

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
REDCLIFFE 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 Redcliffe 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 Redcliffe 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, 138 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 two of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5 and one, The Boltons, received no site-specific objections. Having considered the objections to the Cresswell Gardens and Oakfield Street 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
S534a. Cathcart Road	1 (13)	0 (2)	3 (10)	0	Proceed
S534b. Cresswell Gardens	12 (24)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Do not proceed
S534c. Oakfield Street	13 (25)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S534d. The Boltons	0 (12)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S534e. Westgate Terrace	3 (15)	0 (2)	0 (7)	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 Respondents on Cathcart Road and Westgate Terrace 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 are to convert Pay by Phone visitor bays.

E-bikes left on footways/E-bike users do not return e-bikes to designated bays

- 5.5 Two respondents on Westgate Terrace objected on the basis that e-bikes are often left on footways and this posed a hazard to pedestrians, and to those using wheelchairs or pushchairs.

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 One respondent on Westgate Terrace 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. 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.

Poor behaviour by cyclists

- 5.9 One respondents on Westgate Terrace objected on the basis that cyclists exhibit poor behaviour such as cycling the wrong way on one-way roads.

Officer Response

- 5.10 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

- 5.11 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	this location is between 2 main arteries in London - Redcliffe Garden and Finsborough road. There is a lot of through traffic including heavy good vehicles and not a lot of foot traffic or cyclists; (Westgate Terrace proposal)	Residents of this area are not well served by the existing e-bike parking bay network, this proposal will improve access to this transport option. It is not necessary to cycle along the Red Route roads to reach Westgate Terrace,
2	bike users are not insured (Westgate Terrace proposal)	Bike users are not required to provide insurance, any such requirement can only be implemented by central government.
3	I work as an A&E doctor and I'm sick and tired of having to treat the irresponsible individuals who use the electric bikes and scooters. They would also present a hazard on the pavement outside my front door. I am therefore totally opposed to this initiative here or anywhere else in the borough. (Westgate Terrace proposal)	We have no evidence that e-bike users are more likely to be injured whilst riding than other cyclists. 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. 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.

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Cllr Sidney Yankson

I would like to formally object on behalf of residents to the schemes in The Boltons and Westgate. This is based on verbal conversations with residents that did not reply online to the consultation.

Cllr Tom Bennett

I am happy to proceed with all three recommended locations.

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 residents 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 Hospital 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 Cathcart Road

Objection One

This will reduce space for car parking when there is already not enough spaces currently available for residents cars. Bikes parked next to cars often fall over and cause damage. E-bike Parking should be reserved for roads where there is sufficient space. This area of Cathcart Road is not suitable for e-bike parking.

Support in Full One

No comments received

Support in Full Two

Please install as many bays as possible. If it were up to me, I would do away with the bays system entirely and reinstate the freedom to park the bike wherever one may please. The bikes are vital to a green future and allowing us to find viable alternatives to the “last mile” of transport. Thank you!

Support in Full Three

No comments received

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

Objection One

I have lived in the corner of Old Brompton Road and Cresswell Gardens for some years now and have seen how challenging parking has become for residents, including myself with small children. A bicycle hanger was recently installed removing parking on Gledhow Gardens where it meets Old Brompton Road (and which is just opposite Cresswell Gardens) and it would be a shame to see further parking removed from this little neighborhood street. It doesn't seem at all the right place for it, I would much more recommend a road closer to either Cromwell Road or Gloucester Road like the bottom of Bina Gardens. Cresswell Gardens is busier than it needs to be given lorries sometimes use it as they can't get through Drayton Gardens because of the barriers. It seems it would add a safety issue with the tight corners there (especially with trucks) as well so please do reconsider this street.
Thank you.

Objection Two

I have only twice seen e-bikes on the street so do not feel losing parking space for bike parking space is necessary on Cresswell Gardens. If space were deemed necessary, the side opposite should be considered : I believe that the end of the residents parking along side 14 Cresswell Gardens by Cresswell Cottage is more suitable and would not remove an entire parking spot -- especially one near our only e-charging station.

Objection Three

not enough resident parking spaces

Objection Four

Lack of parking

Objection Five

There is very limited parking in Drayton Gardens, therefore we often have to find a place to park in Cresswell Gardens. As my husband and I are both in our mid 70s we find this often very difficult.

