

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
GOLBORNE 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 Golborne 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 six locations in Golborne 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, 151 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the six proposals, three drew no objections. Officers did not agree with the objections in respect of the three reasons for this are set out in Section 5.
- 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 |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|
| S529a Appleford Road | 1 (13) | 1 (3) | 3 (10) | 0 | Proceed |
| S529b Cambridge Gardens | 2 (14) | 2 (4) | 5 (12) | 0 | Proceed |
| S529c Elkstone Road | 0 (12) | 0 (2) | 2 (9) | 0 | Proceed |
| S529d Murchison Gardens | 0 (12) | 0 (2) | 3 (10) | 0 | Proceed |
| S529e Southern Row | 1 (13) | 0 (2) | 2 (9) | 0 | Proceed |
| S529f Telford Road | 0 (12) | 0 (2) | 3 (10) | 0 | Proceed |

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides comments received from ward Councillors to the proposals.
- 5.2 Appendices 2 – 8 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 traders on Portobello Markets days.

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

- 5.6 The main objective of the e-bike bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, these riders are subject to increasing fines and in general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. The rental e-bike market is currently unregulated, and so, with the limited legal powers at its disposal to control this problem, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off pavements. The operators remain responsible for guiding customers to these bays - with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance - and for tidying of designated bays.

The road is too busy with numerous pedestrians and/or vehicles

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for pedestrians or vehicles already using the road. One respondent to the Southern Row proposal said the road was too narrow to accommodate a rental e-bike parking bay.

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.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.16 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One respondent to the Cambridge Gardens proposal suggested relocating the bay down the street, towards the junction with Ladbrooke Grove.

Officer Response

- 5.17 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.18 There is an existing e-bike parking bay located on the western arm of Cambridge Gardens, close to the junction with Ladbrooke Grove. The proposed location for an additional bay towards the junction with Portobello Road would serve residents and visitors to the markets as well as alleviating any pressures on the existing e-bike parking bays.

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 | One respondent stated that they are already having a problem with e-bikes. (Appleford Road) | It is not clear what problems the respondent is facing, however the main problem that Officers encounter with e-bikes is that they are sometimes parked in the wrong place, either on the pavement or outside of a marked bay. This proposal intends to address that issue. |
| 2 | E-bike parking bays should be larger than 5m. (Appleford Road) | Five meter parking bays have become the standard across London, as they occupy the space of a single car. If a location proved to be popular, and required additional e-bike parking space, the Council would consider consulting on an additional bay nearby, rather than extending an existing bay, to help create a broader network. |

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

No comments received

Appendix 2: Responses received from respondents wishing their responses to apply to all proposed locations in the Borough

Objection One

Thank you for your letter regarding e-bike parking bays and adding more of these to the area. However, I strongly feel this isn't going to stop people riding them just dumping the bikes and scooters and not returning them to the bays. Several times I have come out of my property to find Lime bikes just dumped right outside or under the Shepherds Bush underpass to name just two. It feels like it is a waste of money and resources to me.

Objection Two

I wish to object to these proposals which will reduce residents' parking in order to accommodate parking for ebikes.

This is further loss of amenity for residents and ratepayers, who are in real need of the use of vehicles and parking. We are a single car household and require a vehicle for business and family purposes. My partner's mother is 97 and immobile so requires a wheel chair and vehicle transport.

Please examine alternatives to accommodate bike parking such as the selective use of pavements and behavioural changes.

Objection Three

Please please stop spending any more money on bicycles – I am fed up with being nearly run over by the endless cyclists on the pavement along Holland Park Avenue. Why don't you spend the money on curtailing their dangerous route along a path supposedly for pedestrians. You are Always happy to promote the cyclists – why do pedestrians get so little support.

Objection Four (The Boltons Association)

I have been asked by the Executive Committee of The Boltons Association to contact you regarding both your general consultation for further rental ebike bays in RBKC and also your specific recent proposals for three further ebike bays in the Boltons Conservation Area.

Our view is that at least until RBKC and the rental ebike operators have managed successfully to control effectively the use of ebike riders, parking arrangements etc, we are opposed to the creation of any further ebike bays. We consider that creating new bays in the present highly unsatisfactory situation will merely promote further unwelcome externalities for local residents.

