mansion blocks of flats on this address: Winchester Court, Vicarage Court and Hamilton House. There is hopelessly inadequate residents parking capacity already. I currently have to park in Palace Gardens and walk 250m +most of the time already.

You removed one of the few precious residents bays outside Hamilton House only a year ago for a bike lock up which is used by perhaps 1 bicycle. Nobody wanted that either.

There is a space for your lime bikes next to the existing Santander TFL bikes or utilising a pay and display space.

Objection Fifteen

The current scheme does not work. it is not that there are not enough bays - it is that people who use the bikes are not held accountable when they simply drop them anywhere.

We already lack parking for residents and trades are refusing to come to this area because there is such limited parking.

Stop making your problem my problem. Fix the current situation with bikes and ebikes.

Objection Sixteen

[No comment supplied]

Objection Seventeen

It removes parking spots for cars and still looks messy

Objection Eighteen

1 there is already a severe lack of residential parking in this area with the ratio of parking spaces to flats incredibly low

2 it would be unsightly in our conservation area

3 potential hazard, spilling onto the corner and pavement where pedestrians are trying to cross the road/vans and Lorries regularly access vicarage gate and bikes spilling out into the turning of the road could be dangerous.

Objection Nineteen

This will have a great negative effect on our home which is located directly across from the proposed bay. This is a quiet residential road with a parish at the end. Implementing an e-bike bay here would mean more foot traffic right outside our living room door. This would also be coupled with the noise that these bikes make when they are switched on and off (a loud blinging sound). Also take into the account the noise when people are checking in and out. Our flat is ground level and sound in our living room will be unbearable.

There is already a Santander bike stand directly adjacent. Lastly this would be located bang in the middle of 2 already existing e-bike bays: one on Kensington Church Street and the other by Inverness Gardens. Therefore I don't see the need for this.

Objection Twenty

E-bike companies allow users to dump their bikes anywhere after use. This creates a mess on our streets. It's not acceptable and we don't want it in our residential neighbourhood!

Objection Twenty-one

I am a keen cyclist and am usually supportive of measures which encourage use of cycles, however I object to this proposal for an e-bike bay in Vicarage Gate because I think the location has been poorly chosen and thought through and could actually make safety for cyclists, pedestrians and road users worse in this location. My reasons for objection are:

1. Road Safety at Junction of Vicarage Gate and the Vicarage Gate Spur: The site on Vicarage Gate proposed is on the corner of quite a busy junction. It is already quite hazardous for pedestrians to cross. The Vicarage Gate spur leading to St Mary Abbots Centre and Hamilton House is used by a lot of vehicular traffic (considering the number of residential properties and the St Mary Abbots centre being a centre for many activities attracting lots of visitors to the area). Because that section of Vicarage Gate with parking on both sides is not wide enough for cars to pass both ways it means vehicles are often having to manoeuvre tight corners around each other as vehicles coming from the south (Kensington Church Street) turn right into Vicarage Gate and vehicles entering the Vicarage Gate spur try to turn north. I have seen several near misses of cars either hitting each other, and/or worse not seeing pedestrians crossing the junction, as well as drivers being distracted trying to navigate the turn and almost running into cyclists going south down Vicarage Gate. The small single yellow line area at the junction is used to allow vehicles to navigate

past each other so any e-bikes which encroach outside of the proposed demised area will only make the hazardous nature of the junction more dangerous. The single yellow line is also used for delivery vehicles and parking overnight (due to the restricted number of parking bays in the area) which only exacerbates the situation of road safety.

2. E-Bike Management: The e-bike bays which were installed last year do not seem to have stopped e-bikes being left randomly around the borough, or from being left on footpaths and roadside causing a hazard and a nuisance. There appears to be no policing by the e-bike rental companies of where their bikes are left. Even with the e-bike bays the users often seem to use these as “indicative” of where to leave the bikes - you will regularly find bikes on the pavement, roadside and in residents parking bays that surround the marked e-bike locations. Council needs to give consideration to a method to monitor and control this so that e-bikes left outside the marked bays are removed (within a matter of hours at most) to prevent creating obstructions and hazards.

