

**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  
PEMBRIDGE 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 Pembridge 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 Pembridge 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, 141 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 three of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Dawson Place and Ladbroke Square proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed with these locations.
- 4.3 It is important to note that some respondents asked that their response be applied to every proposed location in the borough. This amounts to an objection to the principle of e-bike parking bays, and whilst people are free to express this position it is not strictly relevant to a consultation on specific sites. However, we have included responses from people who asked for their position to be applied to every proposal in the borough. This means that 12 objections, two 'support in part' and seven 'support in full' responses are not necessarily from residents local to each proposal. Total responses including these responses are indicated in brackets in Table 1. For administrative purposes, these responses and officer responses have been produced separately as Appendix 2. Some of the reasons for these whole-Borough responses also feature in the site-specific comments described in Section 5.

**Table 1 – Summary of responses received.**

Scheme	No. Objections	No. Support in Part	No. Support in Full	No opinion	Recommendation
S532a Chepstow Villas	4 (16)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed
S532b Dawson Place	14 (26)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S532c Ladbroke Square	8 (20)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S532d Linden Gardens	3 (15)	0 (2)	2 (9)	0	Proceed
S532e Pembridge Square	1 (13)	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.

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

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

- 5.7 Some respondents said that the proposals would add to congestion for pedestrians or vehicles already using the road.

Officer Response

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

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

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

#### Officer Response

- 5.10 Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to therefore increase the network of available bays. In some cases, this means introducing additional bays close to existing bays, where those bays have proved popular than others and are sometimes leading to overspill.
- 5.11 Whilst some customers may use bikes from multiple operators, including TfL's Santander Cycle Hire, many are loyal to one operator – 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, litter and/or anti-social behaviour**

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

#### Officer Response

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

### **Poor behaviour by cyclists**

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

#### Officer Response

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

### **Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location**

- 5.16 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One respondent to the Linden Gardens proposal suggested using a footway build out close to No. 79 Linden Gardens.

Officer Response

- 5.17 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.18 The suggested footway space in Linden Gardens is small and directly outside residential property windows and is close to a pedestrian dropped kerb - both factors make this site less favourable for e-bike parking.

**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.**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1	One respondent was concerned that the proposal would lead to far more ebikes - and subsequently tourists - in Linden Gardens. (Linden Gardens proposal)	All bays may be used by tourists and visitors, as well as residents. This is not a reason not to install them, particularly in areas of high demand such as the Notting Hill Gate area.

**Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments**

No comments received

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

### **Objection One**

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

### **Objection Two**

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

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

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

### **Objection Three**

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

### **Objection Four (The Boltons Association)**

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

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

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

### **Objection Five**

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

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

E-bike 'explodes' outside Buckingham Palace

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

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

Please keep E-bikes off the streets of Kensington.

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

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

We have reservations concerning this proposal.

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

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

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

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



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

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

#### **Objection Seven**

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

#### **Objection Eight**

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

#### **Objection Nine**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Objection Ten**

I object ebikes

#### **Objection Eleven**

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

#### **Objection Twelve**

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

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

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

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

[Additional Comments]

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

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

#### **Support in Part Two**

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

### **Support in Full One (WestWay Trust)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for taking the WestWays views into consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Support in Full Three**

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

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

### **Support in Full Four**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Support in Full Five**

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

#### **Support in Full Six**

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

#### **Support in Full Seven**

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

### **Officer responses to objections**

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

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

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

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

### **Rental e-bikes are an eyesore**

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

### **Proposals do not benefit residents**

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

### **Proposals should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays**

None of the proposals are proposed in disabled parking bays.



### **Dangerous cycling**

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

### **E-bike/e-scooters are fire hazards**

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

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

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

### **Opposed to the principle of providing designated e-bike bays**

Provision of designated e-bike parking bays is Council policy following a Key Decision<sup>1</sup> in June 2023. The Council has no plans to revoke this policy at the present time. Even if the Council did not provide designated e-bike bays, the e-bikes would remain on the Council's streets as it has no powers to prevent the companies operating.

