

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
EARL'S COURT 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 Earl's Court 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 three locations in Earl’s Court 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, 91 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the three 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 Laverton Place proposal, officers are recommending not to proceed with this location. Since the Longridge Road location was proposed, a request has been made for a disabled bay at this location, hence officers recommend not to proceed with the rental e-bike bay.
- 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 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| S528a Knaresborough Place | 4 (16) | 0 (2) | 3 (10) | 0 | Proceed |
| S528b Laverton Place | 12 (24) | 1 (3) | 0 (7) | 0 | Do not proceed |
| S528c Longridge Road | 7 (19) | 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 – 5 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 vehicles

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for vehicles already using the road. Two respondents to the Knaresborough Place proposal said the road was already congested with vehicles accessing the A4.

Officer Response

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

parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present.

There is already a hire bike bay nearby

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

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

Poor behaviour by cyclists

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

Officer Response

- 5.15 Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit poor cycling behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to install rental e-bike parking, in the same way the Council would not refuse to provide car parking because a small minority of people who drive contravene traffic rules. In any case, whether or not the Council provides additional parking bays will not affect the number of dockless ebikes in circulation.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.16 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One respondent to the Longridge Road proposal suggested that the proposed e-bike parking bay is best suited on the western arm of Longridge Road, towards the junction with Warwick Road. Another responded to the Longridge Road proposal suggesting that e-bike parking bays be placed closer to tube stations.
- 5.17 One respondent to the Knaresborough Place proposal suggested moving the bay north toward the junction with Barkston Gardens.

Officer Response

- 5.18 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.19 There are existing e-bike parking bays located outside both entrances to Earl's Court tube station, therefore at present, there is no demand for additional e-bike parking bays outside the station.
- 5.20 The proposed location on Longridge Road was chosen to support the high demand of e-bike use within Earl's Court, by creating an additional bay in close proximity to the main high street, where many e-bike journeys begin and end. An e-bike bay toward Warwick Road would not fulfil the current demand.
- 5.21 The e-bike parking bay on Knaresborough Place would be located just a short distance away from Barkston Gardens and would be able to provide e-bike parking for customers of both the upcoming developments as well as those working and using the local Premier Inn Hotel.

Other comments

- 5.20 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 | Resident bicycle parking is needed. (Longridge Road) | 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

Cllr Linda Wade

I have in the past requested a review of the different demands on parking spaces, specifically in the Nevern Square Conservation Area (Longridge Road), but the argument can be applied wider – these conflicting demands on the available space can only work with enforcement and in context with the specific demands that already exist.

In a densely populated area such as Earl's Court, we have a shortage of parking spaces for residents, for pay-and-display, Santander bikes, fast-food delivery bikes, deliveries to businesses and now we have the largely uncontrolled e-bike and e-scooter issue.

The problem is down to enforcement and where the responsibility lies for their control. In Philbeach Gardens we have the problem that an EV charging point is alongside the E-bike bay and the e-bikes have taken over – this is in part due to the fact that the contractors place their brand of e-bikes without reference to the adjacent spaces and in some cases, it has been witnessed that one company will remove the bikes of a competitor and replace with their own.

The stands need to be redesigned so that there is a distinct area allocated and one that prevents the e-bikes falling over. Just providing a space without a barrier/railing around is not working.

There needs to be considerably more use of geo-locating limiting areas such as around the station, and I understand that in Kensington and Chelsea, unlike some other boroughs there are no sanctions on riders dumping indiscriminately.

The onus of enforcement is left to residents to contact the contractors and not for the contractors to control their product.

I understand that we need to move with the times, but as with the fast-food bike companies, e-bike providers are using our space for their commercial ends without any money raised to design, monitor, or enforce the usage.

[Additional Comments]

There are deep seated concerns about e-bike parking and the conflicting demands of the fast-food riders. This is due to lack of enforcement and control over bikes in general and taking away from residents being able to park their bikes.

[Additional Comments]

I think that this highlights the need for mapping of the ward, the parking and the different demands so that decision making can be clearer, more transparent to all.

Different departments are coming up with different suggestions for space use: fast food delivery bikes for example where they are seeking more spaces, plus the e-bikes all of which are reducing the amount of space for residents whether its their bikes, motorbikes or cars.

I would ask again for mapping, as the last exercise did not reflect the growing pressures overall.

[Additional Comments]

There is enormous concern about the management of the bike bays whether e-bikes or for fast food deliveries, Nevern Place and Trebovir Road have been adversely impacted by the introduction of unmonitored and unenforced sites and now another street in the Nevern Square Conservation Area.