I should be grateful if our views could be taken into account when the respective consultation responses are considered.

Objection Five

As you are aware, electric vehicles present a serious health hazard.

For example, witness the E-bike explosion outside Buckingham Palace

E-bike 'explodes' outside Buckingham Palace

E-bike fires contribute to a long list of electric car fires, electric bus fires, and so on.

I strongly advise the Council to learn some basic battery chemistry and understand (a) the explosive potential of the ingredients of any Lithium ion battery and (b) the inherent instability of the internal battery membranes that prevent such thermal runaway.

Please keep E-bikes off the streets of Kensington.

Otherwise, it can only be a matter of time before the Council ends up with another type of "Grenfell Tower" problem on its hands.

Objection Six (Earl's Court Square Residents' Association)

We have reservations concerning this proposal.

This is due to issues with the existing ebike bay in Penywern Road.

We have been advised that ebikes are being left in and around the bay, i.e. on the pavement, in Residents' parking spaces including blocking an EV vehicle charging point.

In addition, we have been advised that one of the ebike companies arrive, move their competitors bikes out of the bay putting the competitors ebikes on the pavement etc. as above and then leaving their own ebikes in the designated bay.

It would appear there is no control or oversight on ebikes being dumped outside the designated bays.

Residents' are being told they will lose their Residents' Parking availability to an unruly ebike free-for-all nightmare.

Until reasonable oversight is in place we object to any further expansion of this scheme.

Objection Seven

I wish to object to any expansion of the e-Bike parking scheme until its efficacy is reviewed. People are not parking properly within them as there is no docking system as with the Santander bicycles, so the e-Bike parking area just becomes a jungle of toppled bikes which eventually spread into resident parking bays. I nearly tripped over a toppled bike which had ended up outside the bay over the weekend.

Objection Eight

In response to your consultation about installing multiple new e-bike Rental Bays across the Borough, I am totally opposed to the sheer scale of your proposals. I do not believe for one minute that this will help the problem of e-bikes scattered across pavements. The people who routinely dump bikes wherever they happen to finish their journeys will not be deterred from doing that by more rental bays, but more rental bays will vastly increase the number of people using these bikes and therefore misusing them. I have lost count of the number of times I have had to report bikes strewn across pavements near where I live in South Kensington, just metres from ample existing Rental Bays near the station. Even when a Rental Bay is available at the station, they still even dump bikes on the concourse, instead of parking them properly. In several cases that I have reported, it has clearly been the same offender, repeatedly leaving bikes in the same places, on side-street pavements in South Kensington, day after day. And this behaviour only appears to cease when I have apparently persuaded the relevant e-bike firm to block that user from renting their bikes.

Objection Nine

Reference your letter of March 6th you invited my thoughts on extended E- Bike Parking in London so here they are - based on living in Hans Road which already hosts too many Uber bikes!

In your note you indicated that additional parking is being considered for E bikes hopefully well away from Hans Road where we are more than fed up with their macho cycling behaviour and failure to park properly.

I experience their lack of consideration virtually every day whether it's riding down the pavements or not parking properly in the space provided behind Harrods. For whatever reason too many of them prefer parking individually across the entrances to the pavements of Hans Road or against the wall of the pavement leading to Hans Place - all of this in preference to the actual parking space even when space is available.

Almost every day I drag one of these bikes to the side to clear the pavement or crossing - otherwise it becomes too difficult for old folk or children to cross safely.

Some Uber riders clearly feel they are not subject to common standards and respect for other people which is why I am concerned about your plans to expand parking specially for Uber/e-bike users

I feel strongly that parking can only be increased if Uber can develop a financial system to ensure Uber riders have to pay for their parking space. I don't know how it can work but in today's techy world it doesn't seem impossible. Right now Uber riders apparently switch off when parked to avoid paying for the bike while not in use - perhaps a parking mode at a premium price can be introduced for e-bikes?

