

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
COURTFIELD 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 Courtfield 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 Courtfield 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, 137 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 one of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Collingham Gardens, Onslow Gardens, Stanhope Gardens and Sumner Place proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed with these locations.
- 4.3 It is important to note that some respondents asked that their response be applied to every proposed location in the borough. This amounts to an objection to the principle of e-bike parking bays, and whilst people are free to express this position it is not strictly relevant to a consultation on specific sites. However, we have included responses from people who asked for their position to be applied to every proposal in the borough. This means that 12 objections, two 'support in part' and seven 'support in full' responses are not necessarily from residents local to each proposal. Total responses including these responses are indicated in brackets in Table 1. For administrative purposes, these responses and officer responses have been produced separately as Appendix 2. Some of the reasons for these whole-Borough responses also feature in the site-specific comments described in Section 5.

Table 1 – Summary of responses received.

Scheme	No. Objections	No. Support in Part	No. Support in Full	No opinion	Recommendation
S526a Collingham Gardens	9 (21)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S526b Collingham Place	1 (13)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S526c Onslow Gardens	5 (17)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Do not proceed
S526d Stanhope Gardens	9 (21)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S526e Sumner Place	5 (17)	1 (3)	0 (7)	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. 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. 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. Two respondents to the Onslow Gardens proposal said the road was too narrow to accommodate a rental e-bike parking bay and cited that it was inappropriate that pub-goers would need to cross the road to access the bay, resulting in road safety concerns.

Officer Response

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

off from the footway side, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to congestion on the footway. As the proposed e-bike bays are proposed where a car can currently park, there is no reason to believe that e-bikes parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present. Notwithstanding that anyone over the alcohol limit should use neither cars or bicycles to travel, any pub customer wishing to leave the pub on Selwood Terrace will by necessity need to cross a road to continue their journey so it is hard to understand why the presence of an e-bike bay would make this any more dangerous than a customer still within alcohol limits wishing to access a car parking bay within Onslow Gardens. Arguably, placing the ebikes on the other side of the road will make them slightly less likely to be used by pub customers.

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 – particularly if used by patrons of the Anglesea Arms pub.

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 bay proposed in Onslow Gardens is not outside of the Anglesea Arms pub located on Selwood Terrace.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.14 Several respondents to the Onslow Gardens proposal suggested installing the bay outside the Anglesea Arms pub on either Selwood Terrace or Selwood Place.
- 5.15 Respondents to the Sumner Place proposal suggested closer to the tube station on Pelham Street, at the other end of Sumner Place or around Onslow Square (north). Other suggestions included installing it on the west side of road, with SYL on either side for overspill.

Officer Response

- 5.16 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.17 Officers would not install a rental e-bike bay directly outside of a pub where the bicycles may be more at risk of misuse by people in high spirits.
- 5.18 There are already a high number of rental e-bike parking bays close to South Kensington station. The bay is already proposed on the west side of the road, which does have a section of single yellow line immediately adjacent on the northern side.

Other comments

- 5.19 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	The council should make all rental bike users park in fixed bike docks similar to Santander Cycle Hire docks. (Collingham Place proposal)	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.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr Janet Evans

We had a meeting with residents of Stanhope Gardens regarding the installation of bike rack at North end of street.

There was an overwhelming discontent at the prospect of putting in this bike rack.

Consequently, the Courtfield Councillors request you cancel the installation of this bike rack opposite 1 Stanhope Gardens.

Please confirm that this is removed from the plan.

[Additional Comments]

Thank you. Please cancel it in any case or configuration.

It is not wanted on Stanhope Gardens. You have probably seen the correspondence. Perhaps clarify with [redacted].

Cllr Gregory Hammond

On the consultation evidence I can only support proceeding with the Collingham Place proposal, for which only one resident has come forward with comments and these being generic rather than specific to the location.

In respect of the Onslow Gardens proposal ward councillors were involved in advising how residents could have their views heard. The consultation result of 5 immediately local objectors and no explicit local support, excluding the generic responses, is clear and should not be overridden.

