

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 NORLAND 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 Norland ward, with a recommendation on how to proceed for each proposal.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Following consideration of all comments received, officers recommend that the Director of Transport and Regulatory Services proceed as set out in Table 1.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The parking of rental e-bikes on narrow footways can cause a nuisance to residents, particularly where the footway is obstructed for those using wheelchairs or buggies. In June 2023, the Council made a Key Decision to implement rental e-bike parking bays, and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with operators to ensure that all rental e-bikes be parked in marked bays. In September 2023, the Council introduced its first designated rental e-bike parking bays for use by e-bike hire operators and their customers, in existing parking bays across the borough.
- 3.2 In general, the creation of the bays has led to a marked reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements. However, some users are still opting to end rides on footways and officers have observed that some of the new designated bays have proved very popular for rental e-bike users, leading to some overspilling of the capacity of the bay (typically ten bicycles). The Council wishes to plug gaps in the network of existing bays to help address footway parking, and reduce overspill from existing e-bike parking bays.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 From 6 March to 17 April 2024, the Council undertook consultation on introducing new rental e-bike parking bays at five locations in Norland 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, 131 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the five proposals, officers did not agree with the objections in respect of four of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Ladbroke Road proposal, officers are recommending not to proceed with this location.
- 4.3 It is important to note that some respondents asked that their response be applied to every proposed location in the borough. This amounts to an objection to the principle of e-bike parking bays, and whilst people are free to express this position it is not strictly relevant to a consultation on specific sites. However, we have included responses from people who asked for their position to be applied to every proposal in the borough. This means that 12 objections, two 'support in part' and seven 'support in full' responses are not necessarily from residents local to each proposal. Total responses including these responses are indicated in brackets in Table 1. For administrative purposes, these responses and officer responses have been produced separately as Appendix 2. Some of the reasons for these whole-Borough responses also feature in the site-specific comments described in Section 5.

Table 1 – Summary of responses received.

Scheme	No. Objections	No. Support in Part	No. Support in Full	No opinion	Recommendation
S531a Holland Park Avenue	0 (12)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed
S531b Ladbroke Road	3 (15)	1 (3)	2 (9)	0	Do not proceed
S531c Lansdowne Walk	8 (20)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed
S531d St John's Gardens	1 (13)	0 (2)	5 (12)	0	Proceed
S531e Swanscome Road	3 (15)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides comments received from ward Councillors to the proposals.
- 5.2 Appendices 2 – 7 list the responses received to each location in full. Officer responses to the objections or 'support in part' responses are detailed below:

Loss of parking space

- 5.3 Some respondents were concerned at the loss of car parking space to accommodate an e-bike parking bay. Some respondents believed the loss of a parking bay would mean less parking available for contractors and tradesmen.

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

- 5.8 There is no reason to think that the proposals will add to congestion or cause a worsening of sightlines any more than their current use as a parking space. Whilst

some cyclists may opt to pick up and drop off from the footway side, this should take no more than a couple of minutes and is not expected to lead to congestion on the footway. As the proposed e-bike bays are proposed where a car can currently park, there is no reason to believe that e-bikes parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present.

- 5.9 Similarly, there is no evidence that supports the idea that the installation of e-bike parking increases the number of those cycling against one-way road restrictions any more than providing car parking leads to people driving against one-way restrictions.

There is already a hire bike bay nearby

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

Officer Response

- 5.11 Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to therefore increase the network of available bays. In some cases, this means introducing additional bays close to existing bays, where those bays have proved popular than others and are sometimes leading to overspill.

- 5.12 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

- 5.13 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

- 5.14 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

- 5.15 Some respondents objected on the basis that cyclists exhibit poor behaviour.

Officer Response

- 5.16 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 or the behaviour of the people riding those ebikes.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.17 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One of the respondents to the Lansdowne Walk proposal suggested relocating the bay to the western arm of Lansdowne Walk, closer to the junction with Lansdowne Road. Similarly, another respondent suggested relocating the bay further down the road, or on Ladbroke Grove.
- 5.18 One Lansdowne Road respondent suggested converting a nearby Car Club bay to accommodate for e-bike parking, and another suggested converting a Pay-by-Phone bay instead of a Residents’ parking bay.