It seems to me that cars and motor bikes park in metered or designated areas and Red bikes have their numerous designated parking areas as well. But Uber riders seem to think they have the right to go anywhere and park anywhere without any consideration or responsibility to others.

I do feel strongly that Uber has to come up with ways to discipline/charge their riders with regard to parking before the Council offers further parking space - this must be a two way deal before anything further goes ahead

I hope this short note is helpful - it certainly encapsulates what my family and friends think.

Objection Ten

I object ebikes

Objection Eleven

Hello I do not agree on the addition of e-bike parking in this, or any location. Creating parking zones certainly encourages their use and their promotion by the e-bike companies. The consultation should first answer the question of whether residents want to encourage e-bike activity in the area! The answer would almost certainly be "no" given the way e-bikes are ridden and 'parked'. The parking designation does in no way prevent the e-bikes littering the surrounding areas.

Objection Twelve

I believe that these cycle hire boxes should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays as highlighted in some of the proposed locations, this is because the parking and poor management of these dockless bikes already causes much aggravation for people with disability and mobility issues as well as older members of our community. Given the large expansion we have seen recently of these dockless eBikes and the continued reckless nature with which they are used and parked in our communities the operators have not been held accountable enough and are not holding their customers accountable. I believe that the expansion of 80 more bays within our communities for these operators will lead to another expansion with more eBikes flooding our streets and creating hazards all for the gain of private companies, not our community. The borough should be ensuring that these companies are operating within clear rules and guidelines, controlling the size and placement of their fleet and reimbursing the community for the inconveniences caused by their operation. Only at that point should they be allowed to expand their reach further when it is clear they are responsibly and sustainably managing their current operation, otherwise the introduction of 80 new parking bays will not result in better distribution of their fleet but instead more bikes entering the streets of London and creating hazards and obstructions that local resident have to live with.

Support in Part One

Many users choose to park the bike they have just used in a place that is most convenient for them, so typically close to their home. This has the added advantage that if it is off the beaten track, there's a decent chance the bike will still be in situ when next required. In the Royal Hopsital ward there have been many instances of e-bikes being parked inconsiderately for other pavement users.

I am a cyclist myself, and think that anything that boosts cycle usage in London is to be applauded, but I can't see the incentive for people to use the dedicated parking spaces. So long as there is no penalty for parking away from a dedicated area the problem will persist.

[Additional Comments]

It was a general point - not specific to a particular parking bay. In the absence of any incentive or penalty surely people will continue to park where it is convenient, rather than going to the trouble of seeking out a parking bay and then walking to the final destination.

I accept that in areas like the Kings Road people may choose to use the parking areas, but once in the sidestreets I can't see why they would bother.

Support in Part Two

I think it would be better to have this rental bike bay at The Earls Court road end of Cope Place and use a pay by phone bay and not a resident bay. If you go ahead will you create a replacement resident bay near by. The same goes for all proposed bays all round our borough.

Support in Full One (WestWay Trust)

Please accept this as organisational response from the WestWay Trust to the consultation on rental e-bike parking bays. Our general comments of support refer to all the dockless bays in the proposal and specifically we support the following proposed cycle bay locations for the reasons outlined below;

- S529a Appleford Road
- S529b Cambridge Gardens
- S529c Elkstone Road
- S529d Murchison Gardens
- S529e Southern Row
- S529f Telford Road
- S525a Arundel Gardens
- S525b Basing Street
- S525c Colville Terrace - No. 31 Colville Gardens
- S525d Colville Terrace - No. 101 Ledbury Road
- S525e Stanley Crescent
- S531b Ladbroke Road
- S531c Lansdowne Walk
- S531d St John's Gardens
- S531e Swanscombe Road

Environmental well-being in North Kensington is one of the 3 pillars of our long-term strategy at Westway. The Trust fully supports the stated aim within the Councils Air Quality Action Plan of RBKC to "reduce the need for cars by promoting and making active travel such as cycling accessible and enjoyable". As a general comment providing convenient locations of dockless bays across the borough is important for making cycling accessible and providing good alternatives to car journeys. This is one important part of reducing air pollution in North Kensington and enabling healthier and more active lifestyles. This is an important part of addressing health inequalities that are exacerbated by air pollution and inactive lifestyles.

