

**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  
ROYAL HOSPITAL 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 Royal Hospital 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 Royal Hospital 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, 153 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the five proposals, four drew objections. Officers did not agree with the objections in respect of two of them, and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Dilke Street and Markham Square proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed with these locations. The Ellis Street proposal received no site-specific objections.
- 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
S535a. Cadogan Gardens	1 (13)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S535b. Dilke Street	19 (31)	0 (2)	3 (10)	0	Do not proceed
S535c. Ellis Street	0 (12)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S535d. Markham Square	16 (28)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Do not proceed
S521e. Royal Hospital Road	5 (17)	1 (3)	2 (9)	0	Proceed

## 5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

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

### Loss of parking space

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

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

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

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

Officer Response

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

parked in the proposed bays should affect traffic movement along the street any more than at present.

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

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

Officer Response

- 5.10 Rental e-bike operators are clear that customers will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that a customer never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council is keen to therefore increase the network of available bays. In some cases, this means introducing additional bays close to existing bays, where those bays have proved popular than others and are sometimes leading to overspill.
- 5.11 Whilst some customers may use bikes from multiple operators, including TfL's Santander Cycle Hire, many are loyal to one operator – in order to reduce the number of apps on phones for example. There are far fewer Santander Cycle Hire stations across the borough than there are dockless e-bike bays, and in turn far more journeys are made by dockless e-bikes than Santander Cycle Hire bikes. It follows that more bays are required for those operators, and that they are likely to be desirable near Cycle Hire bays as these were proposed near desirable locations to start or end cycle journeys.

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

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

Officer Response

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

**Poor behaviour by cyclists**

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

Officer Response

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

parking bays will not affect the number of dockless ebikes in circulation , or the behaviour of the people riding those ebikes.

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

- 5.16 One respondent to the Cadogan Gardens proposal suggests using the 'Paved triangular area between Cadogan Gardens, Symons Street and the rear of Peter Jones'

#### Officer Response

- 5.17 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.18 Cadogan Gardens. This site has been discounted as encouraging e-bikes on the footway here would add more clutter to an already very busy pedestrian area occupied by Sheffield stands, benches, a telephone kiosk an EV charging point and litter bins.

### **Other comments**

- 5.19 Table 2 lists comments received sitting outside of the above themes, alongside officer responses.

**Table 2 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1	One respondent said that there was already an e-bike docking bay opposite Nos 47 to 57 Cadogan Gardens. (Cadogan Gardens proposal)	The Santander dock on the opposite side of the road is not related to the e-bike proposal and is consistently amongst the most popular in the borough. However not all rental bike users want to use Santander, preferring the dockless model.
2	One respondent said that during certain times, such as Chelsea Flower Show, there is more pressure on traffic and parking. (Royal Hospital Road proposal)	The proposed bay will be suspended for the duration of the Flower Show or any other unusual events.
3	One respondent objected to the proposal on the basis that the location was on a major road often used as a bus route diversion when the Kings Road is blocked. (Royal Hospital Road proposal)	Experience of e-bike bays on similar busy roads with bus routes suggests this factor does not impact the flow of traffic.

**Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments**

No comments received

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

### Objection One

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

### Objection Two

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

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

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

### Objection Three

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

### Objection Four (The Boltons Association)

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

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

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

### **Objection Five**

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

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

E-bike 'explodes' outside Buckingham Palace

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

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

Please keep E-bikes off the streets of Kensington.

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

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

We have reservations concerning this proposal.

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

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

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

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



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

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

#### **Objection Seven**

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

#### **Objection Eight**

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

#### **Objection Nine**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Objection Ten**

I object ebikes

#### **Objection Eleven**

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

#### **Objection Twelve**

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

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

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

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

[Additional Comments]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for taking the WestWays views into consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Support in Full Three**

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

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

### **Support in Full Four**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Officer responses to objections**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

None of the proposals are proposed in disabled parking bays.