---

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

### Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Chepstow Villas

#### Objection One

Because you have already put one in in Pembridge Place where it meets Pembridge Villas - it's less than 30 seconds walk away . I'm in favour of e-bikes , and in favour of e-bike Parking bays , but 2 within 50 metres seems a little bit too much?

#### Objection Two

Absolutely not. It would be right outside our building. We already suffer from motor bike park on the on the Pembridge side of our building with the noise and pollution that brings to our building. This area is on the brow of Chepstow Villas before it turns into Pembridge. It is already heavily used . There is no reason why the distribution of parking areas should not be spaced out fairly. Chepstow Villas is a long Road and could accommodate e-bike parking in a less congested pedestrian area exiting the nearby school Wetherby School to access their parked cars. It is totally undesirable and in my opinion unsafe as many children access the area on foot. The pavement is quite narrow. May I suggest the usage of the existing motorcycle park situated in Pembridge Villas outside the back of our Building be utilised. E- Bikes are often left out there on the pavement against our railings anyway. At least we would get more clean air and less noise and children would not be at risk from noiseless e-bikes. The area of road is almost a blind spot for pedestrians because of its location.

I would be welcome to show it to you. as evidence of the foregoing.

Thank you so much for your attention and consideration

PS I am submitting this on behalf of the Owners of Ashdown Lodge. [redacted]

#### Objection Three

We live at [redacted] Chepstow Villas and have just been informed by our neighbour, [redacted], of the proposed ebike station in Chepstow Villas. We are very concerned about this proposal since there is plenty of evidence of other dockless stations where bikes are abandoned or thrown to the ground. There are already 2 bike stations in and near Chepstow Villas, one in Denbigh Road (which is a approx. 200 meters from the proposed site) and one at the top of Chepstow Villas corner of Kensington Park Gardens (about 1/2 mile from proposed site ). The Denbigh Road dockless bike station is a good example of things to come with bikes thrown down onto the pavement and road or not returned to their proper bay and left standing on the pavement. This is dangerous to pedestrians, older and handicapped people. We are in our eighties and need pavements in Chepstow Villas that are easy to navigate without obstructions. Our properties will be impacted by unsightly bike dock stations and abandoned bikes. We therefore ask you to relocate the proposed bike project away from our residential area so that we have unobstructed pavements.

#### Objection Four

We are from [redacted]. I came to understand from my neighbours that there is a proposed e bike station in Chepstow Villas. I believe that my neighbours have also written in with regard to the above.

I am also deeply concerned as bikes are left abandoned on the pavement or are not returned properly. This poses an ugly sight and potentially a position of significant danger to people staying around the area particularly to those aged or have young children. There are already 2 parking stations around the area.

Therefore I would like to see a quiet and beautiful residential area with unobstructed pavements. I hereby object to the proposed e bike station in Chepstow and you would kindly reconsider relocating to another place which is conducive.

### **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. 63% 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, all too often visibility is blocked by large vehicles parking too close to the junctions all around the Square - this improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists
7. bays located closed to cycleways or Quietways make a lot of sense

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

##### **Objection One**

This intersection does not attract many individuals on bicycles, nor does it typically attract a lot of footfall. We already have an issue with noisy individuals from a nearby pub who pass on the street later in the evenings, and would prefer to limit the congregation of individuals / bikes on this street please.

What about the potential of the east side of Pembridge Square Garden?

Thanks.

##### **Objection Two**

We live at [redacted].

Can I say at the outset that I agree that on street e-bike parking spaces should be provided.