In support of the specific locations referred above, the Trust fully supports the increased provision of bays in the local vicinity. Firstly, locating these on the road carriageway reduces the potential conflict with pedestrians. Not only does it reduce pavement obstructions this also avoids the need or temptation for cycle hires to mount/ ride on pavements to access bays. Where a parking bay is lost, the benefits hugely outweigh the small impact of losing one parking space which can accommodate six or more bikes.

It is right that the council has been addressing inappropriately parked bikes that cause obstructions to pedestrians and welcome the combined efforts to ensure dockless cycle hire remains convenient and enjoyable to use. For dockless bikes to remain a viable choice, it is good to see RBKC recognising bays

are only as good as their convenience/ availability. The further people must travel to a dock the more likely they are to park it somewhere inappropriately and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling. They are also an important part in meeting a clear need across neighbourhoods where most households do not have access to a car and do not necessarily have easy access to alternatives such as Santander docks for example. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and convenient dockless bays are a vital part of this.

We support the additional proposed locations especially around popular destinations such as Portobello Market, the WestWay estate, Notting Hill. It is an imperative to provide bays in and around popular destinations that are accessible and convenient especially for non residents who will not be familiar with local infrastructure.

These locations are much needed as local bays are noticeably congested with the existing bays evidently over subscribed and spilling over regularly into adjacent parking bays. They are also clearly regularly used with bays emptying in the morning and filling up towards the end of the day. Equally the continued instances of dockless bikes being left outside of designated bays indicates current provision is not meeting the growing need for conveniently located bays.

This proposal is the right thing to do in a borough striving to be greener, safer and fairer.

Thank you for taking the WestWays views into consideration

Support in Full Two (Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea)

Please accept this as organisational response from Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea

Better Streets fully supports all the proposed locations therefore please accept our response as applying to each individual proposed location in the consultation.

We support efforts to enable people to be more active when travelling in and around RBKC and making active transport as accessible as possible to everyone living, working, studying in or visiting the borough.

Locating these on the road carriageway reduces the potential conflict with pedestrians. Where a parking bay is lost, the benefits hugely outweigh the small impact of losing one parking space which can accommodate six or more bikes. In regards to the proposed Holland Park Avenue bay, we would suggest this ideally would be located on a nearby side street on the carriageway close to the junction with HPA to avoid increased pavement clutter.

Better Streets welcome the councils efforts to address inappropriately parked bikes that cause obstructions to pedestrians and welcome the combined efforts to ensure dockless cycle hire remains convenient and enjoyable to use.

The further people must travel to a dock the more likely they are to park it somewhere inappropriately and in the long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling

These locations also address important gaps in current provision and improve accessibility in neighbourhoods and wards where most households do not have access to a car and may not necessarily have easy access to alternatives such as Santander docks for example. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and providing convenient dockless bays is an important part of offering attractive alternatives.

These locations are much needed as local bays are noticeably congested with many existing bays evidently over subscribed and spilling over regularly into adjacent parking bays. They are also clearly regularly used with bays emptying in the morning and filling up towards the end of the day. Equally the continued instances of dockless bikes being left outside of designated bays points to a gap in current locations and indicates current provision is not meeting the growing need for conveniently located bays close to where people want to travel to.

There remains a need to make dockless bays intuitive especially when not familiar with local area such as visitors. Increasing coverage is part of addressing this. We would suggest a dockless bay at every junction would improve how people use bays and reduce the need to hunt around for a bay when the apps prevent parking bikes outside of designated areas. There is also a need to improve mapping of these bays and visibility on map apps and in the real world (although regular bays at junctions would address much of this)

Support in Full Three

I have read the pdf with the proposed new docking bays. I have lived in Kensington for 41 years and know the majority of the streets where you are proposing docking stations. I am vehemently in favour of your proposals. It will encourage even more people to take up e-bikes and leave their cars at home. I use e-bikes all the time when they are near enough - they often are not. This will transform usage.