The issue is also around the reduction of spaces that are available to residents for their bikes and cars, but also the problems associated with e-bike spaces that are not routinely monitored by the borough, and problems are left to residents to report to the individual companies.

Just providing the spaces does not cure the problem, what steps are attached to this allocation that would safeguard residents' interests.

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 Knaresborough Place

Objection One

There is one already across the street, but people don't dock their bikes, they just leave them on the sidewalk across our entrance

Objection Two

Waste of space. There are enough spaces as is.

Objection Three

Knaresborough Place is an extremely busy street with a high volume of traffic accessing the A4. The proposed e-bike bays do not have fixed stands and bikes frequently fall over creating an obstacle and making adjoining parking bays less useable. This specific location adjoins scarce electric car charging bays and will make using those bays difficult. There is already an e-bike bay near the station on Earl's Court Gardens as well as one very close by in Hogarth Road and another less than a minute's walk away in Courtfield Gardens. There is also a bike storage unit in Barkston Gardens and a large Santander bike bay on Knaresborough Place all taking up valuable vehicle parking spaces. Anyone who needs a rental bike in this location can already access one. For the foreseeable future there will also be an enormous volume of construction traffic created by several major hotel redevelopments on this corner. Please do not add another e-bike bay here, especially one without proper stands. A second new e-bike bay is proposed for just a few meters down the road in Laverton Place. There is not sufficient demand to justify 2 additional new e-bike bays in this small area. Adding this e-bike bay, between the zebra crossing the electric car charging bay, on such a congested narrow section of this vital road is not appropriate.

Objection Four

The Earl's Court Society objects to the placement of additional dockless e-bike parking bays in Earl's Court. These bays are not fit for purpose and attract ASB, unlike the Santander scheme docked cycle parking stands. Even when within a few meters of the marked e-bike parking bays that were added in 2023, users of the dockless system simply drop the cycles anywhere creating a treacherous gauntlet for all other pedestrians and road users in this congested ward. Please redesign the parking bays before removing valuable parking in congested locations like our with many competing demands on scarce space.

I attach our representations as well as a few photos taken in Earl's Court Gardens, where a new e-bike parking bay was created last year. Even with the introduction of the marked e-bike parking bay, e-bikes are left everywhere creating a health and safety disaster, particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those with pushchairs.

Knareborough Place is an extremely busy street with a high volume of traffic accessing the A4. The proposed e-bike bays do not have fixed stands and bikes frequently fall over creating an obstacle and making adjoining parking bays less useable. This specific location adjoins scarce electric car charging bays and will make using those bays difficult. There is already an e-bike bay near the station on Earl's Court Gardens as well as one very close by in Hogarth Road and another only a minute's walk away in Courtfield Gardens. There is also a bike storage unit in Barkston Gardens and a large Santander bike bay on Knareborough Place all taking up valuable vehicle parking spaces. Anyone who needs a rental bike in this location can already access one. For the foreseeable future there will also be an enormous volume of construction traffic created by several major hotel redevelopments on this corner. Please do not add another e-bike bay here, especially one without proper stands. A second new e-bike bay is proposed for just a few meters down the road in Laverton Place. There is not sufficient demand to justify 2 additional new e-bike bays in this small area. Adding this e-bike bay, between the zebra crossing the electric car charging bay, on such a congested narrow section of this vital road is not appropriate.

Support in Full One

This is a sensible area where there is generally low foot-fall and so overspill on the pavement is less of an issue

Support in Full Two

The area is short e-bike parking bays. As there is none on Barkston Gardens, it might make sense to get this proposed parking bay located closer to the junction between Barkston Gardens and Knareborough Place/Courtfield Gardens in front of The Resident and thus in closer proximity to the future 1/1A Barkston/19-22 Courtfield Gardens Hotels, The Presidential Apartments or the former Burns Hotel new Ellen Hotel (18-26 Barkston Gardens).

Support in Full Three

[No comment supplied]

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

Objection One

I am against the proposal because there are not many eBikes in this area and support the one further up the road by 15 Knaresborough place. There is more demand for private parking further down near Laverton Mews and the bottom of Courtfield Gardens and so I am against the removal of resident parking bays.

The council should be instructing TfL that they require the bays back from Boris bikes to convert them back to public parking bays to alleviate pressure on parking in hot spots.

If the solution fades away as we expect it might do given the business model, I expect the council to return these bays to parking access at a later date if demand drops for the bikes.