### **Dangerous cycling**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

### **Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Cadogan Gardens**

#### **Objection One**

An e-bike docking bay already occupies the entire length of the road opposite Nos 47 to 57 Cadogan Gardens. The maximum number of car parking spaces outside Nos 47 to 57 Cadogan Gardens is now approximately four. The proposed site is likely to be popular owing to its close proximity to Peter Jones and King's Road. Judging by the use of the e-parking zone marked out on the pavement at the Sloane Square end of Sloane Street, it is unlikely e-bikes will be neatly parked within the bay or confined to it. Any overspill will likely encroach on what is left of the resident's parking bay, impede vehicles turning left out of Culford Gardens and further clutter an area that is busy with traffic making deliveries and collections from the rear of Peter Jones/John Lewis dept store. A better location might be on the paved triangular area between Cadogan Gardens, Symons Street and the rear of Peter Jones.

#### Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Dilke Street

##### Objection One

I live [redacted] to the proposed site for a cycle park on Dilke Street SW3 (north side), which fact I mention only to declare an interest and to reveal daily experience of what I write below. Obviously close residence is not per se a ground for opposing the Council's proposal.

I wish to oppose the proposed cycle park because

a) it is situated at the junction of two roads where there is close to zero cycle use and where there is close to zero parking on the pavement of Lyme pay-as-you-go bicycles,

b) the residents of Dilke Street and Swan Walk do not own cycles, with two exceptions at [redacted] Swan Walk, because

c) the two age groups resident here are office workers, absent by day, aged 35-60 and non-cycling pensioners aged 60+; the cycling generation, predominantly aged 18-35, is 100% absent because of the cost of owning or renting property between Royal Hospital Road and the river.

d) The road area identified for the cycle park serves daily as a tight three-point turning circle for lorries collecting and delivering soil and plants to the Chelsea Physic Garden; the entry gate to its waste and storage area is awkwardly placed on a road (Swan Walk) that is No Entry at both ends, meaning it can only be accessed, with turns and reversals, from Dilke Street.

e) For amenity reasons, it would be a pity if a cycle park was created on this charming and tree-lined corner, in front of Grade 2 listed buildings, and used as a film set 3-4 times in 2023.

f) The Old Chelsea streets south of Royal Hospital Road down to the Embankment are 100% residential and contain no commercial destinations where cycle parking would be useful.

These reasons are offered on daily observation since I moved here in March 2023.

##### Objection Two

I am objecting to the proposed bicycle parking scheme in Dilke Street.

The reasons for the objection:

This area is predominantly a residential area. Resident car parking is difficult for those living in The Embankment, Tite Street, Paradise Walk, Dilke Street and Swan Walk on an overnight basis, and I regularly have to park up to 300 to 400 yards from where I live, which is very inconvenient.

There has been a diminution of car parking with the provision of a motor-cycle bay at the Royal Hospital Road end of Swan Walk, that would otherwise have housed 2 to 3 vehicles.

There has been additional provision in the area for Pay & Display parking at the expense of RBKC residential parking, admittedly for the benefit of visitors and trades people.

The proposal, at best, will remove another bay. In isolation, the removal of 1 bay shouldn't matter, but the loss of residents car parking is now significant.

I have enclosed 3 photos taken today of bicycles (not staged!) parked on Cheltenham Terrace this afternoon at around 13.30hrs which I think is instructive.

You will observe bicycles parked on:

The pavement and causing an obstruction to pedestrians,

Double yellow lines; car drivers are normally fined and removed for this parking infraction,

Two bicycles causing an obstruction on Cheltenham Terrace into the Kings Road,

Bicycle Bay is full and of carelessly parked cycles.

And a significant overspill of bicycles into residents parking bays, reducing parking availability for residents.

I took another 2 photos at around 16.00hrs on Cheltenham Terrace which shows a similar state of affairs, which I think is unacceptable.

The users and suppliers of the bicycles should be capable of being fined and prosecuted (if appropriate) sufficiently heavily that it will discourage poor behaviour, but that leads down into another rabbit hole but one that should be pursued!

I have enclosed a photo, taken by a near neighbour this afternoon of the parking at Durham Place at the Royal Hospital Road end, showing how users use the parking space provided. It should come as no great surprise that objections will be lodged.