Officer Response

- 5.19 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.20 The location proposed opposite 11 Lansdowne Walk was chosen to provide e-bike parking with as little impact on residents as possible, being not directly outside of any doors or windows.
- 5.21 The nearest car club bay to the proposed e-bike parking bay on Lansdowne Walk is opposite 45 Lansdowne Road. Although there is no proposed bay near this car club bay, this proposal seeks out to strengthen the existing network of e-bike parking bays within the borough. Officers believe that the proposal on Lansdowne Walk will support existing e-bike bays, such as the one located beside Holland Park station, by providing users with an alternative location to start and end their journeys.
- 5.22 The Council is not currently considering converting Pay-by-phone bays to e-bike parking visitor bays.

Other comments

- 5.23 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 said that the bays would not benefit residents, and two respondents, said that they do not benefit residents as there was no demand for them. (Lansdowne Walk)	An effective parking network must include bays close to where people live as well as at ‘destination streets’. Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to encourage travel by more sustainable modes in line with Council policies relating to a cleaner, greener borough, improving air

		quality and reducing congestion. The locations have been chosen where officers consider there is demand, however the Council will have access to data on the use of each bay and will therefore be able to identify and consider removing any bays that are poorly used.
2	One respondent stated that the area would be unsafe for cyclists. (Lansdowne Walk)	In the past seven years, our records show one injury to a cyclist on Lansdowne Walk (at the junction with Ladbroke Grove, in 2018). This does not support the idea that Lansdowne Walk is unsafe for cycling. Cyclists already use this road and would continue to do so regardless of whether a rental e-bike bay is provided.
3	Santander docking stations should be replaced by e-bike parking bays. (Lansdowne Walk)	Santander Cycles are widely used across London, in conjunction with the e-bike and e-scooter hire schemes, so the Council aims to ensure that access to these sustainable modes is prevalent across the Borough.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr David Lindsey

I am aware of the proposal to have a bike stand in Swanscombe Road, just off St Anns Villas and St Anns Road. Like many, I favour encouraging cycling (to say nothing of Shank's pony), but am concerned that it will take up a good many parking bays, and accordingly I wish to register an objection.

Cllr Stephanie Petit

David and I discussed this and would like to veto this particular location for the e-bike parking. I believe the reference is S531b (Ladbroke Road) and not S531a as it is written on the title of the email of the resident forwarded. Could you please confirm it won't happen. Let us know if you wish us to provide you with an alternative spot.

[Additional Comments]

In that case, I am thinking "aloud"...wouldn't it be ideal to move that e-bike parking bay in front of The Cosmic House (19 Lansdowne Walk) to promote this local museum then? Of course, if it is adding work or trouble (or extra consultation) it is probably not worth it but I thought I would mention the idea.

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 Holland Park Avenue

Support in Full One

The current system of "dump your scooter anywhere and walk away" is unacceptable and should be prevented by the impounding of abandoned scooters, with attendant fines. This would provide useful revenue stream to our Council and clear the streets of dangerous trip hazards.

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Ladbroke Road

Objection One

I live in Ladbroke Mews and as it is it I find it very hard to park in the immediate area as so many RBKC residents drive to Ladbroke Road and park there for the day, before catching the tube from Holland Park or work etc.

I had hoped you might install a EV charger in Ladbroke Road as the few you have in Clarendon and Portland Roads are constantly being occupied for long periods of time by RBKC car non EV owners and so I can't charge my car. It's very frustrating. To be fair I'm not sure that it's always intentional as I think drivers don't always see the EV charging sign on lampposts. Anyway your probe not interested in this now as focussing on bikes. I do admire the idea of having more parking spaces but if it could be further away from Ladbroke Mews it would be helpful.

Thank you

Objection Two

I have just returned from an overseas trip and seen the notice, dated 6 March 2024, attached to the Residents' Parking Bay post [redacted], outlining proposals to convert 5 metres of this bay to a dockless bike hire bay.

I strongly object to this proposal.

First, the site chosen is in front of probably the oldest property in this part of Holland Park. The pink house (pictured below) was the head stable boy's house at the forefront of the Ladbroke stables (bombed during World War II and now a modern mews). Before the Holland Park area was residentially developed in the 19th century, horse drawn carriages from other parts of London would frequently visit the Hippodrome (now Hippodrome Mews) for carriage racing - often stopping off for water and food for the horses at the Ladbroke stables.