The suggested location of an e-bike parking space outside our property is however potentially very dangerous, and we strongly oppose it on safety grounds. We have in the past witnessed a number of traffic accidents (some serious) on and around the roundabout, often involving bicycles. Putting an e-bike parking space on a corner by that junction, to be used by cyclists coming from all 4 directions who will often need to cross the road to access it, makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. It is next to what is already a dangerous junction, which would inevitably be made even more dangerous if e-bike riders (many of whom are tourists and are unfamiliar with the area) are parking and collecting bikes there.

In addition, between 8.00am and 9.00am, and again between 3.15pm and 4.30pm, the junction between Chepstow Place and Dawson Place can get very busy, with the parents of children attending 4 schools (Pembridge Hall at 10 and 18 Pembridge Square, Wetherby and Wetherby Pembridge Minors at 11 Pembridge Square) coming and going from all 4 directions. When you add to this the school coaches, public buses (when redirected up Chepstow Place) and regular traffic up and down between Chepstow Place and Westbourne Grove (including delivery bikes and motorbikes typically driving too fast), the roundabout is already hectic.

There has to be a better location for an e-bike parking place than locating it within metres of a dangerous junction, and thereby attracting even more cyclists to what is already a hazardous area. Indeed, I find it difficult to think of a worse place in the immediate area to put it. The neighbours I have spoken to were astonished that the Council could make such a suggestion, bearing in mind the fact there are far quieter potential locations which are not next to a busy junction.

[Additional Comments]

I have already written expressing my objection to the proposed e-bike parking space on Dawson Place. Many of my neighbours share my concern on safety grounds.

I have just read the attached report on BBC News”

“E-bike and e-scooter fires are the fastest-growing fire risk in London: statistics indicate there have been at least 40 this year”.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-68744317>

The proposed location is beneath trees and close to a private residence. Please treat this message as a second ground for objection.

**Objection Three**

I object to this proposal for a bike docking at this location. IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL ACCIDENTS INVOLVING BICYCLES AND MOTORBIKES ON THE CHEPSTOW PLACE/DAWSON PLACE ROUNDABOUT.

THIS IS AN UNSAFE LOCATION FOR AN E-BIKE PARKING BAY.

**Objection Four**

I have seen several accidents at the junction next to the proposed location of the bicycle parking bay, and think the Council has selected a most unsafe place. I am concerned that this will lead to more accidents, and strongly object to the proposal.

**Objection Five**

Proposing to have a e-bike stand at such a busy junction is dangerous. I walk everyday past the junction, sometimes twice a day and have seen many near misses with bike riders, cars and motor bikes.

It's too busy and again too dangerous.

**Objection Six**

I am a local resident and object to the proposed Chepstow place/Dawson place location for a new E-bike parking place on safety grounds.

**Objection Seven**

I am writing in relation to the proposed dockless bikes by Chepstow place / Dawson place.

I live on [redacted] and believe the location is unsafe by the roundabout and will also generate more antisocial behaviour. In the last few months we have seen lots of bikes left everywhere with no consideration for residents, lots of littering too. In addition, we have seen several accidents in recent times on the roundabout and also on Hereford Road next to it. Lastly, it would be an eyesore: Chepstow place is a uniquely attractive residential street and a dockless bike stand is not in keeping with the character of the street.

We would prefer to keep the street as a quiet residential area and would appreciate if the plans for building a station wouldn't go ahead.

**Objection Eight**

Please consider removing the proposed e-bike dockless stand at Dawson Place London W2 as it can be an unsafe location for e-bike parking.

**Objection Nine**

Please do not install e-bikes on this road.

**Objection Ten**

I'm a local resident. While I fully recognise the need to park e-bikes, I object to the location. Dawson place is one of the most beautiful streets in our 'hood, especially at this time of year. Why not put the bikes just around the corner in Chepstow Place, where it's far less intrusive to the character of Dawson Place? Or the East side of Pembridge Square. Both are more suitable in my opinion.

**Objection Eleven**

I am writing to object to the proposed e-bike dockless stand on Dawson Place London W2.

**Objection Twelve**

We strongly object to the above plan as the Chepstow place/Dawson place roundabout is an unsafe location for an e-bike parking bay.