3. Cyclist Safety: Whilst the proposal says that there is no intention to increase the number of e-bikes in the area, by fact of creating dedicated parking the council is encouraging the use of cycles that I support. However the council has a very poor record with regard to implementing cycle safety measures for cyclists (in fact they are better known for removing safety measures they expensively implemented). The recent works on Kensington High Street pay lip service to cycle safety, and the council has not done anything about the most dangerous section between the Royal Garden Hotel and Earls Court Road. Kensington Church Street is also a cyclists nightmare with no measures at all. Like wise the area around Notting Hill Gate which is the other direction users from this cycle bay may go. So it seems to be a serious oversight for the council to be inviting more e-bike users to the vicinity to park their e-bikes while providing no safety measures for cycling up/down Kensington Church Street or along the high street & Notting Hill Gate.

4. Local Amenity: Whilst accepting that if there weren't e-bikes there would be cars parked in the location, how does the council propose that the spaces are kept clean and tidy. Its one thing to sweep along the gutter when a car is parked there, but with multiple cycles in a small location it will be very difficult for the Councils road cleaners to get among the cycles to remove litter, debris and leaves. Being located at the junction also means it is more visible degrading the overall appearance of the neighbourhood.

5. Loss of Parking: whilst recognising the urge to move from vehicular to other forms of transport, parking spaces (both Residents Parking Permit, pay to park and single yellow line parking) is restricted in this neighbourhood. Vicarage Gate has large mansion blocks of Winchester Court, Vicarage Court and Hamilton House, as well as the numerous 6-storey multi dwelling units. The number of parking spaces to the number of residential properties is already very constrained and loss of a further 2 parking spaces will only compound the problem.

6. Alternatives: It would be interesting to know what alternative locations the council considered prior to their final choice. More suitable locations could perhaps be identified that would be less obtrusive eg the residents parking bay opposite no.7 vicarage gate between Hamilton Court and the entrance to the garages is too large for 2 cars but not big enough for 3 - using part of that bay would be less obtrusive and mitigate the safety issue of being located on the junction highlighted above.

Objection Twenty-two

There is already a shortage of parking spaces, and we cannot afford to lose any more.

Because Vicarage Gate is fairly free of traffic, riders on E-Bikes and E-scooters ride use it a lot, and the speeds at which they travel is dangerous. On many occasions I've had to jump back onto the curb to avoid being knocked down by speeding riders flying around the corner.

Objection Twenty-three

What are you thinking about. If our borough has too much money to spend please ask how to spend them and I will offer you free advice. We already have a bicycle bay in Vicarage Gate. An ugly one and most of the time empty!!

Have you made any survey showing how frequent this particular bay is in use or is it just based on a wild assumption to satisfy potential cyclists? Please stop it now and let us start using the bay that already exists first. Trust you being smart. Thank you!

Objection Twenty-four

Too many bikes

Objection Twenty-five

There are already too many bike parks and a double motorbike park in this part of the road.

There are also a few number of parking meters here, with multiple builders lorries using these every day.

With more and more properties containing flats, there are less and less resident parking spaces available to council tax paying residents for us to park. Most days we have to park a long way away from our home each time we use our car.

We are in our seventies, and, having motorbikes and bicycles continually coming down the one-way section of our street the wrong way is dangerous enough already, without increasing the traffic of bikes which do not come from this street, and neither do they go to this street.

The location for a hire-bike stand should be next to shops and tube stations, and not in a residential side road.

Sensible places to allocate more bike hire places is in the substantial area between the Kensington Library and your Town Hall as well as Wrights Lane. These are close to the High Street and Ken High Tube station, where those hire bikes are needed most.

Objection Twenty-six

There is already a private bike store on the street and a public bike docking station around the corner. parking has become increasingly difficult as a result. In my experience, e-bike parks cause massive disruption, with bikes being left on their side, spread across the pavement and in parking spaces adjacent to the bike park. Bikes left on pavements greatly inconveniences residents who use walking frames or wheelchairs.

Objection Twenty-seven

Resident parking is already a huge problem.

