

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
CHELSEA RIVERSIDE 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 Chelsea Riverside 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 Chelsea Riverside 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, 130 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 four of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Chelsea Manor Street proposal, officers are recommending not to proceed with this location.
- 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
S524a Blantyre Street	3 (15)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed
S524b Chelsea Manor Street	9 (21)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S524c Cheyne Walk	1 (13)	2 (4)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S524d Milman's Street	6 (18)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S524e Uverdale Road	1 (13)	1 (3)	0 (7)	0	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. Some respondents believed the loss of a parking bay would mean less parking available for contractors and tradesmen.

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

- 5.6 The main objective of the e-bike bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, these riders are subject to increasing fines and in general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. The rental e-bike market is currently unregulated, and so, with the limited legal powers at its disposal to control this problem, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off pavements. The operators remain responsible for guiding customers to these bays - with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance - and for tidying of designated bays. The Council has no powers to fine e-bike operators, or their customers.

The road is too busy with numerous pedestrians and/or vehicles / Hazard/accident - either to users, others, or vehicles / Parked vehicles cause poor sightlines.

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for pedestrians or vehicles already using the road, and that parked vehicles already caused poor sightlines. Some felt in particular that one-way streets were unsuitable.

Officer Response

- 5.8 There is no reason to think that the proposals will add to congestion or cause a worsening of sightlines any more than their current use as a parking space. Whilst some cyclists may opt to pick up and drop off from the footway side, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to congestion on the footway. As the proposed e-bike bays are proposed where a car can currently park, there is no reason to believe that e-bikes parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present.
- 5.9 Similarly, there is no evidence that supports the idea that the installation of e-bike parking increases the number of those cycling against one-way road restrictions any more than providing car parking leads to poor driving behaviour.

There is already a hire bike bay nearby

- 5.10 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

- 5.11 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

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

Officer Response

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

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.14 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. A respondent to the Blantyre Street proposal suggested using the end of Blantyre Street, outside of the World's End estate concierge office. A respondent to the Milman's Street proposal suggested the bay should be on King's Road instead.
- 5.15 Officers believe there is greater benefit in terms of access for visitors as well as residents under the existing proposal for the Blantyre Road bay than if the bay were located further into the estate. The location, just off the Embankment, is also easier for operators to service. There are already two e-bike parking bays at the junction of Milman's Street/King's Road.

Other comments

- 5.16 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	Proposed location is too busy an intersection for cyclists (Milman’s Street proposal)	Cyclists already use this intersection and would continue to do so regardless of whether a rental e-bike bay is provided.
2	Two respondents to the Milman’s Street proposal said that the bays would not benefit residents as there was no demand for them. (Milman’s 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	Permits should only be given to operators that provide e-bikes with dedicated docking stations. (Blantyre Street and Uverdale Road proposals)	There is already a good network of dock-based cycle hire stations in the ward. The Council does not issue permits, and has no powers to prevent dockless rental e-bike companies from operating. With the limited legal powers at its disposal to control the problem of such bikes left on footways, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off footways.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

No comments received

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 Blantyre Street

Objection One

There isn't enough parking here for residents and visitors. The existing bike parking bays are a nightmare, with bikes lying on the ground and encroaching into the residents' parking bays. A designated bay in Blantyre Street would reduce parking for residents and, as the bays are not monitored, cause problems for residents when bikes are not parked properly. A bike bay at the internal end of Blantyre Street, outside the World's End estate concierge office, might be a more suitable site as that area in theory is not a parking zone (although council staff and tradesmen park there). Placing the proposed bay outside Chelsea Reach Toeer would also cause nuisance for residents.

Objection Two

The area is already littered with dumped bikes!

Objection Three

The manner in which the provision of parking bays for e-bikes has been managed is absurd. Dockless E-bikes, for all their supposed environmental benefits, are a menace on the streets of K&C and London generally. Merely providing parking bays for them does not address the problem of neglectful dumping of bikes wherever the rider chooses and the shameful mismanagement of the companies (Tier, Lime, Forest, River) contracted to deliver this 'service' is verging on wilful neglect. The proliferation of companies flooding London's streets with these dockless e bikes is bewildering. There appear to be very limited (if any) control measures in place. RBKC's first responsibility should be to ensure that effective and proper management is demonstrated before allowing this London 'disease' to spread any further. Parking bays are NOT the answer. You have only to see, for example, the havoc regularly wreaked by the e bike bay in Burnsall Street, SW3: This e bike dumping zone regularly overflows into resident parking bays, pavements and highway and, whether by accident or design, e bikes are often to be seen collapsed in heaps - potentially and maybe even actually causing damage to persons and property. London should cancel the whole dockless e bike/e scooter experiment and revert to companies operating e bikes with dedicated docking stations. The dockless e bike is an unjustifiable menace and an unacceptable eye sore, littering parks, pavements and streets. I refuse to accept that providing parking bays comes remotely close to addressing the scale of the problem and will, in all likelihood, exacerbate it. The situation has become intolerable and, with this absurd proposal to increase the number of dockless bays, RBKC appear to be utterly oblivious as to the extent of problem. London needs to urgently reduce the number of these ridiculous e bikes and permit only contracts that provide e bikes with dedicated docking stations. Anything less than this is wilfully negligent.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Chelsea Manor Street

Objection One

Because we have already others street ebike parking spaces in walking distance from this proposal place.