And there is a small chance that it will therefore the use of the ever-wider, ever-more polluting SUVs that blight our borough and our city. Whenever I pass Thomas's schools near me at arrival or departure time, at least one of them is idling its engine. Occupants are offended and aggressive when I tell them that is illegal. Every trip that one of them does not make is a small victory in the fight against air pollution, visual pollution, carbon emissions. (And entitlement....) Thank you for your work on this subject.

Support in Full Four

I wanted to provide a brief note of support for creating additional bays for e-bikes.

Weather permitting(!) I take an e-bike from the bay opposite #5 Cadogan Gardens frequently, as we currently live on Cadogan Gardens.

We also plan to move soon to [redacted]. We'd be supportive specifically of creating a bay [in] Victoria Road.

The only point of concern is that some users aren't as diligent in parking their e-bikes sensibly.

Some bays are also often overly full and have too many bikes parked together too closely. Particularly in windy weather, this can see e-bikes topple over and a full bay of them scattered like dominoes / litter on the ground.

Hopefully users and operators can do more to avoid this and the creation of more bays will alleviate this problem!

Support in Full Five

I am in favour of ALL of these proposals. Congratulations and thank you.

Support in Full Six

I favour any proposal which reduced the number of e-bikes clogging up our pavements. I support this and the other proposals in this consultation on condition that they will be accompanied by making it illegal to continue to leave e-bikes in the places in which they are currently being left.

Support in Full Seven

This consultation is rather odd! I'd like to make a general comment that there seem too few stations... and wonder why we can only comment on one location (or so it seems to now... the main thing is that one should easily be able when going from area to area to know where the nearest 'station is' and, as I have said, there seem to be too few!

Officer responses to objections

Loss of parking space / Use pay-by-phone bays instead of residents' bays

The proposal has arisen following requests from residents to combat the nuisance and hazard that dockless rental e-bikes can cause on footways, particularly for people who have impaired vision or are using wheelchairs or buggies. In order to accommodate the number of bikes that are in circulation in the borough e-bike parking bays need to be at least the size of a car (one car parking space is five metres – providing space for ten dockless e-bikes). Most footways in the borough are not wide enough to accommodate a bay. Consequently, most e-bike bays need to be on the carriageway, usually in existing marked car parking bays (bikes parked on single yellow lines would normally risk causing an obstruction or affecting loading). This reduction in car parking is thus necessary in order for the e-bike operators and users to park the e-bikes in ways that do not obstruct pavements. There are just under 29,000 residents' parking spaces in the borough – far more than available pay-by-phone bays - so the 80 proposed bay conversions to dockless e-bike bays represents less than half of one per cent, if all proposals proceeded. In comparison, residents' permit numbers are around 14 per cent lower than they were in 2013.

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

The main objective of the e-bike bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, these riders are subject to increasing fines and in general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. The rental e-bike market is currently unregulated, and so, with the limited legal powers at its disposal to control this problem, the Council regards the provision of more e-bike bays as a crucial part of its efforts to keep e-bikes off pavements. The operators remain responsible for guiding customers to these bays - with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance - and for tidying of designated bays.

Rental e-bikes are an eyesore

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

Proposals do not benefit residents

Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to encourage travel by more sustainable modes in line with Council policies relating to a cleaner, greener borough, improving air quality and reducing congestion. The Council will have access to data on the use of each bay and will therefore be able to identify and consider removing any bays that are poorly used.

Proposals should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays

None of the proposals are proposed in disabled parking bays.

Dangerous cycling

Whilst a small minority of people who cycle may exhibit poor cycling behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to install rental e-bike parking, in the same way the Council would not refuse to provide car parking because a small minority of people who drive contravene traffic rules.

E-bike/e-scooters are fire hazards

The article quoted relates to a privately owned e-bike. The Council is unaware of any fires caused by rental e-bikes, however it is important to remember that the Council currently has no choice whether to have dockless e-bikes in the borough or not. The Council has no powers to prevent operators operating. Regulation to improve ebike safety can only be introduced by the Government.

There is no docking system so the e-Bike can topple over and spread into residents parking bays.