### **Objection Three**

I write in support of [redacted]'s objection to the proposed dockless bike hire bay on Swan Walk. I am resident at [redacted] Swan Walk and see no reason to have a bay on this street, it being rarely used by anyone except the residents, many of whom already struggle to park near their homes and who certainly have no need of these bikes.

Those who are cyclists (myself included) keep their bicycles in their homes to avoid unsightly clutter on what is a charming street, deserving of careful conservation.

I would add that the dockless nature of these bikes encourages 'dumping' on nearby pavements. This poses a hazard to elderly residents and those with children or pets, by forcing them to circumnavigate the strewn bikes into an already narrow road.

[Additional Comments]

As the owner of [redacted], I was dismayed to hear that a bike bay is being installed outside 9 Swan Walk. It is a welcome quiet road although it did not stop us being the host to a murder attempt only a few years ago. But it would change the complexion of the place if it became a destination for Lime and Boris bikes. It also is a long way from either busy bus routes or the tube.

I do hope someone will be listening to us and acting accordingly.

#### **Objection Four**

As Chairman of the Physic Triangle Residents Association, of which Dilke Street and Swan Walk are integral parks, I object to the proposal to convert 5 metres of resident's parking to a dockless bike hire bay.

Residents already find it difficult to park their cars near their houses, for lack of spaces, and often have to go further afield to find a space.

Those residents who cycle have been doing so for years, and have no use for heavy unwieldy bikes.

This is not an area frequented by pedestrians, so it is very unlikely that people would wish to drop bikes there, or collect them.

The best solution is for bicyclists to have their own bikes and look after them

#### **Objection Five**

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Dilke Street/Swan Walk to express my objection to the planned installation of a dockless bike hire bay in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

While I fully support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasise the practical impact this development would have on the residents.

**Noise and Congestion:** Introducing a bike hire bay could increase foot traffic and noise, particularly if the area becomes a popular pick-up and drop-off point. This change could disrupt the peaceful and quiet residential nature of Dilke Street and Swan Walk.

**Security:** E-bikes attract younger and often less socially responsible types, leading to noise at all hours, litter, antisocial behaviour and an uptick in crime.

**Damage:** e-bikes are out of control, and e-bike bays are often overwhelmed with bikes which spill outside the bay, often toppling over, damaging cars and causing obstruction and a serious danger to pedestrians and vehicles.

**Loss of Valuable Parking Space:** The conversion of residents' parking into a bike hire bay will lose essential parking spaces. For those who rely on their vehicles for commuting, family needs, or due to mobility issues, this reduction could pose significant daily challenges and reduction in quality of life.

**Increased Parking Congestion:** With fewer parking spots, residents may park further from their homes. This can lead to increased congestion on neighbouring streets, potentially raising safety concerns and making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.

**Safety Concerns:** Increased bike and pedestrian traffic raises safety concerns and loss of amenity, especially for children and the elderly in the neighbourhood. The constant movement of bikes might increase the risk of accidents near our homes. Also, bikes are often placed randomly in the middle of the street and not in the actual bay area, leading to restrictions for residents particularly blighting the elderly, young and those with restricted mobility.

**Heritage Aesthetic Changes:** The bike bay will be an eyesore of bold and brightly branded bikes that will directly contrast the charming aesthetic of our historic streets. Installing a bike bay will alter the visual aesthetics of the neighbourhood. The presence of racks, signage, and possibly even advertising associated with the bike hire service would detract from the residential character of Dilke Street/Swan Walk.

**Environmental Impact:** While promoting cycling is environmentally friendly, the installation process and the infrastructure could have short-term environmental impacts, such as disruption during installation and potential cluttering of public spaces. The position of the proposed bike bay is also where residents place their rubbish for bi-weekly collection. The bike bay will impede this ability, leading to bikes and rubbish enmeshing together.

**Litter:** People often dump litter in bicycle baskets, which end up on the street either blown by the wind or dumped by the subsequent bicycle user.

**Lack of Consultation:** The council has not sufficiently consulted with the residents about this installation. There is a collective feeling that decisions are being made without adequate input from those most affected. Engaging with the community is crucial in considering all viewpoints and concerns.