Objection Two

There are a plethora of bike stations in Chelsea already. I see no evidence that the demand for increased bike availability is there. In the existing stations bikes are unused and available. Moreover frequently the bikes have fallen over, even damaged cars next to them and significantly impact the visual appearance of otherwise neat roads and streets. Whilst I accept that there is a need for controlled access to biking, I feel that it is getting out-of-hand. The council controls satellite dishes and security cameras because they impact the look and feel of the Borough. The same should go for the bike stations. I have never seen a station in the Borough that was empty because all bikes were in use. I posture that enough bikes are available within reasonable walking distance already. There is however a lack of parking for residents in the neighbourhood. It is simply naive to think that people will switch their mode of transport. Chelsea is also well served by public transport with buses and underground. I fail to think that the demographic profile of Chelsea demands more bikes.

Objection Three

I strongly object to dockless ebike area on Chelsea Manor Street. There is already an ebike area on Grove Cottages, off the main road, is it not possible to extend this docking area? I think having one on the main road between Kings Road and the Embankment will look terrible. As we know, ebikes are usually just left on the floor, dumped with no regard for them whatsoever. They always look a mess and if there is no room left for the ebikes then they are left on the pavement, blocking the wheelchair/ pram ramps.

Please do not put a dockless ebike area on Chelsea Manor Street.

Objection Four

I wish to object to the proposed changes.

My home is meters away; as such I witness near misses on a daily basis on this junction which is a four-way blindspot for vehicles and pedestrians.

To clutter and place obstacles in the already tricky spot is a recipe for disaster.

One only has to look at the very large docking bay on a hundred meters or so away (do we really need more so close)? to note the daily domino effect obstructing the slope kerbs, forcing pedestrians to cross into a perpendicular road rather than straight across.

It is particularly an amplified issue as both a primary school and large medical centre is within one hundred meters of the proposal, where the most vulnerable in our community will be obstructed on pavements and face hurtling electric speed bicycles.

One could argue that cyclists shouldn't be riding on the pavements, shouldn't be parking on the pavement, should be giving way at junctions, however clear empirical evidence proves that is simply not the reality.

Further, as a resident who has paid an annual fee for the privilege of parking, I object to receiving less than paid for. There is very limited parking space as it is, and with a disabled child who unfortunately doesn't meet the criteria for a disabled parking space, I depend very much on being able to park near my home. It is woefully unfair to penalise a child who is already in a catch 22 position.

Objection Five

I only discovered last Friday that there are plans to build another bike hire station on Chelsea Manor Street. The bikes this time will be electric, that is, machines of the faster kind. As a resident of Grove House in the street, and close to where this would be sited, I would object to it as inappropriate for this thoroughfare.

We already have a bike hire location in the street next to Peabody estate and one does already see those machines lying around abandoned on the pavement and at the kerb. Where the new row of bikes would be sited is a crossroads where pedestrians often cross and cars often turn. Having bikers speed off over that pavement, or from the kerb, would be risk to all these other street users.

The location is near a primary school and a medical centre and the road can be busy enough with cars and vans, especially at congested times in the King's Road. I wonder too what the residents in Cheyne Terrace will think of such an eyesore and physical danger outside their luxury flats, if they have a chance to be asked.

Objection Six

I am raising an objection to build another bike hire site (Dockless Bikes) in Chelsea Manor Street London SW3 5QB, I hope you reconsider as we residents don't want it in that area.

Objection Seven

I would like to lodge an objection to the planned electric bike dock proposed for the corner of Alpha Place and Chelsea Manor Street. An existing bike hire area in flood walk/ Chelsea Manor Street is often left with bikes lying domino like in the road or bikes left on pavement areas obstacles for the visually impaired. Please no more Street clutter.

Objection Eight

I would like express my objections to an E-Bike Docking Station in Chelsea Manor Street.