Secondly, the pink house - surviving the bombing - is recognised today by neighbours and many residents as an historical and most attractive property at the south end of Ladbroke Road. Putting an unattractive dockless bike hire bay, with the rubbish, constant activity and untidyness such a bay inevitably brings, bang in front of the pink house, is totally inappropriate.

Thirdly, why not choose a Ladbroke Road Residents' Parking Bay nearer Holland Park Underground Station? For example:

outside Mead House, 123-125 Ladbroke Road

outside Cranleigh at 137 Ladbroke Road

outside Bonham House at 107 Ladbroke Road

- locations not in front of historical buildings and closer to Holland Park Underground station and the Park itself. Or if the end of Ladbroke Road is thought essential, why not select the Bay outside 88 Ladbroke Road (see photograph below)

I look forward to hearing from you that you will seriously consider these objections and reject the proposal.

Objection Three

The proposed location does not currently correspond to an existing location for E-bike usage or street parking. As such it would not align to a demonstrated need.

Support in Part One

I support this only if it is combined with a requirement that e-bikes are left only in approved parking spaces and that the bikes are never used on pavements. My husband used a wheelchair and would have found the prevalence of e-bikes left in unsuitable places on pavements a real nuisance and an extra handicap to the already difficult business of getting around. Why does the council make life even harder for the disabled or those pushing prams or buggies who already have a tough time?

I am a bicyclist but also use the pavements to walk around the area, to do my shopping and to take exercise. When I bicycle, I do so on the roads and I strongly oppose the use of e-bikes on the pavements which I find dangerous and alarming. I have often had to jump out of the way of e-bikes speeding down the pavements of Holland Park Avenue - I would prefer to have them banned completely from the borough, but if that is not possible, they should be kept to the roads, and have their speed strictly limited.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied.]

Support in Full Two

[No comment supplied.]

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Lansdowne Walk

Objection One

There is existing provision in two locations for rental bikes of various types. There is an existing e-bike location at the bottom of Lansdowne Walk and a Santander bike location at the top. Both are ill-managed. Lansdowne Walk has no need whatsoever for a third location, particularly given the small number of residents and the very close proximity to Holland Park Tube Station.

Objection Two

Lansdowne Walk is already well covered, with Boris bikes at the top of the road and a designated space for chaos cycles at the bottom. That chaos cycle space is, at maximum, a five second cycle ride from your new proposed space. And it is invariably more or less empty. This is not a surprise because Lansdowne Walk has a very low resident density and is a little bit too far to make good parking for people using Holland Park tube. Really I am mystified why this street would need three cycle parking bays.

In addition, please remember that the top half of Lansdowne Walk is about to become one of the biggest building projects in the borough, with six residential houses simultaneously under development. Three of these houses are directly opposite the proposed new bay. The new bay would presumably come at the cost of either resi parking or pay parking, both of which will be in markedly shorter supply for the top half of Lansdowne Walk once the mega building work kicks off. With all those trades arriving at 7am, we've seen before that with even a single house doing building work every pay parking space ends up being used for the length of the job. And the mega building project will doubtless knock out a handful of resident parking spaces, as well as leaving us with much increased demand for residents parking once complete (since the ladies of The Sheppard Trust are mostly not drivers).

At minimum the proposed bay should be west of the junction with Lansdowne Road.

Objection Three

There is already a ebike parking bay in Lansdowne Walk (at junction with Clarendon Road). The current bay is only some 100-200 meters from the proposed new bay and it suffers from a mixture of overstocking (by the bike hire companies who dump 10-15 bikes at the spot by using the pavement and adjacent resident parking bays), underuse (maybe one or two hires a day?) and poor return parking (as ebikes are often left on the pavement, on their side, in the road or in resident bays). There is no need for this further ebike parking space so close to the existing but it does have the effect of reducing scarce resident bays still further.

If another bay is mandated, it must be better to reuse the abandoned club-car bay nearby or to reduce the similarly underused Santander bike dock in Lansdowne Walk.