Objection Twenty-eight

These bikes are a trip hazard - even when they have these bays they fall over onto the pavement, I have almost fallen on a number of occasions.

Furthermore they are often left with rubbish in the front basket that people have left and are often covered in graffiti.

I oppose this station and ask that you take it into consideration - there are plenty of Santander bikes in the area for people to use.

[Additional Comments]

I noticed the proposed new dockless bikes bay at Vicarage Gate and would like to lodge an objection.

The bikes will be directly outside of my flat and will therefore be an eyesore - I have seen these bikes around the borough and they end up with graffiti on, trash left in the baskets and often thrown on the floor rather than standing.

Furthermore, the bikes represent a clear trip hazard as they often extend out beyond their bay. My father recently almost tripped and fell with one that was protruding outside of its space onto a pavement.

For the reasons outlined above I would like to object to the bikes being positioned here.

[Additional Comments]

Further to my objection below, please see evidence of bikes currently on Palace Gardens Terrace which are a trip hazard - images attached.

Many people attend vicarage gate house the events venue including children and many elderly people. If a parking bay was allowed in the vicarage gate location the pavement would be blocked similar to the images.

In addition to my objection of the above location, please can I add an objection to Dockless Bikes reference II/NS/S523b.

[Redacted] who lives locally turned 100 years old on Monday and such parking of bikes makes it difficult for her as well as many others

Objection Twenty-nine

This proposed site represents a serious risk to the safety of bikers , pedestrians , motorists and residents and will trigger constant antisocial behaviour for the following reasons :

Vicarage gate from Kensington church st. Is the main entrance to all that area up to Nottinghill.

It is one way direction , constantly used by delivery vans and other heavy loads vehicles heading to this area .

Bikers fly downhill against the legal traffic direction to be met by vehicles going up hill in this one way Street .
There is enough unpleasant surprises as it is due to this behaviour .

Vicarage gate has 2 bike ranks/ station : There is already one bike station in the end of the street that has occupied an an existing parking bay

There is another big Santander bike hire station at the corner of vicarage gate close to your proposed location .

The restricted access of vicarage gate , the very limited parking bays , with motorists looking for parking space in that close and the presence of 2 bike ranks increases the risk to lives to bikers . makes the area congested with bikes , makes it unsafe to bikers , padesterians residents , will obstruct the traffic at vicarage gate , increases risk to safety of bikers and harassment to residents from all sources of behaviour . There will be no doubt friction in that particular street due to tbe number overwhelming of bikers whom many are not exactly living in this area .

In conclusion , 3 bike ranks in one restricted access street is not a example of good planning as it invites high level to risk to lives.

Objection Thirty

I live at [redacted] and overlook Vicarage Gate, where the e-bike site is proposed opposite nos.1 and 2 Vicarage Gate. I would be grateful if you would consider the following points:

1. There are already three bike parking facilities within yards of the block:

- a. Santander, immediately opposite comprising 17 parking stations, always well-kept and maintained.
- b. A 6 bay site on the corner of Vicarage Gate and Kensington Church Street , in front of the dry-cleaning store, where numerous bikes in various states of disrepair constitute an eye-sore. Mostly thrown down by their owners or abandoned, sometimes chained to the hoop-like stations, they act as a magnet for others to dump their rubbish and other unwanted items.
- c. The residents' bike parking facility at the bottom of Vicarage Gate by the Church Hall. Like the Santander facility, this is also well kept.

2. Do we really need more, especially as there is already a dearth of parking for tradesmen, who sometimes have to mount the pavement to deliver or collect?

3. I am concerned that the e-bike parking bay you propose in Vicarage Gate, will become a similar eyesore to the one already established in Palace Gardens Terrace, also within walking-distance of our block. Here again, bikes are thrown down in general disarray and attract anti-social behaviour like dumping.

4. The view from Winchester Court over Vicarage Gate, is enjoyed by large numbers of residents, who admire the seven magnificent plane trees which have sloped down to the Church Hall for decades. You are proposing a probable eyesore between the two great trees nearest our windows. When the leaves fall they will engulf that parking bay for several weeks, posing a major problem for the road sweeper and possible damage to the bikes.

