

**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  
COLVILLE 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 Colville 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 Colville 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, 140 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 Stanley Crescent 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.**

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No. Objections</b>	<b>No. Support in Part</b>	<b>No. Support in Full</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
S525a Arundel Gardens	3 (15)	0 (2)	2 (9)	0	Proceed
S525b Basing Street	1 (13)	1 (3)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S525c Colville Terrace (East)	4 (16)	0 (2)	3 (10)	1	Proceed
S525d Colville Terrace (West)	3 (15)	1 (3)	2 (9)	0	Proceed
S525e Stanley Crescent	13 (25)	0 (2)	1 (8)	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 busy with numerous pedestrians and/or vehicles**

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for pedestrians or vehicles already using the road. One respondent felt that would also block already limited access to 43-47 Arundel Court and this had a health and safety implication for residents including elderly residents and very young children.

Officer Response

- 5.8 There is no reason to think that the proposals will add to congestion any more than their current use as a parking space. Whilst some cyclists may opt to pick up and drop off from the footway side, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to congestion on the footway. As the proposed e-bike bays are proposed where a car can currently park, there is no reason to believe that e-bikes parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic or pedestrian movement along the street any more than at present.

**There is already a hire bike bay nearby**

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

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

**Other comments**

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

**Table 2 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1	One respondent said the Council was hoping to generate more money at the expense of limiting residents parking spaces. (Colville Terrace (West) proposal)	The Council receives an annual payment from each operator as a contribution towards the cost of implementing and monitoring rental e-bike parking bays, but this is not the motivating factor in introducing rental e-bike bays. The policy is as a direct result of complaints from residents regarding inappropriately parked e-bikes.

2	One respondent believed the proposals would replace people's personal disabled parking bays. (Colville Terrace (East) proposal)	None of the proposals propose converting disabled parking bays.
3	One respondent wanted to know why rental e-bike bays were being proposed over cycle hangars for resident owned bicycles. (Arundel Gardens proposal)	The Council's secure cycle parking programme is working on meeting the shortfall in the Council's housing estates, so we are not currently implementing new rental hangars on-street. Residents may wish to consider applying for a cycle hangar on their street through the Council's Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy. The e-bike bays are not proposed as an alternative to on-street cycle hangars.

**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 Decision<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Arundel Gardens

#### Objection One

I own and live in a property at [redacted], directly next to the proposed e-bike location.

I am very much opposed to the establishment of an e-bike station in front of my home.

Instead, I would like to understand why there are so few parking spaces for residents' own bikes and there is no safe bike parking space at Arundel Court when so many residents own cycles and have to transport them each day back into their apartments.

Biking is my only source of transport (I do not drive nor own a car and have arthritis in knees hence walking to tube is not feasible). E-bikes are useless as they are only suitable for short distances not a daily commute to the city.

I have to haul my bike (suitable for daily commutes and all other transport) every single day up and down the stairs every single day due to this failure to provide proper parking. I was advised to do this by the local police officer [redacted].

Please clarify why an e-bike station is proposed when there is such a lack of safe parking places (the bike cages) for local residents' own bikes. Existing "cage style" places are all full and the closest one is all the way down the street - way too far with arthritis!

Many thanks in advance for scrapping the plan to install the very unhelpful and unnecessary e-bike station and instead helping council tax paying residents to safely store our bikes by installing the urgently needed bike storage space opposite Arundel Gardens - if there is space for e-bikes what excuse is there for lack of proper storage for residents bikes?

PS: try getting to the city on an e-bike vs a proper road bike and you will understand how useless these things are!

#### Objection Two

The proposed solution will not resolve the problem of bikes being left all over the place. It only takes one bike not in the bays to cause a nuisance and trip hazard and damage. And not all users will use the bays you propose. You do not mention how many residents parking bays will be taken by your proposal. You have already put in locked bike storage at other end of street. I am paying more and getting less and less for my parking permit. I do not support your proposal.