Objection Two

Sorry I filled out for the wrong ward. Please do not put a bike part bay at the top of my mews. I do not support this. The bikes a total pest as are the irresponsible people who use them. The pavements are narrow. And this now going to make the situation worse. You don't seem to mind or help wheelchair users, support disabilities or buggy users. Please stop this in Laverton Place.

Objection Three

I own and reside at [redacted] Laverton Mews. I strongly object to the proposed location of an e-bike bay on Laverton Place for the following reasons:

1) There is a small arch that leads into the Mews. My experience with e-bike parking bays is that the users are not careful about where they leave the bikes. I would expect a regular problem with bikes blocking the Mews entrance and cluttering Laverton Place, making access in and out of the Mews difficult. During busy traffic periods it can already be a problem getting out of the Mews on to Laverton Place and then into the Courtfield Gardens area. This risks dramatically exacerbating the problem.

2) There is very limited parking outside the Mews. Taking up a space in that small stretch of road meaningfully reduces the available parking in the immediate area.

3) The Mews at present is a very quiet residential area. The presence of an e-bike bay risks dramatically increasing the amount of noise in the area.

I understand the need for e-bike bays, but there are a number of heavily trafficked areas nearby that would disrupt residents and traffic flow less dramatically. I would suggest either Barkston or Courtfield Gardens as much better locations where there would be far less impact on traffic and the quality of life for the residents. Please don't hesitate to call me if I can provide any further input. Many thanks.

Objection Four

The fact that there will be a loss of a highly valuable parking space in this residential location is not helpful for the residents in this part of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

The location proposed on Laverton place is not near any clear destination for a cyclist. It is not clear why users of ebikes would want to pick up or leave a bike in this location.

There are a high number of bays proposed for the borough and it is not clear if this will make any difference to the number of ebikes left in various locations other than bays. I note that the council has issued a memorandum of understanding with the operators of ebikes that users will park the bikes in bays. It is not clear to me how the operators would enforce such an understanding from its multiple users.

The proposal also states that there will be multiple sites so that people do not have to walk too far to drop off the bike. They will be cycling when dropping off and tend to stop where they want to get off. There is no evidence to suggest that the majority of users will not continue to do this.

I would recommend review of the proposal of locations and numbers of ebike bays and consider the safety aspect of this as they often blow over and if stacked up next to each other fall over and create a safety issue for road users.

Laverton Place is a quiet, charming residential area. I have lived on Laverton Place for the last 14 years and seen many people stopping to take photographs of the entrance to the mews from the opposite side of the road. I think that the location of an ebike parking bay located just next to the entrance of Laverton Mews would not fit the general sense of place.

Objection Five

This is a quiet residential area. Bike parking creates noise, disruption, inconsiderate parking of Bikes, loitering. Bike parking bays should be places outside commercial properties or on existing noisy/busy streets where they will not disturb residents. This proposed bay is completely surrounded by private residents who do not use these Bikes.

Objection Six

Worried about the bikes ending up in our mews and blocking the narrow exit of Laverton place.

Objection Seven

This 'dockless' e-bike parking bay design is not fit for purpose. E-bikes fall over creating hazardous conditions for other users of the public highway and pavement. We object to the implementation of this bay in Laverton Place using this proposed design due to the health and safety hazard created.

Objection Eight

I object to the proposal to create a street e bike space outside 1 Laverton Place. There are 3 core reasons for my objection:

1. Adverse impact on character of quiet residential street/mews.

I have lived at 2 Laverton Place for 14 years. It is a quiet residential area exclusively comprising residential properties. The proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the road by encouraging e bike users to come into this area at all hours making noise and potentially leaving litter etc. This does not seem to be justified where Laverton Place is not a destination for e bike users, nor a place where users are likely to come in any event and where there can be no confidence that e bike users will in fact abide by the rules of any new scheme.

2. Loss of important parking space

Residents parking spaces on or close to Laverton Place/Mews are limited especially given frequent temporary suspensions. The proposal would mean the permanent loss of an important resident parking space. Again given the points made at 1 above and 3 below this cannot be justified.

3. Scheme of doubtful value

Finally it is hard to see what objective benefits the proposal will bring. The supposed problem of e bikes being left randomly on streets is unlikely to be solved unless users (who may be from any borough or tourists) cannot be compelled to leave e bikes in any given place and even if they do may not do so with any greater consideration for others using the roads/pavements in the area of the proposed bay. In short the proposal does not solve the problem. At best it simply moves the problem into certain specific areas where locals will suffer more. At worst nothing positive will change but a parking spot will be lost with those living near Laverton Place suffering from increase noise and disruption.