The Council has no powers to prevent operators operating, and no powers to force operators to operate under a docked model. The Council has decided not to introduce infrastructure in ebike parking bays (such as Sheffield stands) for streetscape and financial reasons. The operators remain responsible for tidying of designated bays and ensuring they are not over capacity.

Opposed to the principle of providing designated e-bike bays

Provision of designated e-bike parking bays is Council policy following a Key Decision¹ in June 2023. The Council has no plans to revoke this policy at the present time. Even if the Council did not provide designated e-bike bays, the e-bikes would remain on the Council's streets as it has no powers to prevent the companies operating.

¹ Key Decision 06363/23/T/AB Dockless Rental E-Bike Parking Bays - <https://rbkc.moderngov.co.uk/Committees/mgIssueHistoryHome.aspx?IId=4599&Opt=0>

Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Appleford Road

Objection One

Already having problems with hired bike, please stop supporting corrupt elite cooperation company

Support in Part One

Hi,

I sold my car when ULEZ was expanded in October 2021 and regularly hire e-bikes (and e-scooters) and think they are brilliant. I welcome extra bays being installed in the borough but in my experience think more than a 5m bay will be needed. Some bays become more popular as drop offs and overcrowded with bikes, spilling out of their designated area onto the road or the parking bays next to them, so I think more than 5m is required. When they are full, parking a bike or scooter in them is very difficult otherwise.

Support in Full One

The location is next to shops and very close to my flat. Access is excellent. I'm very interested in a bike stand being located there. I'm sure it will benefit the many people who live on this housing estate too.

Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Three

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road
S529b Cambridge Gardens
S529c Elkstone Road
S529d Murchison Gardens
S529e Southern Row
S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overflowing into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand
6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike in Cambridge Gardens

Objection One

This exact location is too close to the market street, where a lot of traders need to park, and the importance of the flow of the market is more essential than the nearness of bike parking. The bike parking this close to Portobello will clutter up this corner and make it dangerous for pedestrians and traders. In my experience, living near a newish bike parking 'zone', I can assure you it is rarely neat and tidy, often the bikes are strewn around the area, on the pavement beside the zone, laying on their sides, out into the street, and/or their baskets filled with rubbish. So, a spot near the market would be useful, but not in the proposed site. What if it was half way down the street towards Ladbroke Grove?

Objection Two

I am a resident and shopkeeper at [redacted] and noticed a yellow notice had recently been fixed to a street post outside my property, considering this stretch of Cambridge Gardens/ junction with Portobello Road, as a proposed site for a dockless bike station.

I wish to make an objection to the proposed dockless bike station at this site. It is unsuitable for a number of reasons.

Firstly, there already exists a problem with traders parking for the Vintage Fashion Market, Fridays through to Sundays. Demand for parking exceeds available space. This involves some imaginative parking and manoeuvring and a great deal of goodwill on everyone's part, but it's part of Portobello.

Cambridge Gardens/ junction Portobello Road, is closed on market days. Despite signage, drivers continue to try and access Portobello Road from Cambridge Gardens, resulting in numerous U turns at the junction. If the bike dock was there too, it would be mayhem. There can be no assumption made that bikes will be docked neatly. Instead, the likelihood would be bikes dumped anywhere, including the road and pavement.

There already exists a bike dock at the other end of Cambridge Gardens and there's another one at the market end of Oxford Gardens. I don't think we need to cram another bike dock into what is already a small and frenetically busy area.

On a personal note, I am a small business owner who will be adversely affected by this proposal. I own and operate [redacted]. If the proposal goes ahead, I would be forced to park illegally to load and unload my van. I have spoken to my neighbours in both Cambridge Gardens and Portobello Road and not one of them is in favour of this proposal.

I believe that this proposed site is totally unsuitable for a dockless bike station; it's too busy due to road restrictions, the market and the extra traffic that brings. My neighbours and I currently struggle to park close to our homes on market days as it is, so losing more resident bays for any reason makes our lives more complex than they need to be.

I do appreciate the benefits of making cycling easy and affordable for everyone. I cycle too! I also appreciate the council's efforts in helping to make cycling easy and affordable for everyone, but in doing so, effort should also be made to consider the proposed siting of bike bays to neighbourhoods. The junction of Cambridge Gardens and Portobello Road can be a dumping ground. In preparation for The Notting Hill Carnival, the very site being proposed is used to unload and store metal crowd control barriers in preparation for the celebrations.