**Better Alternatives:** The council should consider alternative locations for the bike hire bay that do not impinge on residential parking or living conditions. There may be other viable options nearby that meet the goals of increasing cycling without adversely impacting residents. Bays should never be placed directly in front of the main entrances to properties as is the case with the currently proposal in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

**Legal and Regulatory Oversight:** The council should adhere to the regulations outlined in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ensuring that all changes are lawful, considerate of public opinion, and genuinely beneficial to the community.

For the above reasons, we request that the proposed location for the dockless e-bike bay in Dilke Street/ Swan Walk is cancelled and a more suitable location found elsewhere.

**Objection Six**

I thoroughly OBJECT to having a dockless e bike point on dilke street and swan walk SW3.

This is a peaceful part of old Chelsea where the old character and charm of the neighbourhood would be ruined by a bike hire.

Additionally there could be an element of danger brought to the area and criminal crime be attracted to an area that has a lot of elderly people, especially visiting the gardens.

This is an extremely peaceful area In the evenings and that too is something we need to keep treasured and safe not create more havoc at all hours.

### **Objection Seven**

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Dilke Street/Swan Walk to express my objection to the planned installation of a dockless bike hire bay in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

While I fully support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasise the practical impact this development would have on the residents.

**\*Noise and Congestion\*:** Introducing a bike hire bay could increase foot traffic and noise, particularly if the area becomes a popular pick-up and drop-off point. This change could disrupt the peaceful and quiet residential nature of Swan Walk /Dilke Street.

**\*Security\*:** E-bikes attract younger and often less socially responsible types, leading to noise at all hours, litter, antisocial behaviour and an uptick in crime.

**\*Damage\*:** e-bikes are out of control, and e-bike bays are often overwhelmed with bikes which spill outside the bay, often toppling over, damaging cars and causing obstruction and a serious danger to pedestrians and vehicles.

**\*Loss of Valuable Parking Space\*:** The conversion of residents' parking into a bike hire bay will lose essential parking spaces. For those who rely on their vehicles for commuting, family needs, or due to mobility issues, this reduction could pose significant daily challenges and reduction in quality of life.

**\*Increased Parking Congestion\*:** With fewer parking spots, residents may park further from their homes. This can lead to increased congestion on neighbouring streets, potentially raising safety concerns and making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.

**\*Safety Concerns\*:** Increased bike and pedestrian traffic raises safety concerns and loss of amenity, especially for children and the elderly in the neighbourhood. The constant movement of bikes might increase the risk of accidents near our homes. Also, bikes are often placed randomly in the middle of the street and not in the actual bay area, leading to restrictions for residents particularly blighting the elderly, young and those with restricted mobility.

**\*Heritage Aesthetic Changes\*:** The bike bay will be an eyesore of bold and brightly branded bikes that will directly contrast the charming aesthetic of our historic streets. Installing a bike bay will alter the visual aesthetics of the neighbourhood. The presence of racks, signage, and possibly even advertising associated with the bike hire service would detract from the residential character of Dilke Street/Swan Walk.

\*Environmental Impact\*: While promoting cycling is environmentally friendly, the installation process and the infrastructure could have short-term environmental impacts, such as disruption during installation and potential cluttering of public spaces. The position of the proposed bike bay is also where residents place their rubbish for bi-weekly collection. The bike bay will impede this ability, leading to bikes and rubbish enmeshing together.

\*Litter\*: People often dump litter in bicycle baskets, which end up on the street either blown by the wind or dumped by the subsequent bicycle user.

\*Lack of Consultation\*: The council has not sufficiently consulted with the residents about this installation. There is a collective feeling that decisions are being made without adequate input from those most affected. Engaging with the community is crucial in considering all viewpoints and concerns.

\*Better Alternatives\*: The council should consider alternative locations for the bike hire bay that do not impinge on residential parking or living conditions. There may be other viable options nearby that meet the goals of increasing cycling without adversely impacting residents. Bays should never be placed directly in front of the main entrances to properties as is the case with the current proposal in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

\*Legal and Regulatory Oversight\*: The council should adhere to the regulations outlined in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ensuring that all changes are lawful, considerate of public opinion, and genuinely beneficial to the community.

For the above reasons, we request that the proposed location for the dockless e-bike bay in Dilke Street/ Swan Walk is withdrawn and a more suitable location found elsewhere.

### **Objection Eight**

REFERENCE - Dockless Bikes II/NS/S535b | Objection to Dockless Bike Hire Bay Installation on Dilke St/Swan Walk

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Dilke Street/Swan Walk to express my objection to the planned installation of a dockless bike hire bay in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

While I fully support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasise the practical impact this development would have on the residents.

\*Noise and Congestion\*: Introducing a bike hire bay could increase foot traffic and noise, particularly if the area becomes a popular pick-up and drop-off point. This change could disrupt the peaceful and quiet residential nature of Swan Walk /Dilke Street.



\*Security\*: E-bikes attract younger and often less socially responsible types, leading to noise at all hours, litter, antisocial behaviour and an uptick in crime.

\*Damage\*: e-bikes are out of control, and e-bike bays are often overwhelmed with bikes which spill outside the bay, often toppling over, damaging cars and causing obstruction and a serious danger to pedestrians and vehicles.

\*Loss of Valuable Parking Space\*: The conversion of residents' parking into a bike hire bay will lose essential parking spaces. For those who rely on their vehicles for commuting, family needs, or due to mobility issues, this reduction could pose significant daily challenges and reduction in quality of life.

\*Increased Parking Congestion\*: With fewer parking spots, residents may park further from their homes. This can lead to increased congestion on neighbouring streets, potentially raising safety concerns and making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.

\*Safety Concerns\*: Increased bike and pedestrian traffic raises safety concerns and loss of amenity, especially for children and the elderly in the neighbourhood. The constant movement of bikes might increase the risk of accidents near our homes. Also, bikes are often placed randomly in the middle of the street and not in the actual bay area, leading to restrictions for residents particularly blighting the elderly, young and those with restricted mobility.

\*Heritage Aesthetic Changes\*: The bike bay will be an eyesore of bold and brightly branded bikes that will directly contrast the charming aesthetic of our historic streets. Installing a bike bay will alter the visual aesthetics of the neighbourhood. The presence of racks, signage, and possibly even advertising associated with the bike hire service would detract from the residential character of Dilke Street/Swan Walk.

\*Environmental Impact\*: While promoting cycling is environmentally friendly, the installation process and the infrastructure could have short-term environmental impacts, such as disruption during installation and potential cluttering of public spaces. The position of the proposed bike bay is also where residents place their rubbish for bi-weekly collection. The bike bay will impede this ability, leading to bikes and rubbish enmeshing together.

\*Litter\*: People often dump litter in bicycle baskets, which end up on the street either blown by the wind or dumped by the subsequent bicycle user.

\*Lack of Consultation\*: The council has not sufficiently consulted with the residents about this installation. There is a collective feeling that decisions are being made without adequate input from those most affected. Engaging with the community is crucial in considering all viewpoints and concerns.

\*Better Alternatives\*: The council should consider alternative locations for the bike hire bay that do not impinge on residential parking or living conditions. There may be other viable options nearby that meet the goals of increasing cycling without adversely impacting residents. Bays should never be placed directly in front of the main entrances to properties as is the case with the current proposal in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

**\*Legal and Regulatory Oversight\*:** The council should adhere to the regulations outlined in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ensuring that all changes are lawful, considerate of public opinion, and genuinely beneficial to the community.

For the above reasons, we request that the proposed location for the dockless e-bike bay in Dilke Street/ Swan Walk is withdrawn and a more suitable location found elsewhere.

#### **Objection Nine**

This message is to express my objection to installing a dockless bike hire bay station on the corner of Dilke Street and Swan Walk. I am convinced the presence of the bike bay would lead to security risks for our homes and vehicles along with increased litter, noise and antisocial behaviour.

#### **Objection Ten**

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Dilke Street/Swan Walk to express my objection to the planned installation of a dockless bike hire bay in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

While I fully support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasise the practical impact this development would have on the residents.

**Noise and Congestion:** Introducing a bike hire bay could increase foot traffic and noise, particularly if the area becomes a popular pick-up and drop-off point. This change could disrupt the peaceful and quiet residential nature of Dilke Street and Swan Walk.