Objection Nine

Dear Sirs,

Following my telephone conversation with you last week , I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed cycle bay.

I live in [redacted] Laverton Place, which is on the corner of Laverton Mews and Laverton Place. [redacted], I have had a bike thrown into my front light well, causing damage and anxiety to my daughter and I. I can envisage the bay only encouraging this type of behaviour .

I am concerned that the bikes parked outside [redacted] will cause noise and disruption to what is now a peaceful and considerate community, which we wish to maintain. I am worried that bikes may be left outside the designated parking zones, as seen in so many other bike parking bays, obstructing the pavement. This could have a knock on effect causing problems with traffic congestion and blocking the entrance to Laverton and potentially Hesper Mews.

Laverton Place is a one way road and any congestion causes a backlog of traffic. The bin lorries already have enough problems entering and reversing out of Laverton Mews twice a week.

We already have parking issues in Laverton Place , as there is limited parking for residents. I frequently have to park in Courtfield Gardens.

I am not sure who your potential bike customers would be either. There is a college in Collingham Gardens and so maybe it would be a more viable proposition to put one there, or closer to Earls Court station.

Thank you for your consideration.

[Additional Comments]

I have already submitted my response to the above but am subsequently becoming more and more anxious that this is going to be a very difficult situation should you choose to use your proposed space.

I have seen numerous sites where cars are having to drive around bikes that have been left on ground or pushed or blown over.

The pavement has been blocked and this is without my personal input.

I am a 60 year single lady , living on her own and chose Laverton Place as a quiet and neighbourly environment. I am concerned that the bikes will cause stressful noise late at night and early into the morning as well as litter, encouraging vermin and foxes.

This is right outside my kitchen and bedroom and so will have a hugely negative impact on me.

I have also seen that there was a 73% increase in bike fires last year which, as this is so close to my home will have a worrying impact.

The existing sites are mostly outside non residential areas and therefore not having a direct impact on anyone's life.

This will have a devastating effect on me and my neighbours.

Please take my correspondence into consideration.

Thank you

Objection Ten

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 Eleven

My mother currently lives in Laverton Place. She has told me about the potential for new E-bikes just outside our house and I just wanted to reach out to say that it really would be extremely problematic for the residents around the area.

Primarily, the noise would make the area extremely difficult to live in day to day, especially over the weekends when Friday and Saturday nights are already busy around Laverton Place. The charging which takes place at 2am will be right outside the house and by my mum's bedroom, meaning that she will be woken up regularly.

Secondly, when I do visit my mum at her house, there is always e-bikes left lying on the road or just outside our house which is obviously a huge inconvenience for us and others in the mews.

Whilst I understand that the new e-bikes is an attempt to reduce carbon emissions in the area, I truly believe that they should be set up away from people's living locations, as it will significantly impact the residents in the area.

I really hope that this does not go forward in the proposed location as I know it has become very stressful for my mum and her neighbours who love living where they do.

Objection Twelve

The Earl's Court Society objects to the placement of additional dockless e-bike parking bays in Earl's Court. These bays are not fit for purpose and attract ASB, unlike the Santander scheme docked cycle parking stands. Even when within a few meters of the marked e-bike parking bays that were added in 2023, users of the dockless system simply drop the cycles anywhere creating a treacherous gauntlet for all other pedestrians and road users in this

congested ward. Please redesign the parking bays before removing valuable parking in congested locations like our with many competing demands on scarce space.

I attach our representations as well as a few photos taken in Earl's Court Gardens, where a new e-bike parking bay was created last year. Even with the introduction of the marked e-bike parking bay, e-bikes are left everywhere creating a health and safety disaster, particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those with pushchairs.

Laverton Place

This 'dockless' e-bike parking bay design is not fit for purpose. E-bikes fall over creating hazardous conditions for other users of the public highway and pavement. We object to the implementation of this bay in Laverton Place using this proposed design due to the health and safety hazard created.

Support in Part One

I have never seen an e bike parking bag that hasn't been a mess if tipped over bikes, I think they are a great thing to have but the current solution just makes a mess and people block parking spots because the detonated parking bay gets so full

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Longridge Road

Objection One

Absolute nightmare, taking up parking bays, dumped on footpaths, blocking access to disabled and pushchairs

Objection Two

83 parking spaces is ludicrous. Even though these are a few streets away from Earl's Court Square, there is always a knock-on effect. I also do not see why the Borough is not liaising with the suppliers of these bikes and forcing them to act together and they should definitely be charging them. Instead of supplying even more e-Bike Parking Bays the Council should be looking at other proposals.