[Additional Comments]

I am writing to you to request the proposed Orders and further information regarding the proposed new Dockless Cycle bay on Lansdowne Walk, W11.

Whilst I will want to read the full documents before responding in detail, you may be able to help me understand the reasoning behind this proposal (and similar ones in the area) beforehand.

I live very close to the current Dockless Bay at the junction between Clarendon Road and Lansdowne Walk and I am intrigued to understand the reasoning behind the proposal. Could you please give me your thoughts on the following:

1. The current bay in Lansdowne Walk is only 100 meters away and there is a Santander docking station less than 50 meters away. The current bay is not used to any great extent, there are always cycles in it although it is never full (unless it has been "stocked up" by the scheme operator which usually leads to an overflow that takes up further road space (resident bay, pavement and/or road space on a blind corner). Similarly, the Santander bay seems to have very low usage and is always stocked. Why do we need another dockless bay so close by (yet far from any facilities) when these cycles are clearly not in demand and cause such inconvenience to residents and pedestrians?
2. The current dockless bay in Lansdowne Walk almost always has cycles parked outside it on the pavement or in the road. Why are these obstructions to the pavement, road and/or resident parking bays tolerated and, in practice, seem to be almost encouraged?
3. We have seen a large number of resident parking bays given over to electric cars and parking bays and there is often a shortage of nearby parking. Why have you chosen to reduce the amount of resident parking still further rather than use single yellow lines or car park spaces that charge by the hour?
4. I understand that there is a similar proposal to reduce resident parking and add a dockless bay in Ladbrooke Road (near Portland Road); what is the thinking behind this one? And why do we need so many such bays when the cycles are clearly not in demand?

[Additional Comments]

Thank you for your reply. I have now had a chance to read through your responses and the proposals in general.

Using my original numbering, I would comment on your replies as follows:

1. With the proposed new cycle bays, I estimate that I could walk from my house to at least 3 dockless stations and 2 Santander bays within the 2 minute window (certainly within 3 minutes), yet sometimes I have to walk at least as far to find a free parking bay. This is even more worrying for the high number of elderly and infirm residents in the area for whom the inconvenience of pavement clutter and longer walks seems to rank well below the desire of a few active members of society to have to walk another 60 seconds to a dockless bay. Additionally, many of the bays are sited at dangerous and inconvenient spots (where the pavement narrows, at blind spots, etc.). It would be the work of moments to find better locations within 50 meters. Conclusion: a) by TfL's own guidance, the number of bays is excessive; b) there may be a growing demand for cycle hire but that is not what we observe here; c) a better proposal would be to turn some or all of the Santander bay (in decline, as you say) over to dockless cycles until the demand for these becomes clear.
2. We have heard this all before (with e-scooters) and have little confidence in such promises, particularly where TfL are concerned. Meanwhile, enforcement seems non-existent to the inconvenience of all. It would be a simple matter for parking wardens to arrange for the removal of poorly parked bikes.
3. I note that you have not addressed the concern that there are fewer and fewer resident bays. I can only conclude that this is a deliberate policy.
4. As above. Demand is low and the inconvenience caused to residents far exceeds any marginal benefit of reducing the reduction in walking time to a dockless bay by a minute or so.

I would like to understand the facts and figures behind your assertion that here is increasing demand for dockless cycles in this immediate area. Please could you provide the information alongside the similar data for the Barclays/Santander scheme as I suspect that the same growth/plateau/decline will be observed with dockless bikes (and electric cars for that matter).

It is difficult to come to a conclusion other than the council and TfL are wanting to drive out car use, contrary to residents' express wishes (ULEZ, LTNs, bike lanes, etc.) and often at the expense of more pollution, and that this is just one more means to further that aim.

I look forward to being able to analyse the data that you can send to me.

[Additional Comments]

Many thanks for getting back to me.

I cannot consider a proposal backed by data which is not publicly disclosed to be credible. The use of the existing bay in Lansdowne Walk seems sporadic, at best (and very poorly managed), and I expect that any claimed upward trend in use of ebikes will go the same way as club-cars, scooters, electric car charging points and Santander bike hire. However, none of these schemes, all taking resident parking bays out of service, have returned the now underutilised bays to their original use.