In recent years there have been a number of accidents involving bicycles and motorbikes on that roundabout.

Please consider this and the nuisance it would cause for residents.

**Objection Thirteen**

I object to the plan for dockless bikes on the corner of Chepstow place / Dawson place. Proximity to the four-way junction is a dangerous location for the bikes.

**Objection Fourteen**

I hope this is in time (before midnight) to object.

The proposed location is an unsafe location for bikes.

I have been a resident for over 25 years.

I drive through the area and live around the corner and have witnessed several near accidents and one where the rider was taken to hospital.

Please find a safer location.

**Support in Full One**

No comments received.

## Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Ladbroke Square

### Objection One

Currently at this address there already is a charging station for electric car that have been extremely beneficial for car owners. Furthermore at very close proximity there is already a rental of e-bike on Chepstow villas and furthermore there is for scooter up the road by the garden on Ladbroke grove and Kensington Park gardens. Most residents on our square don't see the need at this time.

### Objection Two

I currently live next to a rental bike and scooter bay as well as bike storage, since the installation the number of loud drunk people at night crashing around on these vehicles has increased. They ride on the pavement and cause hazards for pedestrians. There are frequently without helmets cycling all over the pavements and roads in haphazard ways creating a danger for residence. The bikes & scooters frequently blow over in the wind and usually hit cars parked near. All the bikes are deposited in a mess, with the exception of the Santander bikes which at least look orderly and well kept.

In this instance I am opposed to installing more cycle bays in the area. There are numerous parking bays already in the neighbouring streets, including two on Kensington park gardens alone. The massive increase in cycle bays parking spaces are taking parking spaces which are becoming under increasing pressure.

### Objection Three

I supported parking bay for bikes in Ladbroke Terrace. It has been a disaster. Bikes every where, parked stupidly on pavement, by bike bay, not in it, thrown randomly on the ground on Notting Hill Gate. I phone the bike companies and one of them is good at responding, others do not care. Why should we give up parking bays to cyclists who have no consideration for pedestrians. I would like to see council confiscate illegally parked bikes and charge the bike companies a serious amount of money to get them back. It is a total mess!

### Objection Four

The location is at the corner where vehicles turn in from Ladbroke Grove, which is a dangerous blind spot for both motorists turning in; cyclists mounting or dismounting and for workers to load and re- load e-bicycles.

### Objection Five

Hello - I do not support the installation of bike parking on this location due to the following:

1) Ladbroke Grove is downward sloping at this junction and a left into Ladbroke Square would be dangerous if there are bikes and people/teenagers/children around the bike parking bay. We live here and often find cars swerving into Ladbroke Square trying to slow down. This could be a serious health and safety issue.



2) There is already a bike parking bay directly across Ladbroke Grove on Landsdown Walk. I am not sure a second bike parking is needed in such close proximity.

3) There is already limited parking on this street with spots often entirely filled up. Taking away parking spots for bikes is going to exacerbate this issue.

4) There is a nursery on the ground floor of 1 Ladbroke Square (directly across from the proposed bike parking) where there are lots of small children going in and out who could be endangered due to people leaving bikes around that area and cars swerving in from Ladbroke Grove.

#### **Objection Six**

No respect from rental persons to put bikes in correct place. More tourists create noise and limits privacy.

#### **Objection Seven**

This location on the corner of Ladbroke Square and Ladbroke Grove is not suitable for cycle parking. This is a dangerous corner, there is no visibility for vehicles turning left into Ladbroke Square from Ladbroke Grove. To have cyclists dismounting, parking and cycling on this corner is hugely dangerous as cars come around the corner at high speeds. There is a high risk of collision, especially in poor weather. I have seen at least two cyclists fall off their bicycles on the speed bump at the entrance to Ladbroke Square.

Far better locations exist locally, including an expansion of the existing e bike parking bay to the north along Ladbroke Grove (opposite St John's Church).