Objection Nine

I would like to add my objections to this proposal because

1. the bikes will be left on the pavement similar to the bay in Flood walk.
2. the junction has restricted vision when turning into Chelsea Manor St
3. access into Grove House will be impaired, the refuse wagons have to either reverse in or out also emergency access may be restricted

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Cheyne Walk**Objection One [Cheyne Walk Residents' Association]**

As the chairman of the 60-61 Cheyne Walk Residents Association I am responding on behalf of the residents of our block of flats to your consultation letter of 6th March 2024 in respect of a proposed parking bay for rental e-bikes near 60-61 Cheyne Walk.

Cheyne Walk is situated in the Cheyne Conservation Area and contains some of the finest and oldest houses in Chelsea. Our block of flats is situated almost next to Chelsea Old Church, the origins of which date back to the 12th century, and which is one of London's best known churches. This is a very beautiful

and well-preserved historic corner of London and we feel that any e-bike parking bay would have a detrimental impact on one of Chelsea's most attractive and unspoilt streets with outstanding views of the River Thames.

We appreciate the need for parking bays for e-bikes that are currently dumped on the pavements of the Royal Borough and constitute a hazard to pedestrians as well as being an eyesore to anybody passing by. We note there is already a bicycle parking bay in Old Church Street and that in Lawrence Street, which runs along the side of our building, there is a disabled parking space as well as parking bays for both motorcycles and bicycles.

We would strongly propose that Beaufort Street and Oakley Street, where we have already seen discarded e-bikes and where we would suggest there will be a greater usage of e-bikes, would be more appropriate locations for the proposed e-bike parking bay than Cheyne Walk.

Support in Part One

Absolutely agree with proper parking provision for e-bikes. However, there should be no reduction in pay-and-display spaces. Trades vehicles already have considerable difficulty parking near us - and the frequency and extent of residents' parking suspensions increases our reliance on pay-and-display as locations of last resort.

Support in Part Two

I do not oppose this as long as it does not use space currently being used for residents parking.

What are you going to use for these new installations? If it is on current yellow lines that is fine but not using residents parking which is already tight given the number of residents who have a parking permit.

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Milman's Street

Objection One [Cheyne Walk Trust]

We are grateful to be consulted on addition of a further LimeBike bay in Milmans Street.

The CWT and local residents submit this Objection to the proposed conversion to a LimeBike parking bay of an existing Resident Parking Bay at the south end of Milmans St, opposite 104a Cheyne Walk.

There is already an existing, poorly maintained, very disruptive and hazardous Lime Bike Bay at the north end of Milmans St. less than 100metres from the additional bay.

The proposed location at the end of the busy one-way traffic Milmans St. is a busy junction with poor sight lines often masked by short term parking of large vehicles or white vans, since parking is very limited in this area. The proposed bay is immediately adjacent to a designated disabled person parking bay.

The proposed bay is specially hazardous since it would be directly adjacent to a dropped curb at a junction much used by pedestrians, frequently including handicapped and/or wheelchair users. The three resident bays are in almost permanent use since parking is only possible on the northern side of Cheyne Walk. The conversion of a further resident vehicle bay to cycle use is highly undesirable given that Cheyne Walk has resident vehicle bays on only the north side, despite many residents of 106 Cheyne Walk Houseboats also having resident parking rights.

Milmans St. is much used by pedestrians, including residents of the elderly persons' residential home Elizabeth House some 50M from the junction. Elderly residents of Elizabeth Court frequently require to use walking aids such as sticks or zimmer frames etc.

The proposed Lime Bike bay is badly sited, hazardous and will present additional risk to pedestrians and handicapped persons at an extremely busy and problematic junction and should therefore not proceed.

Objection Two

In response to the consultation about dockless bikes, I am writing to object to the positioning of the bay at the south end of Milmans Street.

The proposal would take away one of a limited number of parking spaces in this residential location. It would make sense, if local residents actually used these hire bikes, but we simply don't! Observation of the habits of local residents will show that people walk (school runs, or to nearby public transport), commute using buses, or some in cars. It is unlikely that situating a docking bay will suddenly make ebikes an attractive alternative to any of the above.

Secondly, we have no shops, bars, restaurants or a tube station nearby! Again, observation will show that relatively few people actually visit the area - it is puzzling why this would be a good place to site the bikes. I would imagine that most visitors (whether on bike or other form of transport) are coming into areas where there are shops, tube station etc, and therefore the bays should be sited closer to these destinations.

Lastly, there is already a bay at the North end of Milmans Street , (which is very poorly managed). Perhaps the situation can be improved if there is better management of the existing one? It just does not seem fair, particularly for the reasons in the previous paragraph, that Milmans Street should be 'topped and tailed' in this way....the road is less than 200m long!

So please, no to this in that location.

Many thanks for giving us the opportunity to have our voice heard about this very local matter.