**Objection Three**

The addition of a e-bike parking space at the location proposed will block already limited access to 43-47 Arundel Court. In addition there are health and safety concerns connected with the ease of access and egress from a large building with 21 flats which includes elderly residents and very young children.

**Support in Full One**

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Two**

[No comment supplied]

#### **Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Basing Street**

##### **Objection One**

This area is just in front of our house. We have repetitively contacted the council already regarding heavy littering issues. Nothing has never been done. People put their bin bags in front of our house, and even in our window well. Being so close from Portobello Road, it's only a matter of time before the sidewalk becomes totally blocked by those bikes, or worse, before some end up in our window well.

##### **Support in Part One**

Provided it does not replace the existing facility for push bikes currently on the corner of Westbourne Park Road and Basing St and that it is positioned in a way that doesn't encourage e-bike users to leave e-bikes on the pavement on Basing St.

## Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Colville Terrace (East)

### Objection One

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.

### Objection Two

Bikes are still left on pavements when and the ebike parking I have seen is chaotic

### Objection Three

My concern is that the installation of an ebike parking space will further reduce the number of residents' parking space in Colville Gardens - which have already been reduced for charging spaces in the last couple of years. If a new residents' space was created to compensate for the loss of one to an ebike space, I'd have no problem with it.

### Objection Four

We already have a bike shed on this part of the road and it is hard to find parking at the best of times already this will further cut into this streets car parking spaces. Another thing bikes will be strewn all over the place just like they are around the corner on Talbot Road and will overflow onto the streets and pavement. They are a menace!

### Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

**Support in Full Two**

I highly support E-bike parking here.

I hope you could also slow vehicles from speeding at this junction.

**Support in Full Three**

[No comment supplied]

**No Opinion One**

I believe that there are enough TfL Santander bikes in the area. These eBikes are unnecessary and are nuisance. Even if additional bays are provided, they will still be left in an anti social manner. These bikes are not secured and are often lying on their side blocking roads and pavements.

## Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Colville Terrace (West)

### Objection One

Unfortunately the road (Ledbury) is already very dangerous to cross as cars are always driving extremely fast with nuisances. Adding this station at the level of the street where cars speed is at peak is dangerous and will create even more nuisance for the neighbors. I'm strongly against.

### Objection Two

you are yet again punishing those of us who have to pay for very expensive parking permits - I have to have a car to help elderly parent and family - yet here you go again punishing us by removing yet more parking spaces in Colville Terrace following the big bike shed why can't you remove some pay and display spaces. also guaranteed this will not lead to any more thoughtful eb bay parking but just generating more money for the borough at the expense of limiting residents parking spaces. Perhaps you can significantly reduce the cost of parking permits to reflect the reduction of spaces

### Objection Three

All of the stations in London are messy, bikes are always laying around on the floor, it's very noisy so it would be disruptive for residents during the night on an already busy street. These bikes make a loud beep when activated as well which is disruptive to residents.

### Support in Part One

My local e-bike parking places seem to fill up very quickly and then attract more e-bikes which encroach on the nearby road and pavement where they often seem to fall over and so block the pavement even more than the ones left upright on the pavement. But as they seem to like riding on the pavement I guess they feel that where the bikes belong.

I am glad you are providing more parking spaces; I would be even more glad if e-bike riders used them.

N.B. I am an elderly pedestrian (no car) but mercifully not yet reliant on a mobility scooter; how the users of those - and parents with prams and pushchairs - cope I do not know.

### Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

### Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied]



## Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Stanley Crescent

### Objection One

I think the new e bike parking bay will be unsightly and take up a much needed parking space.

### Objection Two

I think e-bikes are a dangerous nuisance. I am 70 with mobility difficulties and poor sight. E-cyclists continually ride on pavements, fail to stop at traffic lights and crossings. They leave bikes at random on pavements and against railings. Our street is already a tiktok and instagram destination and we don't need any more tourist nuisance. The bikes don't benefit residents and pose a risk to elderly and disabled pedestrians.