I would ask that the site for the dockless bike station be reconsidered and placed in a quieter and safer part of our neighbourhood.

Support in Part One

There is a lot of pedestrian traffic here at the weekends. The problem isn't from people who use the spaces; it's the more usual dumping of the cycles on the pavement.

Support in Part Two

There needs to be more responsibility by both the bike companies and users and the easiest thing to do is to fine them if bikes are not parked upright within a bay. The Oxford Gardens bike parking space is a good example of why these parking spaces are not working. Not seeming to care where they park the bike, within the bay or not, cars won't park near them leaving at least one car parking space distance between them because the bikes also topple over resulting in more often than not at least 2 extra parking bays being used up by them. If a car parks over the line it gets a ticket, the bikes should have a reg number and the user or the company fined if not parked upright within the bays and the money from the fines put back in local use.

Support in Full One

I use the bays sometimes to cycle to school, they are good but better if they are closer to everyone. The one I use is busy with a lot of bikes so probably better to have more bays closer to people

Support in Full Two

Fully support the efforts to increase convenience & availability of dockless bays in the neighbourhood as part of efforts to enable more active travel especially cycle journeys to replace short/local trips. This is also an important part of addressing a key concern raised by people regarding dockless bikes being left on pavements creating obstructions.

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 have to travel to a dock the more likely they are to look for somewhere to dump it and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling.

There should be a dockless bay at each junction but especially around Portobello Road it is an imperative to provide bays as it will be a popular destination especially for non residents who will not be familiar with local infrastructure.

This ward like every area in North Kensington has a majority of residents who do not have access to a private motor vehicle and majority of journeys are public transport, walking or cycling. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and dockless rental bikes are a key part of this.

This location is much needed as local bays are noticeably congested with the other dock at Ladbroke Grove end clearly over subscribed. And spilling over regularly into parking bay. Same applies to other dock in the area that are clearly regularly used with bays emptying in the morning and filling up towards the end of the day.

Support in Full Three

I fully support this bay because we need many more conveniently located bays in the area. The existing bays on Ladbroke Grove and Cambridge Gardens are very busy and crowded and more bays are clearly needed especially near the Markets. The more bays we have in the area will reduce the temptation to just dump bikes on the pavements or random places. I still see bikes blocking pavements n places. Having the bay on the road is also a good idea, I can just pull in and park the bike and avoids the need to mount the pavement. The bikes are heavy so avoiding having to wheel them is good for my back!

Support in Full Four

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road
S529b Cambridge Gardens
S529c Elkstone Road
S529d Murchison Gardens
S529e Southern Row
S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overspilling into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand
6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors

Support in Full Five

I refer to your notice entitled "PROVISIONS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF DOCKLESS BICYCLE PARKING BAYS AND MISCELLANEOUS PARKING AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS CHANGES RELATING TO THE INSTALLATION OF DOCKLESS BICYCLE PARKING BAYS".

My comments on the proposed bay described at: g) x. on the north-west side of Cambridge Gardens, outside the flank wall of No. 289 Portobello Road, situated in Cambridge Gardens, are:

As a local resident, we face day to day issues with e-bikes being abandoned in the middle of pavements, blocking movement for pedestrians. We clearly need more parking bays.

Portobello Road and Golborne markets attract tens of thousands of visitors every week. These visitors arrive by tube, bus, car and bicycle. At present, there is inadequate provision for bicycle parking, especially towards the north of Portobello Road. The proposed site on the north-west side of Cambridge Gardens would seem entirely suitable.

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

Support in Full One

Fully support the efforts to increase convenience & availability of dockless bays in the neighbourhood as part of efforts to enable more active travel especially cycle journeys to replace

short/local car trips. This is also an important part of addressing a key concern raised by people regarding dockless bikes being left on pavements creating obstructions. 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 have to travel to a dock the more likely they are to look for somewhere to dump it and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling. Locating bays near keys transport stops eg nearby tube/bus increases connectivity and choice for people

Support in Full Two

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road
S529b Cambridge Gardens
S529c Elkstone Road
S529d Murchison Gardens
S529e Southern Row
S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overspilling into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand

6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors

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

Support in Full One

More parking for e-bikes is obviously needed and is a far more efficient and sustainable use of space than car parking.