To remove more residents parking would add to our difficulties ...

We have been residents for 42 years..

there are lots of free spaces for bikes on the Old Brompton road near corner with Roland Gardens, so more parking for bikes seem unnecessary.

Objection Six

I strongly disagree with the proposal up for consideration for e bike storage in the proposed sitting at Cresswell Gardens which is totally unsuitable.

I am sure this will be pointed out by many others. There are other locations nearby which are far more fit for purpose.

Objection Seven

As a local I object to the proposal to install a dockless cycle bay in Cresswell Gardens.
The position proposed is highly dangerous to cycle users.
It is situated on a narrow road with a 90 degree corner where large lorries turn.
There are more suitable and less dangerous locations in the near vicinity.

Objection Eight

As a Cresswell Gardens resident I object to the proposal to install a dockless cycle bay in Cresswell Gardens.
The position proposed is highly dangerous to cycle users.
It is situated on a narrow road at exactly a 90 degree corner where large lorries turn.
There are more suitable and less dangerous locations in the near vicinity.
Also, Cresswell Gardens has limited residents parking spaces and to lose another is not beneficial.

Objection Nine

I write to object to the above proposed e bikes docking station near the corner of Cresswell Gardens and Cresswell Place, London SW5 0BJ.

Health & Safety

This corner is used by large lorries and vehicles that cannot use Drayton Garden due to its narrowed opening on the corner of Old Brompton Rd and Drayton gardens.

It is also a rat run for vehicles from both end of the Old Brompton Rd. I believe were a bike bay to be introduced in the proposed location that it would exacerbate difficulties for turning vehicles on this corner.

Please note that I am taking account the newly proposed no Right turn into Cresswell Gardens from Old Brompton Rd. (Ref: NCIL/204/RC09).

Lack of parking provision

Cresswell Mews opposite houses numerous garages and there still insufficient street parking space for residents.

Lack of pavement space

In this exact location there are mature oak trees which practically fill the pavement making the footpath very narrow. This would cause a nuisance to residents, people with buggies and older people all year round but render the footpath prohibitive in the summer months when bikes are used most.

E bike bays nearby

Several meters away and parallel to the 12 Cresswell Gardens' proposal as the crow flies on The Boltons is a similar proposal for a dockless station (Ref: Dockless Bikes II/ NS/ S534d).

I would suggest this location is better than that of Cresswell Gardens in terms of parking provision. There is also an existing bike station on Old Brompton Rd (opposite Rosary Gardens).

In summary, I do not feel it would be safe for vehicles or people at this location and that dockless bike bays should be on roads with existing commercial presence for both bikers' usage and in order to limit nuisance in quiet residential areas.

Objection Ten

As a local resident I object to the proposal to install a dockless cycle bay in Cresswell Gardens.

The position proposed is highly dangerous to cycle users.

It is situated on a narrow road with a 90 degree corner where large lorries turn.

There are more suitable and less dangerous locations in the near vicinity.

Objection Eleven

I write to object to the above proposed e bikes docking station near the corner of Cresswell Gardens and Cresswell Place, London SW5 0BJ.

Health & Safety

This corner is used by large lorries and vehicles that cannot use Drayton Garden due to its narrowed opening on the corner of Old Brompton Rd and Drayton gardens.

It is also a rat run for vehicles from both end of the Old Brompton Rd. I believe were a bike bay to be introduced in the proposed location that it would exacerbate difficulties for turning vehicles on this corner.

Please note that I am taking account the newly proposed no Right turn into Cresswell Gardens from Old Brompton Rd. (Ref: NCIL/204/RC09).

Lack of parking provision

Cresswell Mews opposite houses numerous garages and there still insufficient street parking space for residents.

Lack of pavement space

In this exact location there are mature oak trees which practically fill the pavement making the footpath very narrow. This would cause a nuisance to residents, people with buggies and older people all year round but render the footpath prohibitive in the summer months when bikes are used most.

E bike bays nearby

Several meters away and parallel to the 12 Cresswell Gardens' proposal as the crow flies on The Boltons is a similar proposal for a dockless station (Ref: Dockless Bikes II/ NS/ S534d).

I would suggest this location is better than that of Cresswell Gardens in terms of parking provision. There is also an existing bike station on Old Brompton Rd (opposite Rosary Gardens).

In summary, I do not feel it would be safe for vehicles or people at this location and that dockless bike bays should be on roads with existing commercial presence for both bikers' usage and in order to limit nuisance in quiet residential areas.

Objection Twelve

I hope this message finds you well. We are writing to express our concerns and those of our neighbours regarding the council's proposal to create additional parking bays dedicated to e-bike hire operators and their customers outside 12 Cresswell Gardens, within the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

While we fully support initiatives aimed at promoting sustainable travel options, we believe that the specific location chosen for these e-bike parking bays would not be suitable for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Existing Parking for Residents:** Our street already faces a significant shortage of parking spaces for residents' vehicles. By allocating precious space to e-bike parking, the situation would be exacerbated, causing inconvenience to local homeowners and tenants who rely on on-street parking for their vehicles.
2. **Increased Traffic Congestion:** The introduction of an e-bike hire station is likely to attract additional foot and cycling traffic to the area. This increase in activity, coupled with the loss of car parking spaces, could lead to more congestion on our already narrow street, potentially creating safety risks for both pedestrians and cyclists.
3. **Visual and Noise Disturbance:** The constant coming and going of e-bike users, particularly during peak hours and weekends, could lead to increased noise and disturbance. Additionally, the presence of the docking station and parked e-bikes could detract from the aesthetic appeal of our residential area, impacting the character of Cresswell Gardens.
4. **Access for Emergency and Service Vehicles:** The reduction in available space for vehicles could potentially hinder the access of emergency and service vehicles. This is a significant concern for residents, particularly in scenarios requiring urgent response.
5. **Impact on Property Values:** There is a concern that the introduction of a commercial e-bike hire facility could impact local property values. Potential buyers might view the reduced availability of parking and increased street activity as negative factors.

In light of these concerns, we strongly urge the Sustainable Travel Team to reconsider the proposed location for the e-bike hire parking bays. We believe that a more suitable alternative can be found that balances the need for sustainable transport options with the needs and concerns of local residents.

We are open to discussing this matter further and would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in consultations regarding this proposal. Our goal is to find a solution that benefits the community as a whole while preserving the quality of life for the residents of Cresswell Gardens.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We look forward to your response and hope for a positive outcome.

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Oakfield Street

Objection One

The e bike spaces, become messy with multiple bikes and many bikes knocked over which looks ugly and messy. Bikes are also left around the space and slightly wider area as well which become a hazard when on pavements.

Objection Two

Resident parking in the area is a challenge because of local restaurants and pubs attracting lots of clients who park indiscriminately in the resident spaces and on yellow lines taking advantage of the absence of any controls in the afternoon and evening. We need more resident parking bay, not less, in the area and more controls. Additionally, an e-bike area will increase noise in the area as more restaurants and pubs noisy clients may reach the area after their night out if they decide to use e-bike as transport. Right now the same crowd will either catch a taxi or drive, action which fortunately mostly take place in the vicinity of restaurants and pubs.

Objection Three

While we all appreciate the council's efforts to support green initiatives and protect the environment, the measures they decide to take should be fair and not penalise RBKC residents who pay taxes and levies to the council.

As both a resident and worker within RBKC, the parking arrangements are amongst the best in London and worthy also of preservation.

As the council is aware, there are parking pressures across many parts of the borough where residents struggle to find space to park their cars, even though they pay the council a fee for the privilege .

The removal of resident parking bays will therefore only exacerbate the issue and, it can be argued, is unfair and legally questionable without a proportional reduction in parking fees charged to residents who will be left with a dwindling number of spaces in which to park.

There is of course a need for electric bicycle parking to be tidied up but this should not be at the expense of local residents who pay their council tax and parking permit fees in good faith.

It would therefore be appreciated if the council could propose converting either pay and display spaces (which serve visitors who are not carrying the burden of RBKC taxes) or alternatively single / double yellow lines of which there are ample opportunities at either end of Oakfield, Fawcett, Cathcart or Hollywood Road.

Objection Four

It would be a crazy decision to locate ebike parking at the junction of Oakfield Street and Fawcett Street.

This corner is under a lot of pressure as it is opposite the back entrance to The Servite School and may parents use Fawcett & Oakfield for drop off and collections. Others in you team should be aware of the issues her following discussions with ward councillors and members of the RBKC highways team in the run up the the Hollywood Road project.

A much better location would be Cathcart Road due to its much greater width.

Objection Five

The proposed parking bay is directly opposite the rear school entrance of the Servite RC Primary School - https://mapcarta.com/W856903724#google_vignette - where parents drop off their children. Fawcett Street is the narrowest road v Cathcart and Tregunter and therefore likely to be the most congested/polluting in the event that the e-bike station is located there. There are higher volumes of traffic

on Fawcett Street as the only West to Eastbound Road and I therefore suggest that if there needs to be a e-bike station it should be on the corner of Cathcart and Oakfield Street or on Cathcart Street itself which will be a far safer drop off point for anyone using an e-bike.

Objection Six

1. Oakfield St is a narrow street and unsuitable for a cycle bay. Broader one way streets such as Cathcart Road or Hollywood Road would be more suitable.
2. The proposed bay would be directly facing the Fawcett St entrance to the large Servite School, where large numbers of parents drop off children in the morning and then wait in their cars to collect them in the afternoon. The Council has now planned to stop traffic turning left from Hollywood Road into Fawcett Street as part of the Hollywood Road redevelopment. As a consequence, parents will now have to get to the school gate by turning left into Cathcart Road and then left into Oakfield Street. This will significantly increase the traffic in Oakfield St. The substantial number of parents waiting in cars inevitably results in them ignoring all parking restrictions and already makes it difficult for residents of Fawcett Street to find any residents parking at these times.
3. The current Hollywood Road redevelopment plan has already resulted in a reduction in of residents parking . Customers coming to the restaurants in Hollywood Road bring many extra cars to the area which is considerably exacerbated when there is a football match. On these evenings, residents of Fawcett St returning from work after 6:30 regularly have to drive as far as the Boltons to find the first available resident's parking space.

Objection Seven

The parking bay facility in The entire Borough is vastly over subscribed and yet the price to park increases each year, Now with the almost pedestrianisation of Hollywood Rd between Fawcett and Cathcart more bays for local residents are lost, to benefit the businesses there only. Sometimes I have to park in the Boltons three streets and a ten minute walk away. Local Residents are being marginalised.

Objection Eight

Hello, There is a school pick up at 3.00 pm everyday on Fawcett Street. Both Oakfield and Fawcett get jammed. Remove more parking spaces will only make it worse.

Please don't install there.

Many thanks

Objection Nine

Hello,

Although it is a great initiative, I strongly oppose to having the e-bike docks on Oakfield street for the following reasons:

- there is already e-bike parking space at the beginning of Hollywood road
- this area is crowded with restaurants and terraces - which is lovely - but having an e-bike dock here would mean that there would be a possibility that the bikes are parked not in the places they are meant to be parked at

- this area is already busy and there are other places nearby which are less busy i.e. Tregunter road for example that could easily accommodate such a parking facility
 - the corner of Oakfield and Fawcett Street gets also very crowded due to people dropping off and collecting their children from the school
- I sincerely hope that the locations should be reconsidered.

Objection Ten

To begin I'd like to say I am very much in favour of ebike bays and use ebikes regularly myself. However, I am opposed to the location you cite.

The majority of e-bike usage is likely to be to come to the shops/bars in Hollywood road. By situating the bike bay in Oakfield street it will increase the amount of footfall and bike travel along Fawcett street. You have just spend a load of money making the Hollywood road/Fawcett street corner safer by reducing the left urn from Hollywood road. You will now have e-bikes turning left ignoring the "no left turn" and causing a risk to pedestrians. Why not cite the bay on Hollywood road where the users are travelling to (This was obviously the main port of call as it's where the bikes ended up prior to the parking being restricted).

Additionally you have a school opposite the bay. Citing an e-bike bay there increases the risk of an accident with schoolchildren regularly walking in Fawcett Street.

Objection Eleven

Hello, Please dont install ebike parking there.

Fawcett and Oakfield Streets get very jammed because of school pick up at 3.00 pm every day..

so please do not removed more spaces..

Objection Twelve

I want to object to the proposal to put a dockless e-bike parking zone in Oakfield Street, on the corner with Fawcett Street.

Oakfield Street is a very narrow, entirely residential street, in an area where parking is very difficult at the best of times. Putting a dockless bike parking area there makes no sense, and will cause difficulties both for driving and parking. There is currently only one bike parking zone in Hollywood Road, a much wider road that is one-way. Perhaps a zone there, near all the restaurants, would make more sense?

I understand that there is certainly an issue with bike parking in the area - we are absolutely fed up with bikes being chucked around, lying on the pavements and on the street, an absolute trip hazard for pedestrians. However, bike parking zones should be in wider roads, not in narrow, residential streets. How about an extended bike parking zones in Redcliffe Gardens or Finborough Road?

Objection Thirteen

I am writing to object to the instalment of a new e-Bike Cycle Bay Parking in Oakfield Street (OS) Chelsea.

The reasons for my objection are the following:

- After the road works are completed on Hollywood Road (HR), there will be no left turn on Fawcett Street (FS) from HR, therefore the traffic for FS from Fulham Road will be directed to turn left into Cathcart Road, then left into OS. This will create additional congestion during the drop-off and pick-up times during the school runs especially at the local Primary Servite School.
 - Safety - more e-bikes might turn right into HR, creating confusion among drivers and possible accidents.
 - Reducing already the limited parking availability in the area. I have two young children, 1 & 3 years old, and I already experience difficulties in finding parking in FS. Removing additional parking space in OS will put more families in more difficulty of finding a parking space close to where they live in FS.
 - The e-bike users are often people who come to the area to visit the bars & restaurants in HR, where currently most of the e-bikes are left, especially during the football match days at the Chelsea stadium. Therefore the e-bike parking bay would make more sense to be placed in HR.
- Given the above reasons, I hope you will consider changing your plans to install the new e-Bike Cycle Bay Parking in OS.
Thanks in advance for your consideration.

Support in Full One

proposals are reasonable provided users are educated to park their bicycles considerately

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in The Boltons

No site specific responses were received to this proposal.

The objection of The Boltons Association is recorded as Objection Four in Appendix 2: Responses received from respondents wishing their responses to apply to all proposed locations

Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Westgate Terrace

Objection One

1-I believe users will not follow rules anyway

2-bike users are not insured

3-more bikes in this area will only complicated the lives of people around, as these users do not follow rules and do drive on sidewalks, roads, anywhere the can. I was almost overrun various rimes

4-taking more space from our parking bays is getting ridiculous, especially with charges going up too.

People have cars because they need them and do not use them all the time. So they need proper residents parking. My 80 year old neighbour uses it to go to the supermarket, as she cannot afford other costs

She already has the car, so she is averaging it's cost down. It has been years. When the council continues to reduce parking availability to those who pay and increases fees, normal people are left worse off. It is not my fault a 20 year old has no money to buy a car and uses a bike. But they do not follow rules, have no insurance. Those who have had cars long ago and need them should not be sacrificed vs bike users.

Objection Two

I am not in favour of the installation here for a number of reasons:

1. Issues with bays - this is a major concern. I have walked by a number of these bays over the city and 3 days ago by one next to Mansion House, and it was a mess. Apart from the bay itself, there were at least 2 more rows of bikes parked in front of the bay (taking up space on the road) and more on the sides of the bay, as if it justified them being there. At other spots, I have seen bikes parked all over on the pavement and taking up much more space on either side of the bay as again, through proximity it justified them being there.

2. Location - this location is between 2 main arteries in London - Redcliffe Garden and Finsborough road. There is a lot of through traffic including heavy good vehicles and not a lot of foot traffic or cyclists; at rush hour all the roads on either side of the main roads are used by drivers as short cuts; since we have been here, a roundabout was added in and one corner of it is the proposed bay. So with all the traffic we will then have to contend with bikes placed haphazardly, which will probably end up causing safety issues and would definitely impact our quality of life.

3. Parking - We have recently had a secure bike unit installed almost opposite the proposed bay and this new bay will take an additional 5m of parking space. This area with multiple flats per building would be considered a high density living area and with the church being very active, more often than not, it's almost impossible to find any resident parking spaces.

I do think the bays are helpful as they do deter electric bikes from being placed randomly all over the borough, and would hopefully stop them being placed on the pavement outside our building entrance, but I think Westgate Terrace may not be the best place for it.

Thank you.

Objection Three

I work as an A&E doctor and I'm sick and tired of having to treat the irresponsible individuals who use the electric bikes and scooters. They would also present a hazard on the pavement outside my front door. I am therefore totally opposed to this initiative here or anywhere else in the borough.