### Objection Three

I do not agree as it will take another residents parking spot and it is already difficult to park around here. Also e-bike stations are very messy , bikes fall over and they often encroach into the parking spots around. I do agree with more bikes but please put them on main roads and yellow lines NOT residential streets.

### Objection Four

They litter the streets and pavements. They restrict access to buildings and cars. They are a safety hazard for the elderly and people with little or no sight.

Lime bikes should be required to have locking stations like the Boris bikes.

### Objection Five

We have already had a bike 'box' forced on us despite residents not wanting this, it is empty most of the time and is absolutely full of rubbish underneath which is a health hazard for vermin. Now you are proposing that we have a pile of electric bikes falling over -as they are always on the ground -creating a risk to all pedestrians plus damaging any car parked near by. I would question who would pay for this damage? There are many elderly people living on our street and we do not need an e-bike mess - it is too dangerous. Those who are younger and want to ride an e-bike should not be making life harder for local residents.

Selecting the space opposite no 14 Stanley Crescent is particularly unsuitable , this section is full of workmen's vans on a daily basis and so the bikes will for sure be knocked over onto the residents parking bay. They really should never be positioned next to a parking bay. Outside 22 Kensington Park Gardens at the top end of Stanley Crescent – there is a yellow line there and if you needed a meter or so from the residents bay that would be safer

### **Objection Six**

The northern half of Stanley Crescent contains a majority of multi-residential units compared to the southern half which is mostly houses. Therefore there are far more car owners who already struggle to find a parking space. One has already been removed to make way for a bike shed which is used by only 3 bikes when I last looked. The east side where you propose to install the e-bike parking space has a large number of pay parking bays that are always occupied on weekdays by contractors reducing even further parking for residents. Nearby Ladbroke Gardens is impossible to find a parking space so inevitably I have to park in St John's Crescent outside St John's Church where there are fewer residents and therefore more parking spaces. Why not establish the e-bike parking space there? Or opposite St John's Church on Ladbroke Grove, adjacent to the existing e-scooter parking space?

I also noticed last Friday the e-bike parking space on Ladbroke Tce. (close to Notting Hill Gate/Holland Park Ave.) clogged with bikes to the point they overspilled on the road and pavement. You are planning to squeeze this parking spot between parking bays so what will happen if there is overspill denying cars a spot either side and conceivably blocking a narrow pavement?

I also noticed at another e-bike parking space last week during strong winds a number of bikes had fallen over: what if bikes fall over and damage a car? Will the bike hire company pay for damage? And even if they do why would a resident have to go to the trouble of having to go through a lengthy process of making a claim for such an event? Sure these parking spaces for e-bikes (which are considerably heavier than normal bikes) should be separate from car parking spaces to remove such a risk? See above for suggested alternative spots away from resident's cars

### **Objection Seven**

It would appear that the Council want to take away another residents bay in Stanley Crescent to accommodate e-bikes – while I appreciate the need to get these dangerous obstacles off the pavements it should not be at the expense of a parking space in Stanley Crescent – at present if we arrive home in the evening often we cannot find a space in the vicinity and frequently have to park across Ladbroke Grove behind St John's Church – many of us are elderly and find the walk intimidating and are therefore reluctant to go out in the evening.

Also the choice of the space opposite no 14 Stanley Crescent is particularly unsuitable as it is a residents parking bay next to a much needed Pay and Display bay – as we have seen bikes are often parked badly and they will undoubtedly stray into either or probably both bays. Even if the bikes are parked correctly they often blow over in windy weather, all too common in recent months, and they could damage vehicles parked on either side of the bay who would be held responsible for the damage?

I do not wish to be entirely negative but have you considered the spot outside 22 Kensington Park Gardens at the top end of Stanley Crescent – there is a yellow line there and if you needed a meter or so from the residents bay that would be less of a loss than the present spot and with lessen my worry of placing the bike bay in the middle of a parking area.

### **Objection Eight**

We have just received your letter re the proposal to install storage for e-bikes.

RBKC has already taken away a residents bay in Stanley Crescent and it would appear that the Council intends to replace another one to accommodate e-bikes.