Objection Three

I write with regard to the consultation around a docking station for e-bikes at the South end of Milmans St. I would very strongly like to object to this. There is already an e-bike stand at the North end of the Street. The bikes there are already often lying on their side, including falling onto local parked cars.

To put another station in the same street makes no sense to me. Having taken one parking space at the top it would then take a further space at the bottom in an area already tight for resident parking. It is also not a particularly easy site for cyclists. It is a very busy intersection with a lot of through traffic but also not particularly close to shops/ restaurants. It is a residential area but with an older / elderly population not likely to use the bikes. What would make more sense is to put it on the King's Rd close to some of the amenities that younger folk who are likely to use the bikes frequent.

The South end of the St also borders the local Conservation area

Objection Four

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed installation of a LimeBike parking bay in what is a much-needed Resident Parking Bay at the south end of Milmans Street.

I live on one of the houseboats opposite Milmans Street and have a Resident Parking Permit. This proposal would cut down on available parking spaces in an area where parking options are already very limited.

As it is impossible to park on the river side of the Embankment, the parking space in question is the nearest available to my home.

There is already a LimeBike parking area at the north end of Milmans Street, scarcely 100 yards away from this proposed new parking bay, and therefore the new bay is surely not remotely necessary.

Objection Five

I should like to object to the above proposal. The junction at the south end of Milmans Street is a busy junction with regularly blocked visibility onto Cheyne Walk. The introduction of dockless bikes here, I believe, would add to congestion and would create hazard and obstruction to wheelchair pavement users.

Objection Six

I'm writing with regard to your proposal for a bike docking station on the junction of Milmans Street and Cheyne Walk.

I live at [redacted], Cheyne Walk, SW10 0DQ and sit on The Cheyne Walk Trust committee.

Obviously your proposed new ebike dock directly affects those of us living opposite Battersea Bridge and the houseboats on the embankment road.

As a rule, Transport for London have a total disregard for those of us who live in and around the area but it's a bitter pill to swallow when its comes from our own RBKC.

Please consider the following;

We live on a busy road but largely a quiet people area, with historically very few bikes left or picked up from here.

Generally when a dock arrives once the designated places are used up riders dump bikes around the area which means they would inevitably spill out onto the pavement.

You've not noted on your street plan the area has a large dropped pavement, which is in constant use by;

- People entering and exiting Brunel House,

- Children in pushchairs, runners, walkers.
- But more importantly, the residents of Elizabeth Court retirement development whom I note use mobility devices when they take their daily strolls.

We do have a problem, mainly at the weekends with cars parking on the single line across the dropped pavement so adding bikes to this will only make matters worse for all.

These pictures I took TM at the top of Milmans Street to demonstrate the problem and as we don't have existing racks it will be much worse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Uverdale Road

Objection One

In seeking to provide E Bike parking bays, RBKC appear to be either overlooking or ignoring the real issue with dockless E Bikes. The failure of the contract E Bike providers to effectively manage their stock. Providing parking bays does not remove in any way the menace presented by the indiscriminate dumping of bikes where ever users choose to - all the time that the operators fail in their duty to ensure that this does not happen. I have a library of photos of virtually empty E bike parking bays, while E Bikes are dumped (usually collapsed in piles) on neighbouring pavements, resident parking bays, blocking building entrances, entrances to Hyde Park, in Hyde Park and just about anywhere other than the supposed dedicated E Bike parking bays. If RBKC think that by providing E Bike parking bays that this will materially change this dynamic of indiscriminate dumping of dockless E Bikes, then they are failing in their duty to residents and rate payers. Surely the Council have recognised the extent of the problem is caused not by a lack of E Bike parking bays but by the very fact that these bikes are entirely dockless in the first place and ,as such, enable both the contract operators and end users to continue to abuse the feckless system that enables them to do so. RBKC would do better to ban all dockless E Bikes and encourage the increase in dedicated docking station E Bikes.

Support in Part One

Whilst it is good to see RBKC acknowledge that the current situation with the dumping of bikes across pavements and basically anywhere that suits the user when the bike is no longer needed, the provision of extra designated areas for parking mostly ignores one of the main problems. I doubt that the fact that there may not be sufficient parking spaces for the bikes is the main problem with casual parking. Unless there is some form of penalty consistently applied to the leaving of bikes anywhere the user pleases then there is no incentive to anyone in a hurry or ' can't be bothered' to park it safely or responsibly. This would apply to car users unless parking restrictions had been imposed. So I cannot see the money which will be spent on this well-intended project will do anything to improve the safety for pedestrians(especially wheelchair users who frequently are no longer able to access some pavements). Surely it is time for the spotlight which is on all aspects of improving life for cyclists/e scooters etc. was equally shared with encouraging us pedestrians too to enjoy and feel safe as we move around our neighbourhoods.