I would be very grateful if you would consider the above and look forward to an early response.

Objection Thirty-one

I see that you there is proposition of adding an e-bike by on vicarage gate - I highly object to this. These bays just promote sloppy behaviour by users. My car has been damaged in another location by someone carelessly leaving their bike and it falling and hitting my car. I have attached a photo of a carelessly placed bike on vicarage gate today. See image attached. Even if there was a dedicated bay the user would not have put it in the appropriate place. More behaviour like this will be expected.

I have not seen a bay that has been properly managed by the company. They are always either overflowing or users are reckless with how they place them.

Objection Thirty-two

I have a flat in vicarage gate and I saw the poster notifying of the dockless bikes station.

I object to the dockless bikes as I would be looking at it from my window, and they are an eye sore.

The bikes always fall over, there's always a lot of noise and graffiti and mess.

Objection Thirty-three

Following a recent application for the erection of another e-bike scooter shelter to be erected on Palace Gardens Terrace, I write to lodge my formal objection to the application.

I fail to see why there would be a requirement for a second shelter so close to the first – Palace Gardens Terrace does not require a shelter at both ends of the street. Surely this tucked away location does not warrant such a high demand for ebike usage given the demographic of the area. They are an eyesore and not in keeping with the current local authority restrictions on other 'street furniture' allowed in this area. There is also the concern that ebikes would not be correctly racked, or abandoned thereby littering the street and causing further issues

Objection Thirty-four

This is a response to the proposal to remove a parking bay on Vicarage Gate, for e bikes.

I think this is crazy, and discriminatory, given that these streets are next to large blocks of flats, whose residents pay RBK and C parking permits but are often unable to find spaces. Council officials probably visit during the daytime when free spaces can sometimes be found in this section of Vicarage Gate. But at night there is a great shortage and it is often necessary to walk many hundreds of yards into less densely housed streets to find an overnight place for a vehicle.

I would point out that in the last few years we have already lost five spaces to bikes of one sort another, just in this little neighbourhood. Four were removed to accommodate 19 Santander bike stations and their payment kiosk. Another space, in the short cul-de-sac leading to the Parish Centre, has been given over to a little used rental bicycle shed. Now you propose to take yet another space, when there are several alternative locations which would be fairer, and less wasteful. And also safer - since the east side of Vicarage Gate which you are proposing, is a speedy thoroughway with high speed cyclists roaring down to join Kensington Church Street from Notting Hill Gate and the north, just where the e bikers would be parking.

These new e bike bays ought to be put on the particularly wide pavements on the Winchester Court side of Vicarage Gate, or on the east side of Kensington Church Street leading down from the zebra crossing. They need not take any extra space, if, at the same time, you can reappraise and

rationalise the many conventional steel bike racks that have been put up in three different spots over the years - on the western side corner of Vicarage Gate by the carpet shop, and on the east side of Kensington Church Street outside Church Close (ie number 33)

Two out of the three are underused, and unsightly because of the abandoned and disintegrating bikes that are seldom removed by the council. The rack nearest the bus stop is mostly empty even in midweek during the daytime.. This is because this is a residential not an office area, with many elderly residents, and so there is less demand for street bike racks than there is nearer the high street. Why not consolidate, and have two regular bike parking areas, and one e bike area, making better use of the space available?

Hoping you will consider this carefully.

Support in Part One

Designated e-bike parking spaces are essential if we are to encourage more e-bike usage as an alternative to cars and public transport. However, e-bike rentals in general are only to be encouraged if users behave responsibly and return their bikes to these designated spaces after use. Dumping of e-bikes after use is a scourge upon many cities. This practice must be stopped through banning of e-bike rental companies who do not oblige their users to park their bikes responsibly after use. Provision of new parking spaces should go hand-in-hand with responsibility obligations of e-bike rental companies.

Support in Full One

Marvellous - remember every cyclist is one less car - cleaner air, fitter people, cycling is great for mental & physical health, the environment, the city - long list - get as many people cycling as possible (safely)!

Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied]