

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
QUEEN'S GATE 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 Queen's Gate ward, with a recommendation on how to proceed for each proposal.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

3 BACKGROUND

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

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 From 6 March to 17 April 2024, the Council undertook consultation on introducing new rental e-bike parking bays at six locations in Queen’s Gate 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, 173 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the six 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 Petersham Lane, St Alban’s Grove and Victoria Road 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
S533a. Cornwall Gardens	7 (19)	1 (3)	2 (9)	0	Proceed
S533b. Hyde Park Gate	6 (18)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S533c. Petersham Lane	9 (21)	0 (2)	2 (9)	0	Do not proceed
S533d. Queen’s Gate Gardens	2 (14)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed
S533e. St Alban’s Grove	8 (20)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S533f. Victoria Road	9 (21)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Do not proceed

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides comments received from ward Councillors to the proposals.
- 5.2 Appendices 2 – 8 list the responses received to each location in full. Officer responses to the objections or ‘support in part’ responses are detailed below:

Loss of parking space

- 5.3 Some respondents in Cornwall Gardens and Queen's Gate Gardens 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. None of the proposals in Queen's Gate ward 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 on Cornwall Gardens and Hyde Park Gate 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.

There is already a hire bike bay nearby

- 5.7 Some respondents in Cornwall Gardens and said that there was no need for another e-bike bay as there was already a dockless e-bike bay nearby.

Officer Response

- 5.8 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. This proposal is 190 metres from the e-bike bay opposite 10 Cornwall Gardens, in a densely populated area this is a reasonable spacing.

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

- 5.9 Some respondents in Cornwall Gardens objected on the basis that rental e-bikes diminish the visual appeal of neighbourhoods where there are listed buildings and detracting from residents' enjoyment of the area by introducing increased noise and litter and visitors to the street.

Officer Response

- 5.10 To a large degree, visual appearance is a matter of subjective taste. Some people may prefer a row of bicycles parked on-street to a car. Both types of vehicle are commonplace across London. 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

- 5.11 One respondent from Queen's Gate Gardens objected on the basis that cyclists exhibit poor behaviour such as ignoring traffic signs, zebra crossings, or general rules of the road.

Officer Response

- 5.12 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.

Other comments

- 5.13 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	1. Two respondents said that no one would use the e-bike bays proposed. (Cornwall Gardens proposal)	The bays are sited to be available to residents as well as visitors. 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. If an e-bike bay proved unpopular in future, the Council would remove it.

2	E-bikes and bikes generally reduce the safety of roads and footpaths. Cyclists do not wear helmets and often are in dark clothing. (Cornwall Gardens proposal)	We have no evidence that e-bikes reduce safety on roads or footpaths, however footway riding is a matter for the Police to enforce. Enforcement of cycling in Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens is the responsibility of Royal Parks. There are no laws regarding the wearing of cycle helmets or the colour of clothes cyclists must wear, but even if this was the case, it is immaterial to the siting of the proposed parking bay.
3	There is already an e-bike bay nearby and respondent believes it should be located on the exact opposite side of the gardens where the north facing buildings are. (Cornwall Gardens proposal)	This proposal is 190 metres from the e-bike bay opposite 10 Cornwall Gardens, in a densely populated area this is a reasonable spacing. The suggested location on the south side of Cornwall Gardens whilst it might be suitable, is just 32 meters from the proposed site, and it offers no significant benefits over the proposed site.
4	Two respondents objected to cyclists riding through Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. (Hyde Park Gate and Cornwall Gardens proposals)	Enforcement of cycling restrictions in Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens is the responsibility of Royal Parks. It has no bearing on the merits of the proposed e-bike bays.
5	This small cul-de-sac street is famous for its past residents and tourists like to visit. There are also four embassies/high commission residences. (Hyde Park Gate proposal)	The proposal is in the arm of Hyde Park Gate parallel to Kensington Road, not in the cul-de-sac mentioned.
6	There are already too many docked and dockless ebike parking bays in Queen's Gate and the top area of Kensington Gardens. (Hyde Park Gate proposal)	On Queen's Gate, between Kensington Road and Cromwell Road (an eight minute walk) there are two docked bike stations and two dockless bays. 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.
7	The position of this bike bay is inappropriate, tucked away and not visible as it is in Hyde Park Gate It requires unsafe crossing of Kensington Road when cycling east, north or south. (Hyde Park Gate proposal)	The location will be visible from the A315 Kensington Road and in the supplier's apps. Cyclists unconfident about crossing Kensington Road will be 70 metres from the nearest light controlled crossing, which can be accessed by travelling east on Hyde Park Gate.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr Roberto Weeden-Sanz

We have had representations from all the residents of Petersham Lane objecting to the proposed bay on Petersham Lane. Please could you pull that one and not proceed with it as proposed.

Cllr Will Lane

I also object to this specific [Petersham Lane] location, in support of Cllr Weeden-Sanz objection. To be clear, I support e-bike parking spaces generally, but these should be on the larger roads nearby with space and footfall (e.g. Queen's Gate Terrace). Not on the very small side streets and Mews.

Cllr Sam Mackover

I agree with these objections. As ebikes tend to gather and fall beyond the box limits this would be a problem for road and footway users. They should be on main roads like Gloucester Rd.

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 Cornwall Gardens

Objection One

This is a beautiful square. Why would you interrupt the gardens and layout of the square with a bike stand that adds clutter? There is also (more importantly) not enough room for parking at this end of the square with never a space available in the proposed area. Why would you make parking even more difficult for us residents? I am a bike user myself and vehemently am against this.

Objection Two

I'm appalled by this suggestion. Cornwall Gardens is a beautiful Victorian Garden Square which is already being used by taxis and delivery vans as a car park because of its single yellow line status. It would be highly disruptive to have bikes and people who do not live here outside our houses. E-bikes belong on main thoroughfares, not on garden squares.

Objection Three

Dear Council,
Definitely not supporting it!!

- 1) The bikes will be left everywhere - on the pavement and on the road due to faulty geolocation
- 2) Noone goes into Cornwall Gardens unless they live here so its not particularly useful
- 3) We already have a parking opposite 10 Cornwall Gardens - it is never too full (but is a mess!)
- 4) It will take away from residential parking which is at times problematic as it is.

I strongly object.

Objection Four

Dear Council.

It makes no sense whatsoever. We already have a parking on Cornwall gardens - outside of 8-10 Cornwall Gardens and we do not need another one. It does not overflow and its close to the main road (Gloucester Road) which makes it usable by neighbouring areas. Noone goes to Cornwall Gardens unless they live here so adding one deep inside the square makes no sense whatsoever. But it will make things loud and unsightly. People will park in the vicinity because the geolocation on these things does not work well - hence the road and pavement will be blocked by the bikes as well. I use e-bikes all the time but I really dont think its a good idea to have parking deep in residential areas. It makes the bicycles less accessible to others as well in comparison to having them close to main roads and junctions. I really hope you reconsider!!!

Objection Five

THE HOUSES IN CORNWALL GARDENS ARE GRADE 2 LISTED. THAT IS BECAUSE THEY HAVE ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE. THE GARDENS THEMSELVES PROVIDE AMENITY AND BEAUTY. PLANTING A BAY FOR E-SCOOTERS/BIKES IN THE MIDDLE OF A HERITAGE AREA IS A VERY STRANGE PROPOSAL FROM A COUNCIL WHICH PURPORTS TO BE A CUSTODIAN AND ENHANCER OF RBKC'S HERITAGE. THESE BAYS SHOULD BE POSITIONED ON MAJOR THOROUGHFARES. NOT IN LEAFY HIGH VICTORIAN GARDEN SQUARES. THEY ARE VERY UNSIGHTLY, THEY CREATE NOISE AND OBSTRUCTION. I HAD UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU HAD REACHED AN AGREEMENT WITH THE PROVIDERS FOR A SOFTWARE ALTERATION SUCH THAT ANY USER NOT RETURNING THE SCOOTER/BIKE TO A DESIGNATED BAY WOULD INCUR AN ADDITIONAL CHARGE. THIS IS THE WAY TO STOP OUR STREETS BEING LITTERED WITH DROPPED BIKES. ENCOURAGE USERS NOT TO DROP BIKES/SCOOTERS RANDOMLY, BY THIS METHOD; AND KEEP THE BAYS CONFINED TO MAJOR ROADS.

Objection Six

E Bikes and bikes generally are reducing the safety of our roads and footpaths . They are ridden in footpaths , in Hyde Park and Kensington Palace Gardens in lanes clearly marked no bicycles . The cyclists do not wear helmets and often are in dark clothing this is a complete unnecessary menace for the profitability of the operators at the expense of residents safety , well being and takes up scarce parking in Cornwall Gardens .

Objection Seven

I note the plan to build a new bay for e-bikes on the southern side of the north arm of Cornwall Gardens.

Given that we have already lost two bays to electric charging points on this side of the square, and the pressure on spaces in part due to the density of flats in Stanford Court, might you consider placing this bay on the southern side of the square which appears to have less pressure on parking spaces?

Support in Part One

This side of cornwall gardens already has a e bike parking station near gloucester road. I believe it should be located on the exact opposite side of the gardens where the north facing buildings are. Secondly, there is already a parking site for private bicycles only on that side near the garden gate. This could be extended for ebikes as well.

Thank you.

Support in Full One

I think this is crucial for the gardens and the best way to travel nowadays. Due to the increase of usage being able to rent an e-bike close to our house is a real asset.

Support in Full Two

More bikes are great.

I think e-bikes are a great way to get from point to point and lowers the reliance on taxis, ubers, etc. So am in full support. There is an e-bike parking about 100m from here already, so not sure why another one is needed so close? But if it is - go for it! Else its simply another car - and there is plenty of parking for cars here already.

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Hyde Park Gate

Objection One

You have allowed e-bike operators to create total nuisance and disruption in the borough. You should not allow them to operate as users drive on the pavements, leave bikes scattered as they please and endanger people. Particularly alarming is the fact that wheelchair users i.e., disabled and the elderly are prevented from using the pavement as cannot have safe passage due to the bikes. There are frequent incidents with walkers especially children. If you are unable to regulate, monitor and fine e-bike companies you should not allow them to operate. The residents are paying you a council tax and their road and pavement safety should come first!

Objection Two

I am sick and tired of both tourists and commuters riding through the Royal Parks on No Cycling lanes. It is out of hand and dangerous. It is ruining the ability to take relaxed walks when idiots drive through on ebikes at high speed and you have to watch your back all the time.

Objection Three

I think It is not suitable to install a “ dockless bike hire bay “in the entrance to Hyde Park Gate .
This small cul-de-sac street is historically famous for its many past residents .All year round tourists make a pilgrimage down it and many conducted tours take place especially outside 28[Winston Churchill home] and 22 [Virginia Woolf 's home].
Here 4 Embassy/High Commission residences and 1 Embassy occupy the street .When “ Presentation of Credential’s” by Ambassadors/High Commissioners occur a horse drawn carriage has been used with a 3 point turn at the entrance where the bike dock is suggested .I have also spoken to the garbage collectors who said they use that area to turn and” backup” to go down Hyde Park Gate to collect the rubbish
A few feet along from this suggested area is a popular art gallery [Gallery 1957] where many exhibitions are held during the year.
On the right side there is a ugly rubbish bin dumping area and if there is a dumping bike bay area on the left what will tourists from all over the world think when entering this famous street!! .
There has been a designated single motor bike area nearby and all the years it has been there it is hardly ever used .
There are hundreds of bike docking stations and dockless bays all down Queen’s Gate and in the top area in Kensington Gardens plus RBKC have allocated 80 streets in the borough for this type of bay.
I think it is totally inappropriate to install a DOCKLESS bike bay in this small area

Objection Four

I disagree with a bike stand in this quiet historic corner (Hyde Park Gate) and suggest more accessible locations either at the top of Queens Gate or at the top of Palace Gate (Eastern side, south bound).

I am very supportive of these bays local to where people live. work and show to encourage their use and to prevent the bikes being scattered everywhere. More needs to be done to fine (more regularly) and even ban persistent offenders which you should insist upon with the providers. But a pre-requisite for that is a good network of these bays which RBKC is very close to achieving.

Objection Five

I have to say that the position of this bike bay is wholly inappropriate, tucked away and not really visible as it is in Hyde Park Gate, and requiring of an unsuitable and unsafe crossing of Kensington Road when cycling East North or South - the latter via Queens Gate - on picking up a cycle.

There are surely numerous other bays close by.

May I ask you please on reflection to drop this proposal?

Objection Six

Please take this email as my objection to the proposed plan for an e-bike/dockless bike stand or park to be placed on Hyde Park Gate (ref:- II/NS/S533B).

As a resident on the street I strongly believe the proposed plan would continue to lead to further disruptions already caused by said bikes discarded without thought, blocking carriage ways and obstructing local traffic.

Hyde Park Gate is a historic street and is frequented daily by tourist groups. I also fear this proposal would severely impact upon this experience.

I ask that you take my concern into account, along with that of other local residents and reject this proposal.

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Petersham Lane

Objection One

It affects the tranquility of people living nearby.

Objection Two

Too dangerous with all the traffic on that tiny street

Objection Three

The road is too small and we are having our delivery and waste collection as a business on that street.
The bike lane will take up too much space and we won't be able to get any big trucks coming down that road

Objection Four

This lane is very narrow and greatly amplifies sounds. We are already experiencing noses from bin lorries collecting rubbish of restaurants. It is noticeable.

Plus we have a lot of noisy students in this area when they are coming back from parties. Having this bike park will attract and concentrate more noise (loud voices plus bikes chimes) at night.

Objection Five

Petersham Lane is a narrow lane which already has a lot of mess dropped in it and is inadequately cleaned as our regular complaints to the council have made clear. A bike bay will inevitably result in even more mess. Furthermore, the Lane is visited by rubbish collections two or three times daily already as shops and restaurants on Gloucester Road have all their rubbish collected from the back in Petersham Lane. These collections already leave plenty of rubbish behind in the street and we don't need a further source of litter.

In addition, the pavement in Petersham Lane on the parking bay side is already narrow, being only three feet wide and badly left bikes will block it completely.

Finally, why hide the bay away in a narrow lane, where bikers will not see it? Obviously it would be better to put the bike parking area in either Elvaston Place or Queens Gate Terrace, which are both huge, where it will be plainly seen and where the bike users are more likely to be going. They will not be coming to Petersham Lane as we are the only residential address in it and we don't use bikes.

As it happens, it seems unlikely that bike users, who are often an inconsiderate bunch, will park their bikes in the designated places anyway unless they get fined for not doing so and that is a hard trick to pull off.

Therefore, please do not place the bike park in a narrow lane like Petersham Lane, on which we live.

Finally, you do not make clear on what criteria you selected locations nor how many parking bays in Petersham Lane you are thinking of reserving for bikes. You should make both of these very clear.

My email address is [redacted] and I would like clarification o these matters please.

Thank you

Objection Six

We own a corner basement flat, and that proposed location is our fire exit from the basement.

With the additional fire risk of e-bikes, this location is not suitable, and dangerous.

In addition, people discard bikes all over the place, and it will result increase in falls and claims (against the council).

If you wish to discuss, my mobile number is [redacted]

Thanks

Objection Seven

There is already plenty of parking for all kinds of rental bikes. Additional spaces will only create nuisance for residents and remove parking spaces.

Petersham Lane is a terrible idea anyway because it's 1) too close to existing bicycle parking 2) the street is very small with lots of commercial traffic (going into the parking of the hotel and restaurants) and hence dangerous to cyclist and to the parked bicycles

Objection Eight

Bicycle parking on a small street like that is not useful

Objection Nine

It is quite a private and quiet street and we value this feature very much for our families

Support in Full One

No comment received.

Support in Full Two

No comment received.

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Queen's Gate Gardens

Objection One

We need this space for the residents of Derwent house as all other spaces on Stanhope Gardens are taken by the residents of the houses along the street.

Objection Two

This area is area has heavy pedestrian traffic on a busy road—Cromwell road. It will make walking unsafe for families with small children.

Please not that in general bikes are left, thrown, or placed outside the designated area.

When is the Council going to make pedestrians a priority when cyclists routinely ignore traffic signs, zebra crossings, or general rules of the road.

Support in Full One

No comment received.

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in St Alban's Grove

Objection One

I think this would increase the confusion and congestion in St Albans Grove's very narrow street where the pavements are narrow and 2 cars pass with difficulty. The road will be more than busy with 400 pupils, teachers, parents, deliveries and residents. Also I believe when the construction for Heathrop college begins the lorries coming through will make it more dangerous. This is going to be a very busy street.

Objection Two

The street 6 St Albans Grove is too narrow and with the school it will be too dangerous...

Objection Three

Although generally in favour of bike areas, I think this would increase the congestion in a very narrow street with narrow pavements where 2 cars pass with difficulty. In addition the new St. Thomas's school with 400 or so pupils will increase traffic and congestion. It looks like St. Alban's Grove will become a gated "school street" and having a bunch of for hire bikes behind the barrier may be problematic.

Objection Four

With the Thomas' development at Atlantic House on St Albans Grove, the street will likely become a gated "school street" > Therefore, having a bunch of for hire bikes behind the barrier may be problematic. Bike riders will come over the pavement during barrier times to access the parking zone - pavements that at the same time need to accommodate c800 pedestrians (pupils/parents/teachers) coming in each morning (and 250 then departing) and 250 coming in each afternoon (with c800 then departing).

So, I would say not there...

Good idea though - and a necessary next step

Objection Five

Thomas's Kensington is relocating both its previous sites to St Alban's Grove. There will be a lot of traffic in the morning in the evenings and St Alban's Grove can only have one car going down the road at one time. Drivers often have to wait to let a car through. The bike parking is on the corner and will affect cars turning in to St Alban's Grove and being able to stop and let traffic through.

Objection Six

I think this would increase the congestion in a very narrow street with narrow pavements where 2 cars pass with difficulty. In addition the new St. Thomas's school with 400 or so pupils will increase traffic and congestion. It looks like St. Alban's Grove will become a gated "school street" and having a bunch of for hire bikes behind the barrier may be problematic.

Objection Seven

We are supportive of bike schemes in general but we are not supportive of a parking bay on St Albans Grove as the location has a number of issues that are particular to it and make it unsuitable. Firstly, St Albans Grove is the narrowest street in the area where there is only parking on one side. The parking of bikes beside or outside the zone (which often happens with spill over) will cause considerable disruption to both foot and vehicle traffic. Secondly, St Albans Grove is one of the most heavily trafficked roads in that area as cars use it to avoid traffic jams on the high street and Individuals use it to walk between high street Ken and Gloucester Road. Thirdly, the new school on St Albans Grove will make both of the issues above worse and could become a hazard for children and others walking to school in due course.

Objection Eight

There are two proposed parking bays within the area of the Victoria Road Area Residents' Association:

- St Albans Grove; and
- Victoria Road.

We are unconvinced of the need for these two bays because:

- there is an absence of any “destinations” within our area;
- the area is a “low traffic neighbourhood”, with no through traffic and, even though it has cycle Quietways, is largely unfamiliar to anyone who does not have a reason to come into the area; and
- there is little local demand from residents for e-bike hire.

The main attractions/destinations in this area are:

- Kensington High Street;
- Gloucester Road North Local Centre; and, to a lesser extent
- Kensington Gardens.

In terms of “evidence” of lack of demand:

- From observation, there have been few instances within our area of rental e-bikes being “parked”; and
- From e-bike websites, a snapshot of where bikes have been parked shows that this area seldom has any e-bikes left on the street.

Unless you have clear evidence of a need for parking bays in this area, we would suggest that the two bays proposed cannot be justified.

Individual proposals:

In terms of the individual proposals:

- The location of the St Albans Grove bay is very close to the junction with Victoria Road which is subject to congestion problems because St Albans Grove cannot accommodate two-way traffic; and
- The Victoria Road bay is in an area subject to parking pressures from the cars of residents in Kynance Mews and from Cornwall Gardens.

These proposals were very fully discussed at the VRARA Committee last Thursday night. We would like to reaffirm our support for cycling, but we have strong reservations about the need for e-bike bays within our area as well as about the two specific proposals.

Support in Full One

No comment received.

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

Objection One

1. There are another 3 purposes: S5333e St Albans Grove, S5333C Petersham Lane, and S533a Cornwall Gardens, which are very close together,
2. There are more bicycles space needed on the north side of Victoria Road close to the south of Hyde Park, which I can usually see ebike park around without parking space/
3. It's the end of the road that no commercial store around, only residential property, there is no need to attract people who don't live around.

Objection Two

These on street ebike parking spaces take space from car parking spaces. This is a residential area and one cannot transport children on ebikes.

Objection Three

The proposed place for the ebike parking space is at the end of a cul-de-sac which is accessed by a set of seven steps, on one side, which makes it very difficult for cyclists to carry the heavy bike down the steps to Kynance Mews. All the residents in this small cul-de-sac park their cars in the road, so the road itself is quite busy. also there is a 'drop-off point' for the Nursery which is located at the top of the steps. It is difficult to turn a vehicle around in the cul-de-sac.

A much better solution would be to locate the ebike parking space at the end of STAMFORD RD., which runs parallel to Victoria Road and also ends in a cul-de-sac. The street here is wider, one side of the street has a blank wall of a block of flats, which has its own parking within the block. But the most compelling argument is that there is a pathway through to Cornwall Gardens at this end of the street - no steps.

[Additional Comments]

I am a resident of the lower end of Victoria Road, and I am writing to OBJECT to the proposed Dockless Ebike 'parking area' for the road at the top of the steps down to Kynance Mews.

There is a Nursery School whose entrance is just at the top of the steps from Kynance Mews – so Mums and carer's arrive twice a day with buggies/prams and vehicles. The Ebike area would be very much in the way. Also, the area outside the Nursery School (but within the grounds, and accessed through the same gate) is a carefully constructed 'Teaching Garden' which was opened a few years ago, and supported by RBKC, is host to school groups from various schools in the area.

The proposed area for the bikes is only accessible from below by a steep flight of steps – difficult to manage a heavy bike up the steps.

Parking in this area is at a premium. People who live in Kynance Mews park here, and on weekdays, there is so much building work going on that we residents often have to park at some distance from where we live. We pay very high Council Tax and are quite likely to have to pay more in the future, so I feel it would be unfair to make parking even more difficult for us.

The bikes very often end up in an untidy pile. If you look at the 'bay' for Ebikes at the top of Victoria Road, it is usually a mess and an eyesore. How is it that these bikes are allowed to park without a dock??

In a previous objection, I have suggested that the Ebike bay should be put at the end of Stanford Road – which is quieter, has more space, and has easier access to the passageway to Cornwall Gardens.

I d hope you will consider my objections carefully.

Objection Four

I wish to object to the proposed siting of the Victoria Road e-bike parking bays.

Being by the steps down to Kynance Mews, parking for those living in Kynance Mews, which is not possible in the Mews itself, will be further restricted.

It would be more sensible to put the e-bike parking bays around the corner in Eldon Road.

Objection Five

I wish to object to the proposed e-bike parking bays at the end of Victoria Rd by ChristChurch. There are few enough parking spaces in the area as it is. I live in Kynance Mews and the proposed space is the nearest residents parking to the Mews. It is normally possible to park there which is the nearest parking space to the Mews. There is no parking in the Mews.

Like at least half the residents in the Mews, I am quite elderly and it is considerably further to carry heavy shopping or luggage from other rare spaces in the neighbourhood.

Inevitably, some bikes will not be parked correctly which will lead to a trip hazard. This is a very busy thoroughfare for pedestrians (including many children going to St Thomas's school) walking along the adjoining pavement to go down or up the steps into the mews. They do not want to get tangled up with bicyclist who are frequently to be seen on pavements as well as the road.

Eldon road which is less busy would be a better site.

[Additional Comments]

I refer to the proposal to position a dockless bicycle station at the end of Victoria Rd W8 by ChristChurch. I have 2 main objections:

1) Safety:

Bicycles regularly get left on the pavement close to these stations as well as on the road. See the photo of the dockless station in Gloucester Road.