**Security:** E-bikes attract younger and often less socially responsible types, leading to noise at all hours, litter, antisocial behaviour and an uptick in crime.

**Damage:** e-bikes are out of control, and e-bike bays are often overwhelmed with bikes which spill outside the bay, often toppling over, damaging cars and causing obstruction and a serious danger to pedestrians and vehicles.

**Loss of Valuable Parking Space:** The conversion of residents' parking into a bike hire bay will lose essential parking spaces. For those who rely on their vehicles for commuting, family needs, or due to mobility issues, this reduction could pose significant daily challenges and reduction in quality of life.

**Increased Parking Congestion:** With fewer parking spots, residents may park further from their homes. This can lead to increased congestion on neighbouring streets, potentially raising safety concerns and making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.

**Safety Concerns:** Increased bike and pedestrian traffic raises safety concerns and loss of amenity, especially for children and the elderly in the neighbourhood. The constant movement of bikes might increase the risk of accidents near our homes. Also, bikes are often placed randomly in the middle of the street and not in the actual bay area, leading to restrictions for residents particularly blighting the elderly, young and those with restricted mobility.

**Heritage Aesthetic Changes:** The bike bay will be an eyesore of bold and brightly branded bikes that will directly contrast the charming aesthetic of our historic streets. Installing a bike bay will alter the visual aesthetics of the neighbourhood. The presence of racks, signage, and possibly even advertising associated with the bike hire service would detract from the residential character of Dilke Street/Swan Walk.

**Environmental Impact:** While promoting cycling is environmentally friendly, the installation process and the infrastructure could have short-term environmental impacts, such as disruption during installation and potential cluttering of public spaces. The position of the proposed bike bay is also where residents place their rubbish for bi-weekly collection. The bike bay will impede this ability, leading to bikes and rubbish enmeshing together.

**Litter:** People often dump litter in bicycle baskets, which end up on the street either blown by the wind or dumped by the subsequent bicycle user.

**Lack of Consultation:** The council has not sufficiently consulted with the residents about this installation. There is a collective feeling that decisions are being made without adequate input from those most affected. Engaging with the community is crucial in considering all viewpoints and concerns.

**Better Alternatives:** The council should consider alternative locations for the bike hire bay that do not impinge on residential parking or living conditions. There may be other viable options nearby that meet the goals of increasing cycling without adversely impacting residents. Bays should never be placed directly in front of the main entrances to properties as is the case with the currently proposal in Swan Walk/ Dilke Street.

**Legal and Regulatory Oversight:** The council should adhere to the regulations outlined in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ensuring that all changes are lawful, considerate of public opinion, and genuinely beneficial to the community.

For the above reasons, we request that the proposed location for the dockless e-bike bay in Dilke Street/ Swan Walk is cancelled and a more suitable location found elsewhere.

### **Objection Eleven**

We are writing to object to the proposal to put an ebike parking bay on the corner of Clover Mews and Dilke Street. The majority of cyclists in this neighbourhood already have their own bikes and we don't see that there would be a lot of demand for on street ebike parking.

We think it would be better to site the ebike parking at the top of Swan Walk - where it would be convenient for the Physic Garden or the top of Tite Street where it would be handy for the National Army Museum.

Another alternative would be to site it on the Embankment where increased use of bicycles would increase cycle awareness among car drivers and help encourage people to observe the 20mph speed limit.

### **Objection Twelve**

I am writing to object to the proposed siting of a dockless cycle parking bay on the corner of Dilke Street and Clover Mews.

As a regular user of hire e-bikes myself I am well aware of the need for more bicycle infrastructure in the Borough and support the intention to improve bike parking facilities in the vicinity. However the site for this parking bay seems very ill chosen for several reasons:

- 1.
- 2.
3. There is very limited requirement for
4. a cycle bay in this location and much better alternatives. The demand for local
5. cycling parking facilities comes mostly from residents of the embankment or Royal Hospital Road. Very few bikes are parked at the moment on the streets around this site, notably Dilke Street , Swan Walk and Paradise Walk for the obvious reason that they are
6. relatively sparsely populated. There are much better alternative sites that would meet local demand and not disturb the quiet street appearance and visual amenity of the historic Dilke Street and surrounding conservation area. For instance:

7.
  - 
  - 
  - A site on the Embankment close to the Southern end of Tite Street would be much more
  - useful and it would be safe and logical to put this at the end of the level crossing on the embankment or adjoining the end of Embankment Gardens.