In conclusion, I can see the place for ebikes but not at the cost proposed and without a better reallocation of spaces dedicated to failing schemes. So, I must object to the proposals for the new dockless ebike bays in throughout the area and in Lansdowne Wald and Ladbroke Road in particular.

Objection Four

We have already lost three parking spaces to rental bikes. There are proposals to convert the old ladies homes which co storytelling five houses into ordinary residential which will create more parking issues in Lansdowne walk. I propose that the e bike parking replaces pay and display in Lansdowne walk and not residents parking spaces

Objection Five

Could you please think again about the e-bike parking opposite number 11 Lansdowne Walk? There is currently a planning application in for a massive redevelopment of a number of properties in Lansdowne Walk including nos 12, 14 and at the other end of the street too to replace what was the Sheppard Trust with a range of flats and houses. It seems inevitable that this will be given consent in some form or other and I understand from the developer, Chris Bodker it is likely to start early in 2025. Given the scale of this redevelopment, part of which is happening right opposite the proposed site, it is likely that there will be a need to suspend many parking bays to make room for large trucks and lorries delivering to the site. We can therefore ill afford another potential parking bay being out of use to residents. Secondly, the presence of numerous large vehicles manoeuvring in the street raises safety concerns if people - particularly those inexperienced in biking - are also picking up bikes from this location.

[Additional Comments]

The council appears to be consulting on a number of different areas for the location of rental bikes, one of which is opposite our house 11 Lansdowne Walk.

I am not sure whether or not the council has sufficiently focused on the fact that that there is currently out for planning consultation a truly massive redevelopment of the Sheppards Trust which applies to Nos 12-14 Lansdowne Walk (next door to us and right opposite the proposed rental bike park) as well as further up the street. I've no doubt that the proposed planning application (proposed by developer Chris Booker) will get through in some form or other.

The proposed bike park would no doubt come at the expense of existing resident's parking or P&D, both of which will be in markedly shorter supply for the top half of Lansdowne Walk once the mega building work kicks off - with all those trades arriving at 7am. We've seen before with even a single house doing building work that every space ends up being used for the length of the job.

I also feel this would be a safety issue with large vehicles manoeuvring at exactly the spot where bike renters - some of whom in my experience are distinctly wobbly looking to begin with - launch themselves into the traffic.

Additionally there is already one bike rental location at the bottom of Lansdowne Walk and Boris bikes at the top. I am mystified as to why this street would need three rental bike parks given the small number of residents and the distance from the tube.

Please could sense prevail on this occasion?

Objection Six

I do not support the installation which will cause the loss of parking places (presumably 2) in the residents parking bay, for the following reasons:

- 1) We already have a rental bike parking bay.
- 2) There is proposed redevelopment of The Sheppard Trust old ladies homes at 2-4 & 12-14 Lansdowne Walk to be converted into 6 houses and 2 apartments. This could mean that there will be an extra 8-16 parking permits granted for the part of Lansdowne Walk between Lansdowne Road and Ladbrooke Grove and a shortage of parking places which will be exacerbated if we lose 2 parking places to an e- bike parking bay

Objection Seven

I object to this happening as there are very few parking bays left and few and far between you are getting revenue from parking so why would you put a bike bay in there when you have one round the corner , most bikes get tossed any where and that costs to collect , most homes have private parking if you can make space for electric have pity on people trying to shop in the area using cars , all in the week construction vehicles parking there so it's even more difficult to find parking , if it problem of revenue put the few and far between and few that's left up in price but do be unfair and take it out on vehicles that park there to visit loved ones help the elderly or work in surrounding areas let alone support businesses Please give it a thought Thanking you in advance

Objection Eight

The station will not be used. The bikes will still be parked indiscriminately. Because of the habit in this borough that people cannot just move into a property as it is, when they buy it, they have to gut it, this results in the constant occupation of builders vans in the pay and display parking spaces. I have to use the pay and display bays and having a disability, it is extremely hard to get a space at the best of times, for builders vans, all day, every day. This proposal is very wrong. Opposite 11 Lansdowne Walk is not the place to place this bays and take out more needed parking spaces. Put them further down or round the corner on Ladbrooke Grove, this is not right at all. If this goes ahead I will be extremely angry and will never vote Conservative again.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied.]