In respect of Sumner Place, ward councillors have not been involved in any local conversations, but the consultation objections look like five individually thought through positions, and the one categorised as 'support in part' reads more like an objection than expression of support. With no counterbalancing submissions in full support, the Council should respect the majority view that has emerged from the consultation.

I support your recommendations not to proceed for Collingham Gardens and Stanhope Gardens for the reasons you have set out.

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 Collingham Gardens

Objection One

I am objecting to RBKC Council concerning proposed locations for e-parking bays. One of the suggested locations is in our Courtfield ward outside 526a Collingham Gardens, in the same street as the existing Santander bicycle station on the side of our house.

I would like to object to the proposed location.

Our street already has the Santander bicycle station and I do not want a second helping. Adding an e-parking bay in the same street seems unfair as it could double the noise and litter for us.. I have suggested they spread the pain and select another street,

Of course, I am in favor of bicycles and e-bikes. I just do not want them all parked in our street.

Objection Two

You have to be kidding. The bikes are dumped in the middle of pavements. Usually, purposely diagonally across so pedestrians, wheelchair users, pram and buggy users have no access and forced into the road. The bike parking areas are an eyesore in conservation areas. The renters of these bikes are usually not used to cycling on London streets. Have no helmet and more interested in their mobile phone whilst cycling and have zero accountability for safety . Please stop this!!! I do not support more of these bike parks narrowing dangerously pavements and not supporting those with disabilities. STOP these plans.

Objection Three

There is already a Santander bicycle station In Collingham Gardens which causes disturbing noise to some residents particularly at night. It seems unfair to stick an e-parking location in the same street. That is doubling the pain for some residents. Would it not be fairer to choose another street?

Objection Four

A nuisance, spoil the road.

Objection Five

There are enough E-bike parking slots but not enough resident parking slots. Also, please ensure there is a gate between the E-bike and car parking slots as E-bikes often fall or are thrown into neighbouring cars causing damage. There needs to be a way of keeping the E-bikes in their slot without over-riding car slots or causing damage.

Objection Six

I am objecting for the following reasons

- the road is one way with heavy congestion
- the number of parking spaces is very limited on laverton place with frequently 100% occupation. Removing a parking space is not what residents need
- immediately as you turn left from the parking space it is on a dangerous bend, which will create safety implications for cyclists
- the area is very residential (space immediately in front of a house), the noise will be a nuisance for residents and spoil the peace

Objection Seven

[No comment supplied]

Objection Eight

There is already santander bike parking taking up space. We need more bicycle parking space (not ebikes).

Objection Nine

We already have an existing Santander bike location. It is already creating a very real noise nuisance in the evenings, as well as unwanted litter and at times antisocial behaviour.

Adding an e-parking bay in the same street seems unfair as it could double the noise and litter for us.. please spread the pain and select another street or at least at a difference level.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Collingham Place

Objection One

What is the point of cycle bays if cycle users continue to park on pavements and resident bays with impunity. Despite promises of geo positioning enforcement nothing has changed. I regularly see ebikes parked in the middle of pavement side on to cause the maximum inconvenience to pedestrians. The council should address these issues before taking up more resident parking bays for ebikes. The Netherlands now make all bike users park in fixed bike docks similar to santander bike docks.

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Onslow Gardens

Objection One

These take up valuable car parking spaces, encourage dangerous and abusive use of bicycles and are a blight on any area

Objection Two

I have been in touch with the ward councillors about this proposed site already but I understand you are the road safety officer looking at this. While we welcome the introduction of bicycle bays to try to curtail this problem of abandoned ebikes, we need to ensure they are located in the most appropriate locations so that they would not cause more harm in other ways.

Accordingly, the proposed location of the one outside / opposite No 17 Onslow Gardens would be inappropriate and unsafe in many ways; the draw of the ebikes in this locality is the Anglesea Arms pub - there is no dispute about this. The bike bay should therefore be in the immediate vicinity of the pub, this being Selwood Place, immediately adjacent to the pub. This would be the most obvious and safest location.