Space for e-bikes should not be created at the expense of YET ANOTHER parking space in Stanley Crescent. Our parking spaces (to which we are entitled and pay for) are slowly becoming eradicated and this is not fair. Finding empty car parking bays in this area is already a challenge particularly for those residents who are less mobile and vulnerable in the area. Elderly residents should not be expected to walk distances (particularly in the dark) from their parked car to their front door to accommodate e-bikes and it is unfair of the Council to expect them to do so.

The proposal to install accommodation for the e-bikes opposite No 14 Stanley Crescent requires further thought as it is not suitable. The bikes will be stored between cars which are likely to be damaged should the bikes be stored incorrectly and fall over. Will the Council be reimbursing residents when the cars are damaged from the bikes?

Please review the areas where there are yellow lines and on wider streets and do not take away any more parking spaces from Stanley Crescent.

### **Objection Nine**

I gather that the Council are proposing to reduce the number of residents parking bays in Stanley Crescent to accommodate e-bikes – while I appreciate the need to remove these dangerous obstacles from the pavements, it should not be at the expense of a residents parking space in Stanley Crescent. At present, if we arrive home in the evening, it is often extremely difficult to find a space in the vicinity and we frequently have to park across Ladbrooke Grove behind St John's Church or in other streets which is not ideal.

Also the choice of the space opposite no 14 Stanley Crescent is particularly unsuitable as it is a residents parking bay next to a much needed Pay and Display bay – as we have seen ebikes are often parked badly and they will undoubtedly stray into either or probably both bays. Even if the ebikes are parked correctly they often blow over in high winds, all too common in recent months, and they could damage vehicles parked on either side of the bay, in which case who would be held responsible for the damage?

I do not wish to be entirely negative and have a couple of suggestions for other locations. Have you considered either the spot outside 25 Kensington Park Gardens at the top end of Stanley Crescent, where the yellow line is? If you needed a meter or so from the residents bay that would be less of a loss than the present spot and with lessen my objection to placing the ebike bay in the middle of a parking area. Or, alternatively outside 22 Kensington Park Gardens, where there is a yellow line?

A third suggestion is in front of where the large planting pots have been placed to block off Lansdowne Crescent.

I very much hope that these alternative locations will be considered by the Council, rather than depriving us of much needed residents parking bays or Pay and Display bays in Stanley Crescent.

### **Objection Ten**

I am forwarding this email written to the council from one of my neighbours on Stanley Crescent W11 2NA regarding the proposed plan to remove more of our resident bays to accommodate e-bikes. [Redacted] has written exactly what the majority of our neighbours are thinking about this proposal, so there is nothing more to add. I would like to reiterate the concern that the majority of these bikes are left “dumped “ everywhere and especially around where a bike bay is designated. The side of the road where 14 Stanley Crescent is is extremely narrow and difficult to navigate at the best of times, so adding dozens of badly parked or over parked e-bikes will make this stretch of pavement impossible. Not to mention the damage to parked cars and the fact that these bikes will overspill into more resident parking bays which we, residents, pay for. E-bike users do not pay for resident parking space.

[Additional Comments]

I emailed them too this morning, also pointing out that that stretch of pavement is incredibly narrow and difficult to navigate at the best of times and a proposed bike park would make it impossible as we have all witnessed how these bikes are left.

### **Objection Eleven**

I agree with [redacted]'s comments.

### **Objection Twelve**

I refer to your letter dated 6 March 2024 relating to the proposed new e-bike parking bay opposite 14 Stanley Crescent and write to object to the proposal.

Cyclists are already well and sufficiently catered for in this area. There are e-bike parks in Chepstow Crescent and Denbeigh Road both close to Chepstow Villas and four cycle hangars very close – one in Stanley Crescent just by Ladbroke Gardens, one in Kensington Park Road close to Ladbroke Gardens/Westbourne Grove, one in Arundel Gardens by Kensington Park Road and one in Ladbroke Grove near Lansdowne Crescent.