The pavement is quite narrow and close to the steps to Kynance Mews which are used by school children going to Thomas's school, mothers with prams picking children up from the nursery at the rear of Christchurch, elderly people carrying shopping and luggage and dog walkers, on top of random pedestrians. There can be quite a bottle neck in this area now, let alone once people are having to negotiate around bicycles. Apart from inconsiderate parking of bicycles, they can get blown over in the wind, adding to the obstacle course this creates.

2) Reduction of parking spaces for residents.

Residents of Kynance Mews cannot park in the Mews and it is not easy to drive in and back out again from the cul de sac end. A number of the residents of the cul de sac end are elderly, including me. The nearest parking is at the bottom of Victoria Rd. It is difficult to carry heavy shopping or luggage from further up the road.

Please reconsider your plan.

Objection Six

I object to the proposed location of the above bike bay as it is in such a quiet, almost remote corner of such a very residential area.

As an alternative I would like to propose Kynance Place, a cul de sac off Gloucester Road and within easy reach of the proposed location. There it would be more accessible to the shops and restaurants on Gloucester Road thereby having more use yet less disturbance to residents (the unlock tone is so annoying). A Kynance Place bay would also increase the accessibility of the Gloucester Road businesses and so help revitalise our "high street", so there would be a double benefit by choosing that location.

I am very supportive of these bays local to where people live, work and shop to encourage their use and to prevent the bikes being scattered everywhere. More needs to be done to fine (more regularly) and even ban persistent offenders which you should insist upon with the providers. But a pre-requisite for that is a good network of these sensibly located bays which RBKC is very close to achieving.

Objection Seven

There are two proposed parking bays within the area of the Victoria Road Area Residents' Association:

- St Albans Grove; and
- Victoria Road.

We are unconvinced of the need for these two bays because:

- there is an absence of any “destinations” within our area;
- the area is a “low traffic neighbourhood”, with no through traffic and, even though it has cycle Quietways, is largely unfamiliar to anyone who does not have a reason to come into the area; and
- there is little local demand from residents for e-bike hire.

The main attractions/destinations in this area are:

- Kensington High Street;
- Gloucester Road North Local Centre; and, to a lesser extent
- Kensington Gardens.

In terms of “evidence” of lack of demand:

- From observation, there have been few instances within our area of rental e-bikes being “parked”; and
- From e-bike websites, a snapshot of where bikes have been parked shows that this area seldom has any e-bikes left on the street.

Unless you have clear evidence of a need for parking bays in this area, we would suggest that the two bays proposed cannot be justified.

Individual proposals:

In terms of the individual proposals:

- The location of the St Albans Grove bay is very close to the junction with Victoria Road which is subject to congestion problems because St Albans Grove cannot accommodate two-way traffic; and
- The Victoria Road bay is in an area subject to parking pressures from the cars of residents in Kynance Mews and from Cornwall Gardens.

These proposals were very fully discussed at the VRARA Committee last Thursday night. We would like to reaffirm our support for cycling, but we have strong reservations about the need for e-bike bays within our area as well as about the two specific proposals.

Objection Eight

I am opposed to removing a resident parking bay in this location and putting an e-bike parking bay at this location. It makes no sense at all. I had a look on a friend’s Lime Bike App and there were no bikes parked in the area at all—but there were many parked on Gloucester Road. Why not put the parking bay there where there is more use?

The residents' parking on the southern end of Victoria Road is already under severe strain as people living in Kynance Mews have all converted their garages into living space and park in these bays along with the people living on Victoria Road. In addition, even residents from Cornwall Gardens park here as well. It would make more sense to take away a pay and display bay from Gloucester Road.

Objection Nine

I am also resident of the area and believe that Kynance Place is a very good location for such a bay [instead]. there are no cars passing thought and it's repaired from the wind.

I would also like to stress that most of the locals who use such bikes are not up to date with your surveys and might not email you to express support - while the people who are against it seem to beote engaged.

I am a street representative for VRARA and although we have expressed an opinion on the matter, our members have not been consulted on the proposed bay.