Placing it across a busy road from the pub, in a single lane, one way street which is entirely residential would invite serious problems: safety concerns in crossing the road to and from the pub (especially after a lot of drinks), lead to more antisocial and disruptive behaviour from pub leavers after 11pm when they congregate and try to board the bikes outside our homes, and the volume of the bikes is likely to spill into our single lane street and block the traffic. The safety issues in placing this bay across the street etc would most likely leave the council with clear legal liability in the event of the inevitable accidents this proposed locality would result in.

We therefore object very strenuously to the proposed bike bay opposite 17 Onslow Gardens, for the key reasons outlined above, and repeated below, and suggest the most appropriate and safe location would be adjacent to the Anglesea Arms in Selwood Terrace:

1. Inappropriate locality - should be adjacent to the pub, in its immediate vicinity;
2. Serious safety concerns to pub goers crossing the busy road to get to the pub and back (especially after closing time);
3. An increase in antisocial and disruptive behaviour, particularly after closing time when drunk pub leavers congregate outside our homes to attempt to get a bike - antisocial behaviour has been reported to the police about pub leavers outside our homes in the past (can forward police report refs), and this proposed bike bay would most likely form a hub for such behaviour;
4. Narrow street, single lane: the bikes are likely to fall and block the road to traffic;

Narrow road leading onto busy street (proposed bay would be where the silver car is on the right):

Bikes likely to fall, leading to obstruction of the highway (e.g. below, near Duke of York Sq)

For these reasons, we object to the proposed location of this bike bay (opposite No 17 OG) and would strongly suggest it be relocated to the more appropriate locality so that it is in the immediate vicinity of the Anglesea Arms, (Selwood Terrace) which is the draw for these bikes.

Thank you for your understanding, and perhaps you could please confirm.

Objection Three

Further to my fellow part owner/resident of [redacted] Onslow Gardens communications and objections, my name is [redacted].

Over the years we have been subjected to increased noise and inconvenience arising from patrons of the Anglesea Arms, particularly late at night. This has increased significantly in recent times particularly with the introduction of these e-bikes. The abandoning of such not only creates a hazard but also increases the noise and volume of foot traffic from the pub. Further to [redacted]'s points with which I concur entirely, I would emphasise the dangerous nature of the junction between Onslow Gardens and Neville Terrace. I am sure you will be aware of the number of vehicle collisions that have occurred over the years and one major incident resulting in a car bursting through the railings and ending in the basement area below.

Any plan to introduce an e-bike parking bay at or around this junction would significantly increase the numbers of bikes and pedestrian activity around a very busy and hazardous junction. Additionally placing the parking bay on the opposite side of the road to the pub seems an unnecessary and poorly considered plan incurring more pedestrian and bike activity across such a busy and hazardous junction. Of course there is the wider consideration as to the use of e-bikes when consuming alcohol and whether the provision of a parking bay acts to encourage such use and behaviour?

As a long term resident I must object in the strongest possible terms, not only on the grounds of the nuisance value/increased noise, hazard creation but also the considerable additional safety concerns arising from the proposed location.

Objection Four

Having been a resident of [redacted] Onslow Gardens [redacted] for over 10 years, I very strongly second [redacted]'s email listing the many concerns this dockless bicycle bay would present, if located where suggested.

Noise at late hours of the night, along with safety issues (fallen bikes on the road) are arguably the most problematic issues.

As suggested by [redacted], it would seem logical that the bay be located on Selwood Place, adjacent to the pub Anglesea Arms.

Most of the e-bike users are clients of the establishment anyways, and I'm afraid having to cross the street to park the bike would lead to "abandonment in the wild" (as such is sadly the case, mostly in front of our door, at the moment).

I do hope you will hear our concerns as local residents, and find a solution which best benefits all parties involved.

Objection Five

My business owns two apartments at [redacted] and note the proposed dockless bicycle bays at the north west side of Onslow Gardens, which I object to at this specific location for the various safety and practical reasons previously notified.