Support in Full Two

Fully support additional bays in local area

1. An important enabler to offer more active travel choices to local residents and visitors alike
2. This bay will increase convenience & availability of dockless bays in the neighbourhood
3. Removes dockless bikes from pavements, an increasing issue as the estate development loses more public space
4. Reduces conflict between hire users and pedestrians
5. The further people have to travel to a dock the more likely they are to look for somewhere to dump it and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling.
7. This ward like every area in North Kensington has a majority of residents (66%) who do not have access to a private motor vehicle and majority of journeys are public transport, walking or cycling. A fairer approach to how space is allocated is needed
8. Surrounding bays are further away and are clearly in high demand and congested at times

Support in Full Three

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road
S529b Cambridge Gardens
S529c Elkstone Road
S529d Murchison Gardens
S529e Southern Row

S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overspilling into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand
6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Southern Row

Objection One

Southern Road, the road where the e-bikes are proposed to go is very narrow, only allowing one lane of traffic at a time - rubbish trucks struggle to reverse down that road and cars have trouble exiting the 2 off road car parks due to the roads narrowness.

E-bikes are often just dumped in their parking bays and often obstruct cars or pedestrians and rarely left in an orderly fashion. Having an e-bike bay is more then likely going to obstruct the flow of traffic and be a hindrance to cars and pedestrians trying to get by.

In addition, parking is quite limited in that area already. In the last 12 months, on that road a part of a resident bay was re-purposed for a private disabled parking bay and 3 or 4 metered parking bays were re-purposed as electrical parking bays. The e-bike parking will remove another 2 or 3 spaces.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Two

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road

S529b Cambridge Gardens

S529c Elkstone Road

S529d Murchison Gardens

S529e Southern Row

S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overspilling into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand
6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors

Appendix 8: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Telford Road

Support in Full One

Creating parking for e-bikes is a far more efficient use of road space than parking for cars. Using the road space will help clear e-bikes from the footpaths.

Support in Full Two

Fully support the efforts to increase convenience & availability of dockless bays in the neighbourhood as part of efforts to enable more active travel especially cycle journeys to replace short/local trips. This is also an important part of addressing a key concern raised by people regarding dockless bikes being left on pavements creating obstructions. The further people have to travel to a dock the more likely they are to look for somewhere to dump it and in long term undermines the desirability of rental bikes if they do not meet people needs when travelling. There should be a dockless bay at each junction but especially around the markets it is an imperative to provide bays as it will be a popular destination especially for non residents who will not be familiar with local infrastructure. This ward like every area in North Kensington has a majority of residents who do not have access to a private motor vehicle and majority of journeys are public transport, walking or cycling. Cycling remains a key part of reducing car journeys and dockless rental bikes are an important offering to increase choice especially when there is a lack of Santander docking stations in the North of the borough. This location is much needed as local bays are noticeably congested and clearly over subscribed.

Support in Full Three

I found the online survey clunky so am responding by mail. I am a Golborne ward resident [redacted] and fully support the additional cycle bays in my ward:

S529a Appleford Road
S529b Cambridge Gardens
S529c Elkstone Road
S529d Murchison Gardens

S529e Southern Row

S529f Telford Road

Because:

1. Offers convenient and accessible choices for those wishing to cycle more and drive less or use cabs less
2. on street bays are convenient to use and reduce potential conflict with pedestrians
3. more regular locations with bays will reduce the occurrence of pavement parking and obstructions
4. 66% of local residents do not own a car, the use of one parking space for 6-8 bikes offers a fairer approach and provides much more utility
5. existing bays are well used and often crowded with returned bikes overflowing into surrounding parking bays - better more convenient locations will help meet a clear demand
6. important to have a consistent and comprehensive network of bays especially around the markets so they are easy to find by visitors