Objection Three

What residents need are safe places to park their own bikes. We don't need e-bikes in our road especially at that end of Longridge Rd as there are 20 e-bikes in the next road Nervern Place only 40 M from the proposed site in Longridge Road and space for a further 10 in Templeton Place again only 40 M

from the proposed site. So 30 e-bikes are available only one minutes walk from the proposed site.

Those 30 bikes are under used as I always see plenty of them parked. I just looked and there must be 20 free now. If you really wanted to put another e-bike parking space it it would make more sense to put it at the Warwick Rd end of Longridge Road so would be more convenient for people visiting or living at that end of the road an area that could better benefit from more e-bikes.

I have had several bikes stolen from this end of Longridge Road so would much appreciate more safe places to lock my current bike. I see evidence of other bikes being stolen when attached to the house railings that thieves easily break with a hammer as they are cast iron.

So please reconsider this and either put in a safe place for residents to park their bikes or keep the space for resident parking as residents often have to look for ages and park a long way from their flat or house to park.

Objection Four

The 'dockless' design of the proposed e-bike parking bays makes them grossly unsuitable for this location. There is not sufficient demand for another e-bike bay in close proximity to other new bays added this year, and too far from the station to justify the loss of other uses of scarce space. Evidence demonstrates that e-bike bays become a magnet for ASB, with competing operator's operatives knocking over competitors' bikes like dominos, creating a tangle of overturned e-bikes on the public highway and the pavement. This renders nearby electric car charging points unusable, takes away scarce resident and pay & display bays and creates a dangerous trip hazard for the elderly, disabled and those with young children in pushchairs. In an area with many competing demands for scarce space, with other bays taken over by delivery motorbikes, electric car charging points and car club bays, and with limited if any enforcement, this scheme is not fit for purpose. Please do not install this e-bike parking bay in a narrow residential street like Longridge Road. Instead create an appropriate design, such as the one used by the Santander cycle scheme, and put it in an appropriate location. This is not it.

Objection Five

You shouldn't be ditching any residents bays. People will still dump them on pavement s. Get these e bikes off our streets

Objection Six

The current allocation for motorized vehicles is woefully inadequate and is further exasperated on game days at Chelsea FC. On any average evening it is difficult to find available parking spaces on Longridge Rd which worsens after 10pm.

Secondly, there are a number of Barclays bikes currently available for use which does not present a safety hazard given their docking stations. However the other bikes which allows riders to abandon them wherever they feel is not merely an eyesore but a safety hazard requiring pedestrians to traverse

the already narrowing roadways but crucially hampering use by wheelchair users.

There are no facts presented here to support any increased demand for bicycles in the area and surely if there is, the bay should be located nearer the train station.

Objection Seven

The Earl's Court Society objects to the placement of additional dockless e-bike parking bays in Earl's Court. These bays are not fit for purpose and attract ASB, unlike the Santander scheme docked cycle parking stands. Even when within a few meters of the marked e-bike parking bays that were added in 2023, users of the dockless system simply drop the cycles anywhere creating a treacherous gauntlet for all other pedestrians and road users in this congested ward. Please redesign the parking bays before removing valuable parking in congested locations like our with many competing demands on scarce space.

I attach our representations as well as a few photos taken in Earl's Court Gardens, where a new e-bike parking bay was created last year. Even with the introduction of the marked e-bike parking bay, e-bikes are left everywhere creating a health and safety disaster, particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those with pushchairs.

Longridge Road

The 'dockless' design of the proposed e-bike parking bays makes them grossly unsuitable for this location. There is not sufficient demand for another e-bike bay in close proximity to other new bays added this year, and too far from the station to justify the loss of other uses of scarce space. Evidence demonstrates that e-bike bays become a magnet for ASB, with competing operator's operatives knocking over competitors' bikes like dominos, creating a tangle of overturned e-bikes on the public highway and the pavement. This renders nearby electric car charging points unusable, takes away scarce resident and pay & display bays and creates a dangerous trip hazard for the elderly, disabled and those with young children in pushchairs. In an area with many competing demands for scarce space, with other bays taken over by delivery motorbikes, electric car charging points and car club bays, and with limited if any enforcement, this scheme is not fit for purpose. Please do not install this e-bike parking bay in a narrow residential street like Longridge Road. Instead create an appropriate design, such as the one used by the Santander cycle scheme, and put it in an appropriate location. This is not it.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]