Already there are more bikes parked randomly along the embankment where there is a larger resident population.

- 
- 
- There is already a motor cycle bay not well used at the top of Swan Walk and this could
- be extended to include e-bike cycles and this would serve both the needs of residents on the embankment and on Royal Hospital Road. At the moment this bay has very few motor cycles some of which appear to be parked there semi permanently.
-

- It would be more sensible and useful to create a bay close to the Physic Garden entrance
- on Royal Hospital Road as this would be much more convenient for visitors to this popular attraction. There is already a Club car bay there and a cycle bay would fit conveniently alongside it.
- The existing off road site next the Royal Army Museum could be usefully extended. Or
- a location set up at the top end of Tite Street where the demand is much more evident.
- 

No evidence is provided in the application for why this unnecessary site has been chosen and the other much more obviously needed locations rejected and residents are entitled to see the reasoning for this choice, what surveys of cycle traffic were undertaken and what alternatives were considered.

Also unlike the present proposal, these alternative sites are all on the opposite side of the roads from private dwellings - the site at the top of Swan Walk for example is opposite number 1 Swan Walk, which is in anycase bounded by a solid brick garden wall - by contrast the proposed site sits right next to the doorsteps into the doorway to number 9 Swan Walk, an invasion of privacy that could easily be avoided in this area.

2.

3.

4. Dilke Street is a very quiet street

5. in a conservation area. Dilke Street is in a conservation area and the houses

6. at the bottom of Swan walk are of some historic and architectural interest. The street is very quiet with limited foot borne or cycle traffic. Placing a cycle bay in this location would attract cyclists and foot traffic into the area and detract from the visual

7. amenity of the street with its history of artists (sketch club) and patchwork 19th

8. century architecture. There have already been a number of very serious security incidents in the vicinity in the last 24 months (including knife attacks) and residents are entitled to feel that attracting cyclists into the area will increase that risk.

9.

3.

4.

5. The siting of the bay would pose serious

6. safety concerns. The proposed site is immediately off the corner of Clover Mews

7. so that residents turning right out of Clover Mews or turning left into Clover Mews will be potentially in conflict with cyclists arriving to park their bikes in a street which is not well lit. It is well established that a proportion of cyclists will leave

8. their bikes outside the exact curtilage of the cycle bay and these will be hard to see for cars turning into the street. Further the location is on a corner that catches the wind and as a result bikes particularly e-bikes are likely to end up lying on their
9. side creating a risk to cars coming in and out of the Mews.
- 10.

For all these reasons I would like to object to this proposal and urge the Council to consider carefully the much better available and more useful alternatives.

#### **Objection Thirteen**

Personally I see no real valid reason to have bicycles littering what is a rare tranquil bastion of London.

Since returning to the capital after a 25 year hiatus, one thing that I find disturbing is this influx of rental bicycles literally fallen over cluttering pavements all across London.

I do not wish to see the potential for the same here on swan walk.

There are untold other places close by in Chelsea to acquire one of these dirty looking bikes, why place one in an area that is clean and respectful.

There is not much through fare of customers, I just see this as spreading too thinly and ultimately leading to more problems than solutions.

It is unneeded and unnecessary to place a station where it is being proposed.

With all due respect I know for sure that the local residents all own their own bicycles. I see no point in taking away valuable limited parking for the residents to replace with what I personally see as a trashy and tacky bike station.

#### **Objection Fourteen**

I am writing to you as a 95-year-old resident of Swan Walk/ Dilke Street with significant mobility issues, to express my concerns regarding the planned installation of a dockless bike hire bay directly outside my home and hence my objection to the proposal.

While I fully support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasize the practical impact this particular proposal would have on my daily life, especially considering my age and health condition. My mobility restrictions necessitate frequent visits to the doctor and hospital, for which I rely heavily on ambulance services and my personal vehicle, which needs to be parked close to my home.