Accordingly, the proposed location of the one outside / opposite No 17 Onslow Gardens would be inappropriate and unsafe in many ways; the draw of the ebikes in this locality is the Anglesea Arms pub - there is no dispute about this. The bike bay should therefore be in the immediate vicinity of the pub, this being Selwood Terrace, immediately adjacent to the pub. This would be the most obvious and safest location.

Placing it across a busy road from the pub, in a single lane, one way street which is entirely residential would invite serious problems: safety concerns in crossing the road to and from the pub (especially after a lot of drinks), lead to more antisocial and disruptive behaviour from pub leavers after 11pm when they congregate and try to board the bikes outside our homes, and the volume of the bikes is likely to spill into our single lane street and block the traffic. The safety issues in placing this bay across the street etc would most likely leave the council with clear legal liability in the event of the inevitable accidents this proposed locality would result in.

We therefore object very strenuously to the proposed bike bay opposite 17 Onslow Gardens, for the key reasons outlined above, and repeated below, and suggest the most appropriate and safe location would be adjacent to the Anglesea Arms in Selwood Terrace:

1. Inappropriate locality - should be adjacent to the pub, in its immediate vicinity;
2. Serious safety concerns to pub goers crossing the busy road to get to the pub and back (especially after closing time);

3. An increase in antisocial and disruptive behaviour, particularly after closing time when drunk pub leavers congregate outside our homes to attempt to get a bike - antisocial behaviour has been reported to the police about pub leavers outside our homes in the past (can forward police report refs), and this proposed bike bay would most likely form a hub for such behaviour;

4. Narrow street, single lane: the bikes are likely to fall and block the road to traffic;

Narrow road leading onto busy street (proposed bay would be where the silver car is on the right):

Bikes likely to fall, leading to obstruction of the highway (e.g. below, near Duke of York Sq):

For these reasons, we object to the proposed location of this bike bay (opposite No 17 OG) and would strongly suggest it be relocated to the more appropriate locality so that it is in the immediate vicinity of the Anglesea Arms, (Selwood Terrace) which is the draw for these bikes.

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

Objection One

Stanhope Gardens is a quiet residential street with children using the pavements to play. The entrance to the communal gardens is right by the proposed bay. There is no demand for bike parking on this street as bikes are rarely seen here. There will be needless nuisance, disturbance and disruption caused if the bike bay is located here as proposed. The bike bay should be located on Queensgate close to hostels and Imperial College, which is where the real need is.

Objection Two

I would suggest a better location would be further down the street some distance from the significant number of vehicles that turn into Stanhope Gardens from Cromwell Road. It is a one way road.

Objection Three

As a resident of Stanhope Gardens I am very concerned about anti social behaviour. Most of the residents of the street are families or older residents. We already have issues with groups of young adults congregating and causing problems on the street E.g smoking drugs, knocking on doors, making some people feel uncomfortable with their security and a recent example of fireworks being set off in the early hours of the morning. I also worry that E bikes are often left outside of areas where bikes are supposed to be left which make it difficult for people using pavement and road. Finally as a resident who parks on the street at busy times losing this parking space would make it difficult to park near our building.

Objection Four

I do not support the installation for the ebikes based on the following:

There are currently two TFL bike parks sandwiching Stanhope Gardens at the junction of Queensgate and Cromwell Rd and Queensgate & Stanhope Gardens in th eother direction. SUREly it would be more logical to put all the bikes together.

The way that the bikes are returned leads to bikes being left on the ground, outside the marked bays and quite frankly in dangerous positions to either road users or pedesatrians. At least with the TFL bikes they are in an orderly safe arrangement.

The anti-social behaviour that follows these bikes is quite high. I am a cyclist and I have contacted the council on numerous occasions to ask for a bike locker(s) to be put into our street for residents, all to no avail. I feel aggrieved that money making companies can install these ebike and scooter bays at the detriment to homeowners who will see the value of properties diminish due to the locations.

If you look at the mess over in Hammersmith & Fulham where bikes are just dumped on the ground regardless of bike bays.