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in St John's Gardens

Objection One

The location of the e-bike parking space is nonsensical. Rather than the south-east side of St John's Gardens, it should be located on the north-east side because there is no through traffic on the north side.

The south side will cause massive problems since it is the only direct access to Lansdown and Clarendon Road. Considering all the building traffic that has to go through St John's Gardens, this will cause issues.

Besides, it is frankly ridiculous that the Council has to take steps to accommodate e-bike rental firms because these commercial firms can't operate a responsible scheme to ensure the bikes are parked responsibly. Charge these firms £10 for each bike parked illegally or inconsiderately, and the problem will be solved quickly, without costs and inconvenience to the residents and taxpayers.

Support in Full One

Fully support

1. Convenient, easy to find and accessible bays much needed in neighbourhood
2. Bays are essential to address anti social pavement parking
3. Bays reduce potential conflict between pedestrians and hire users
4. Increased availability provides better transport choices for people and supports councils stated aim to enable more active travel and reduce car journeys
5. majority of households do not have a car in this area, a fairer approach to road space and kerb space is needed, 1 parking bay can accommodate up to 8 bike, this is a much better utility for 5 metre of suggested space
6. Suggested locations near junctions are very good and also increase visibility at junctions - this improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists
7. bays located closed to existing or proposed cycleways or Quietways make a lot of sense

Support in Full Two

Seems sensible as there would not be too much impact on existing residents as there is normally good parking availability

Support in Full Three

[No comment supplied.]

Support in Full Four

[No comment supplied.]

Support in Full Five

[No comment supplied.]

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

Objection One

On Swanscombe Road there is exactly space for 6 cars with resident parking permits. [redacted] has 2 vans, [redacted] has 2 cars, residents of St Anns Villas use Swanscombe Rd to park their cars. At the best of times it is difficult to find residents parking and a bike stand will further take away from the few available spaces. Furthermore, there is a massive area for bikes already on the back of Swanscombe which is a mere minute walk away. Our household objects therefore in the strongest terms for using Swanscombe Road for one of the schemes.

Objection Two

Attached photos of - Queensdale/Norland Road - Santander approx. 200 steps from proposed area in Swanscombe Rd. As of 6th March 28 bikes, 9 taken out at 10.30am.

Attached photos of - Avondale - Santander approx. 230 steps from proposed area in Swanscombe Rd. As of 6th March 21 bikes, none were taken at 10.30am.

Firstly, [redacted] - are objecting to the placement and taking up of at least a parking space for yet another e-bike parking area.

Questions:

1. Which company will the space be supporting?
2. Who has instigated this request?
3. Why?
4. Who pays for this to be installed if it happens, that is?
5. How does this proposal 'fill the gaps' your quote on letter, when in a short distance of each other there are 49bikes waiting to be take out?
6. Who are these bike spaces intended for? Is there an influx of extra bike riders in the area?

Personally I am [redacted] - e-bikes are of no interest to us, we will not be using them or dropping them off anywhere, so what advantage are they for us living close by the proposed area and local council tax payers.

Our neighbours and those who might be affected by the loss of the parking space: one neighbour will be squeezed to park next to his garden door where he plugs in his electric cables to his Tesla car. The other who have two regularly used cars like ourselves already pay our residents parking charges. Plus any from the flats at the end of the road who cannot park in their allotted parking area.

This is a busy cul de sac road - however it has various shops in it on the opposite side of the proposed area. Some days it is like Piccadilly Circus with large delivery vans delivering to the Chemist, the butcher, the cafe, the grocery/paper shop & general food shop. That is without the Laundrette with droppings off and collections. Then there are Amazon, DPD, UPS, Post Office delivery vans - that's without the drug dealers cars that wait for their pick ups . Taking off the corner will also cause problems for the larger vehicles turning into Swanscombe Road.

Due to the lack of RBKC Parking Wardens there are non residents who drop off and pop in parkers that do not pay for the parking on the Hammersmith and Fulham side of the road.

So, I do not see much empathy or consideration shown for the few locals living in Swanscombe Road. These e-bike spaces are ugly and in my opinion detract from an area which I might add has many faults already.