There is a parking bay for twenty one “Santander” bicycles in Ladbroke Grove called “Ladbroke Grove Central” and another parking bay for twenty six “Santander” bicycles in Chepstow Villas just by Kensington Park Road.

There is a parking bay for six or seven motor cycles in Arundel Gardens just by Ladbroke Grove and a scooter park for six or seven scooters on the corner of Kensington Park Gardens and Ladbroke Grove.

I have not seen any e-bikes abandoned on the pavement in this area and I am not aware of any 'overspilling in popular existing rental e-bike bays' in this area. The e-bike parks in Chepstow Crescent and Denbigh Road were almost empty yesterday.

I believe there is no demand for additional parking facilities for bicycles, e-bike or other, in this area but there is demand for residents' car parking in Stanley Crescent. I do not have a residents' car parking permit, but my neighbours tell me that competition for residents' car parking places is intense, particularly at night, and residents have to use the pay to park bays. This will only get worse if sixteen feet of the residents' parking opposite 14 Stanley Crescent is designated for e-bikes. My experience, occasionally, of trying to park my car late at night in Stanley Crescent and the surrounding streets confirms my neighbours' reports.

If e-bikes are now more popular than the "Santander" bicycles, I suggest that sixteen feet of the Ladbroke Grove Central parking bay and/or of the Chepstow Villas parking bay be re-designated for e-bikes instead of taking up residents parking space in Stanley Crescent.

### **Objection Thirteen**

I wish to object strongly against the proposed dockless bike hire bay proposed on Stanley Crescent W11, on firstly safety grounds, and secondly to the detriment and inappropriateness in this crescent overlooking listed buildings.

#### **SAFETY**

There has very obviously been a complete failure by RBKC in proposing this site, for bike hire, to consider any safety ramifications for pedestrians.

The proposed bike hire dock is sited on a curved sloping road, Stanley Crescent, leading to a busy road and on a blind spot for pedestrians. At present bikes, electric or otherwise, speed silently down Stanley Crescent and do not stop at the junction, instead swinging at speed on to Ladbroke Gardens, which is used as a cut through on to Ladbroke Grove.

On countless occasions, I have nearly been seriously hit by bikes speeding down the blind Stanley Crescent slope, as I have attempted to cross the road, including with my Mother who is registered blind.

Additionally, even when crossing, and I have been in the middle of the road, cyclists speed down on the blind spot of Stanley Crescent and Ladbroke Gardens and have nearly, very frighteningly hit and knocked me down.

I witnessed this also with an elderly lady, whose aid I went to.

The users of electric bikes could not care less about pedestrians. Many bikes are illegally used by youngsters cracking codes, or ridden over pavements, etc, with no care for pedestrians.

The proposed bay should be re sited on Ladbroke Grove, where pedestrians have at least a chance of crossing the road on a crossing and not being hit by these bikes.

Your proposed site on Stanley Crescent is wholly inappropriate for safety reasons on a sloping road leading to a blind spot at a junction. It is clear users of these bike speed and it is just so dangerous and wholly to the detriment of pedestrians living here and trying to cross roads multiple times daily, avoiding careless and speeding bikes.

Secondly I enclose photographic evidence below, on how these dockless bike areas. are used and kept in an area of listed buildings which is wholly inappropriate.

In trying to cross a road , I have had to avoid a bike as it toppled over, which could have broken someone's leg.

The photograph which represents how these bikes are left is inappropriate for citing in a road of listed buildings and is to the detriment of the listed area should be recited on a main road.

Clearly the operation of hiring electric bikes is not in the interests of pedestrian safety or for a conservation area of listed buildings.

To conclude , it is inappropriate for the council to seek to install a bike hire dock on a sloping crescent leading to a blind crossing point for pedestrians. This puts pedestrians in further danger from large amounts of silent electric bikes encouraged to use a junction which bike riders have already made difficult for pedestrians to use. The dock should be cited on Ladbroke Grove where pedestrians can at least see where bikes are coming at speed at them.

#### **Support in Full One**

[No comment supplied]