It will also lead to the Garden Square becoming unsafe. This is a tranquil street, considering its next to Cromwell Rd its quiet at night. There are multiple young children and families whose lives will be disturbed by this and quite frankly it's not necessary in this street. What is more necessary is that the street has only 1 fast fibre cable provider, 21st century, Central London and we have no choice, but that obviously isn't important to the council !

Objection Five

As a long term resident of Stanhope Gardens, being witness to many similar proposals, I can attest that the installation next to the corner of Cromwell Road and Stanhope Gardens (east) is not the best proposed location. It is a very dangerous spot - the cars take the left turn from Cromwell road into Stanhope Gardens quite abruptly and thus may inadvertently collide with a bike coming from the ebike parking space. In addition, very few bikes come/ use Cromwell Road due to the heavy traffic.

A more widely used road for bikes is Harringdon Road - it makes more sense the ebike parking space to be located at the corner of Stanhope Gardens (east) and Harringdon road - it is a safer location and the incoming traffic from Cromwell road into Stanhope Gardens is better visible by the users of rented bikes, if the station is farther from Cromwell Road.

Also, the constant influx of taxis collecting passengers, or waiting for ones, from the Frasier Suites Hotel will obstruct the rented ebikes if the stand is located at the proposed spot. It is highly inconvenient for all parties, therefore it is best to move the proposed location closer to Harringdon Road, where there are more parking spots and more space for proposed ebikes.

Finally, if I speak on behalf of the residents of Derwent House, who I am sure will raise the issue themselves, the proposed spot is used for parking by the said residents, due to its proximity to the highrise building. If some of the space is used for ebikes, it will inconvenience the residents, as most have cars, and do not use bikes.

I do hope you will take all those points into consideration and am more than happy to discuss on the phone if necessary.

Objection Six

Road safety - this is a dangerous corner, where cars turn off the Cromwell road, and would put at risk inexperienced cycle riders. If Stanhope Gardens is to be used, much safer to put at other end of street, which is quieter.

Congestion - given Derwent House and Fraser suites, the Cromwell road end of Stanhope gardens is much busier for parking than the other end of the street.

Disruption - a parking bay for motorcycles was discontinued 2 years ago in this exact spot precisely because of excessive disruption to residents.

Objection Seven

The location at the north end of the east side of Stanhope gardens is right around the corner from Cromwell Road - it is a very dangerous spot as cars from Cromwell road tend to take the turn on Stanhope Gardens at high speed and the bike riders can be put in danger, as they swerve on their rented bikes. It

is a quite busy turn in addition due to the constant traffic of rented taxis and ubers coming and waiting / parking in front of the east entrance to Frasier Suites (right next to the proposed rental bikes station), therefore additionally posing threat to the bike riders.

A much better spot would be at the farther end of Stanhope gardens (same street) right next to Harringdon Gardens, which is a natural bike path (a lot of bike riders are on Harringdon Gardens as opposed to the busier Cromwell Road. This makes for a better transition, as the bikes can be left and rented right at the corner of Stanhope Gardens and Harringdon Road.

Objection Eight

The location at the north end of the east side of Stanhope gardens is a very dangerous spot as cars from Cromwell Road tend to take the turn on Stanhope Gardens at high speed and the bike riders can be put in danger, as they swerve on their rented bikes. In addition, due to the constant traffic of rented taxis and ubers coming and waiting / parking in front of the east entrance to Frasier Suites (right next to the proposed rental bikes station), there is a constant collision threat to the bike riders.

There has already unsuccessfully been another suggestion for a similar park, but it was overturned due to the impracticality of the location.

A much better spot and more practical spot would be at the farther end of Stanhope gardens (same street) right next to Harringdon Gardens, which is a natural bike path (a lot of bike riders are on Harringdon Gardens as opposed to the busier Cromwell Road. It would be a mirror image to the bike parking across the south side of Stanhope Gardens and Harringdon Gardens. This makes for a better transition, as the bikes can be left and rented right at the corner of Stanhope Gardens and Harringdon Road.