Please could you reconsider the proposed location as I believe this is unsuitable for the above reasons.

#### **Objection Eight**

I wish to object privately to the installation of the proposed ebikes bay on Ladbroke Square and also request that the consultation period be extended and the communication of the notice be expanded.

I could see only one post communicating the notice which was very discreetly posted. Many residents on Ladbroke Square will have not noticed it. Furthermore, there are a large number of elderly residents on Ladbroke Square and it would be more likely to be seen by them if you post the notice to all residents on the square.

I object to the proposal as it will reduce the number of parking spaces on the square which are already under pressure.

I also reject the idea of acquiescing to the ebike companies because they have effectively held the Council to ransom by encouraging their users to dump the bikes on pavements and walkways.

We have a world class bicycle hire scheme with docking stations located less than 50m from the proposed site and inevitably what will occur at the proposed site is a pile of blown over bikes which will be an eyesore. A similar site on Ladbroke Road is often littered with bikes on the pavement right by the designated bay (see attached photo from today).

### **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. 63% 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

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

### Objection One

I am concerned that it will lead to large numbers of e-bikes in Linden Gardens not for the use of residents but left my tourists and others. These may not be left in the designated spot but on pavements which will cause obstructions/hazards for pedestrians. This has been the case with the dock less scooter designated areas outside the Czech embassy and outside the tube station at the top of Pembridge gardens. It may also attract litter. Most of the litter in Linden Gardens is brought in by visitors to Notting Hill Gate as is evident from the much greater concentration of litter near to the Gate.

### Objection Two

We often have quite a lot of litter dumped near the Notting Hill Gate entrance to Linden Gardens and it seems this would be likely to increase the problem. In addition, we have had more people riding bikes on the pavement and I'm concerned this would also rise in a very residential cul de sac. I've witnessed a couple of near misses with residents.

### Objection Three

Thank you for speaking to me today. And, for listening to my possible suggestion for re-allocation of pavement space for the proposed new e-bike stand in Linden Gardens.

At the moment, you plan to re-allocate a pay-by-phone parking space approximately outside No. 7 Linden Gardens. At the moment there is a space allocated for ordinary bicycles on the pavement, close-by beside the tree.

I would like to point out, there is also a quite large pavement space on the opposite corner of the road, a space near No. 79 Linden Gardens. This extra pavement space is only there because originally it was built to protect a large mature plane tree, which as a result of negligence fell down. However, despite the lack of tree, the pavement extension was still built, taking a residents' parking space in the process.

My suggestion is that some of this extra pavement space could be used for an ordinary bicycle stand and the existing bicycle stand, closer to the main exit of Linden Gardens could be used for electric bikes. This way it would not be necessary to lose a parking space.

I hope you will consider this possibility and look forward to hearing from you about this.

### Support in Full One

Hopefully these new parking bays will make people's behaviour alter in a way that having taken an ebike out to use they return their bikes appropriately in the required parking bay.

My own opinion, is that leaving bikes all strewn across the pavement is a hazard to everyone whether they are disabled or perfectly fit. Perhaps for consideration they should be a system that everyone who uses an ebike is registered when the bike is taken out at what time and date and if a tracking device is installed on the bike and alerts the council when an ebike is left on the pavement instead of being returned to the parking bay a fine should be introduced for not returning the ebike to the parking bay.

**Support in Full Two**

only place close to us, and perfect for a closed off crescent. there are so many lime bikes there every night (i walk my dogs on that block) showing a clear need in the immediate surroundings for this.

## Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Pembridge Square

### Objection One

They're a nuisance and a hazard to pedestrians. They get thrown around on the pavement and it's causing huge issues to pram users, the elderly and the visually impaired. The maintenance cost is no doubt very high also!

### 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. 63% 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, all too often visibility is blocked by large vehicles parking too close to the junctions all around the Square - this improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists
7. bays located closed to cycleways or Quietways make a lot of sense