Why not place a sight nearer to the Hilton Hotel/Royal Crescent where visitors could benefit from the uses of these e-bikes. Not many tourists visit Swanscombe Rd, picking up or dropping off from my observations. Or maybe St James Square around the church.

Objection Three

I wish to object to the above order for the following reasons:

1. Highway Safety

a. The proposed site is approx. 5m east of the St Ann's Villas/Swanscombe Road junction. This junction is a priority crossroads and has a poor accident record with 5 injury accidents reported in the 10 year period 2013-2022, including a fatality on 14/12/15. A further collision occurred last week on 07/04/24 between a car and a motorcyclist (picture attached). The rider was taken to hospital but the severity of his injuries is unknown. Visibility from Swanscombe Road to St Ann's Villas (south) is very poor and obstructed by parked vehicles. St Ann's Villas has a 20mph speed restriction but causal observations suggests that 85th percentile speeds are closer to 30mph. The recommended stopping sight distance from Manual for Streets, DfT 2007, for 30mph is 23m (2.4m back from the give way line). This standard is not met at this junction with current speeds. The proposed dockless bike park will add additional cycle turning movements at the junction and specifically to and from the south west corner of the junction. Given that the junction does not meet minimum visibility criteria as set out in Manual for Streets, the proposal will generate a highway safety hazard.

b. On the north side of Swanscombe Road (within LB of Hammersmith & Fulham) there is a parade of retail and commercial units which constitutes a local centre. No off-street servicing facilities are available, so servicing takes place from the carriageway. This involves a range of medium and heavy goods vehicles which stop in the carriageway during unloading, plus loading for waste & recycling. This servicing takes place in both the eastbound and

westbound lanes and requires all other passing vehicles to cross into the opposing lane. When the eastbound lane (adjacent to the commercial premises) is being utilised for servicing, this results in all other eastbound vehicles passing adjacent to the proposed bike dock and in close proximity to the junction with St Ann's Villas. This generates a highway safety hazard.

c. The north side of Swanscombe Road is provided with a row of car parking spaces perpendicular to the carriageway. These spaces are controlled as short stay paid-for parking and are well used by visitors to the adjacent commercial premises and nearby residential properties. Users of these spaces either drive into the spaces in a forward gear or pull up alongside and reverse in. When accessed in a forward gear, egress must be achieved in a reverse gear, with reversing taking place into the carriageway. Both the eastbound and westbound lanes are required for this manoeuvre as 6m is required to egress from a perpendicular parking space. The proposed bike dock is expected to operate in a similar manner to parallel car parking spaces, except that all access is likely to be cycling forward. To egress, users will walk a bicycle backwards into the carriageway before turning into Swanscombe Road. The cumulative effect of a vehicle reversing from a car parking space into the carriageway and a cycle user walking backwards into the same carriageway space is that neither user may see each other and may collide. Drivers have the facility to use their mirrors, but cycle users cannot walk backwards holding a bicycle and see behind themselves at the same time. Reversing drivers may also be concentrating on vehicles moving eastbound and westbound in Swanscombe Road, and not pedestrians walking backwards towards them reversing a bicycle from the south. In common with the reversing drivers, the reversing cycle users are also likely to concentrate on eastbound and westbound vehicles in Swanscombe Road and not a reversing vehicle directly behind them. This represents a highway safety hazard.

d. The series of highway safety hazards outlined above could be mitigated by locating the proposed bike dock adjacent to the commercial premises on the north side of Swanscombe Road (within LBHF) where there is a large area of paving. This location would also better serve trips to/from the commercial premises.

2. Residents' amenity

a. The south side of Swanscombe Road currently provides 6 residents' car parking spaces. Removing one space to provide the proposed bike dock will have a disproportionate effect on the availability of residents' car parking in this area, reducing the number of spaces available for residents' vehicles by 16.7%. Locating the bike dock away from the carriageway as identified above would provide the benefits of the bike dock without this significant reduction in residential car parking availability. Alternatively, if the proposed bike dock is located in an area where more car parking is available, the net loss would be substantially less. For example, in a street where there are 50 residents' car parking spaces, the conversion of one space to a bike dock represents only a 2% reduction in car parking space availability.

Support in Full One

[No comment supplied.]