Objection Nine

I am writing to object to the introduction of a dockless cycle bay: Ref 1x. On west side of eastern arm of Stanhope Gardens opposite number 2.

Reasons for objection:

The proposed site to install the dockless bay is currently the most congested part of Stanhope Gardens located by the entrance to Fraser Suites where throughout the day and night taxis and chauffeur driven cars pull up and wait for guests. Added to this there are constant deliveries and refuse collections from larger vehicles to Fraser Suites already causing congestion and bringing extra traffic to the area and taking up already limited parking spaces.

There is already more competition for resident parking bays at west side of the eastern arm of Stanhope Gardens as Derwent House (located opposite), not surprisingly has a higher occupancy of car users than the other end of Stanhope Gardens. Has this point been considered?

On safety grounds - traffic from Cromwell Rd use Stanhope Gardens as a cut through often travelling at speed which has already caused concern for the safety of residents and has been reported to the council. Adding rental bike parking (and collection) as well as inexperienced cyclists is an accident waiting

to happen. I would like to ask that a safety report is carried out. This is a residential street with a high number of young children and elderly residents, their safety must be a consideration too.

Extra noise disturbance to residents – guests from Fraser suites already cause considerable noise disturbance when returning late in the evening. Add e-bikes to this and the council is encouraging yet more foot traffic and noise to the area.

The council needs to be reminded that this is a residential street with already high and increasing council tax charges and our needs must be listened to.

I am copying this to Janet Evans as our councillor so that she is fully aware of the level and strength of objections from residents of Stanhope Gardens and we would welcome further engagement.

I look forward to your response in due course.

Support in Full One

I think it's a really good idea and there is a school close by and residential apartments

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Sumner Place

Objection One

We already have a large london bicycle bay opposite our house. Residential parking is often very limited due to the hospitals near by using residential bays in the day. Far enough from the tube that it would also significantly increase number of pedestrians walking to and from.

Objection Two

We already have a TFL bike rental area at the Fulham Road end of Sumner Place which has removed a number of parking spaces. It also regularly gets electric bikes parked there too. I understand that the proposed area in question is only a few meters from this parking which means we lose residents parking bays and have more bikes. Many times the e-bikes are parked on the pavement even when there is space in the TFL bike area and not collected for a day or two. The proposed bay is close to the hospital and there are often people in wheelchairs needing full access to the pavement.

Can I suggest that you consider putting the bay closer to the tube station where there aren't any bike bays such as Pelham St, the other end of Sumner Place or around Onslow Square perhaps on the north side. All of Onslow Square has parking on both sides. There are flats on one side of the square and residents parking on both sides so residents parking wouldn't be as affected. We already have TFL bike parking and pay and display parking for the hospital and reduced residents parking on one side. The south end of Sumner Place has the only TFL bike parking within 500 meters of the tube station.

Objection Three

This section of street has already lost several spaces to disabled parking and e-charging bays in recent years! Surely you could put this bay on another street nearby that has not lost any spaces?

Objection Four

We already have a bike stand in Sumner Place which uses up resident parking space (already in short supply) and creates noise during the night as drunk people park bikes noisily. Adding more bikes will just exacerbate these problems. Please think of the long-suffering residents before going ahead with this. Thank you.

Objection Five

We would like to point out that there is Boris Bike rack already in Sumner Place and residents parking is reduced further by heavy use of the resident spaces by Hospital Staff who appear to have inviolability from fines following on from the pandemic relaxation.

Please confirm that there is no provision for Hospital Staff or doctors using the resident parking without being residents. The problem we also are concerned with is the unsightliness of this provision with no arrangements for this space to be regulated.

Support in Part One

I believe an ebike parking space should NOT take away any of the visitor parking bays on this street as they are much needed. Ebike parking bay is best on the west side of the road. Also think best that it is stand alone space in area currently covered by single yellow line. One of the problems with ebike bays is the "overflow" as the bikes are often left in a haphazard manner. Instead of losing one bay of parking one could in theory lose 2-3 bays.