The current proposal would place the bay directly in front of the entrance of my house and make access to my home much more difficult.

The installation of a bike hire bay in place of existing parking spaces would severely limit my ability to manage my health effectively. Accessibility is not merely a convenience but a necessity in emergency situations, where every second counts. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 under sections such as 6 and 124 emphasizes the need for considering the safety and convenience of road users, including residents with mobility issues.

Furthermore, under the Equality Act 2010, it is essential to ensure that changes in community infrastructure do not disproportionately disadvantage individuals with disabilities or those with reduced mobility. By removing close access parking, the council risks failing to comply with these statutory duties by not accommodating the specific needs of elderly and disabled residents.

Given these considerations, I kindly urge the council to:

1. Reassess the proposed location of the dockless bike hire bay, considering the needs of residents with significant health and mobility issues.

2. Explore alternative solutions that would not involve the removal of essential parking spaces near the homes of vulnerable residents.

3. Ensure that any decisions made do not compromise the safety, health, and well-being of elderly and disabled residents.

I believe that a solution that supports the council's environmental goals while also catering to the needs of its residents can indeed be found with further dialogue and consideration. There are much more suitable locations such as in the Royal Hospital Road or the Embankment or perhaps even the northern end of Tite Street where this bay could be located and made better use of.

Importantly, such bays should never be placed in front of the entrances of private houses let alone that of an elderly person with mobility issues such as myself yet this is exactly what the current proposal is doing.

On a final point, I would like to raise the issue of security and nuisance. My experience of these bays is that they attract noise and disturbance by the predominantly young males who use such locations at all hours with scant consideration for others. Bicycles are frequently left toppled over and Litter is often left in the bikes and ends up on the street and I frankly feel very distressed by the proposal to put such a bike bay directly in front of my home with all the negative impact it will have as mentioned above.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and am hopeful for a resolution that considers the well-being of all residents so that our lives are not made a misery by such proposals especially to me in the last few years of life that I have left.

Thank you in advance for considering my circumstances in your planning processes.

#### **Objection Fifteen**

I have only just noticed the yellow notice attached to a lamp pole on the corner of Dilke Street and Clover Mews and read that it's about plans to locate a dockless bike parking bay in that area.

Living at [redacted] Dilke Street, opposite, perhaps I should of noticed this earlier but with recent parking restrictions in place due to building works at that location I clearly missed reading this until earlier today but would like to object to these proposals in the strongest possible manner.

I am all for more bikes and am also a regular user of Lime bikes but find the proposal to locate a parking bay for these at this location ill thought out.

Can I note the following observations as someone who lives in Dilke Street and uses e-bikes on a regular basis.

- Dilke Street is a quiet street and not a cut through in any way. As such beyond primarily resident traffic it is a low traffic area and given the sparse number of houses and flats it's also not an obvious choice of location for potential users.

- Presently I normally walk up to the Royal Army Museum where there is a parking bay or else to the Tesco Express where there are usually multiple bikes located. Failing this, the embankment always has a few scattered around locally. What I can say is that there are never any in Dilke Street, Swan Walk or Clover Mews that clearly shows demand for them here is very low.

- Given the above, if bikes were located here, potential users would have to go out of their way to find them as Dilke Street is not a cut through or busy street.

- If a permanent location in this area was needed then it would make far more sense to locate at the top or bottom end of Swan Walk (either by the embankment or the existing motorcycle bays where it would be far more prominent and also on existing busy thoroughfares)

- This is a quiet residential neighbourhood and we don't want the nuisance and noise of the bike operators collecting or dropping off their bikes at anti-social hours. The same can be said of users too. Again, if located at either end of Swan Walk (or junction of Site Street and Embankment, or near Tesco's) this would not be an issue as they are already busy areas and there's no housing immediately in the location.

In short, if the need exists for parking bays there are multiple far more appropriate locations in their very close vicinity that would be far more convenient for users and cause far less disruption to existing rate-paying residents.

There has been no residents consultation process and there is no evidence of any thoughtful planning in regards to this location which brings into serious question how this was arrived at?

Can I please suggest that a more open debate and planning approval process is taken rather than just rubber stamping ill-thought-out plans just because it adheres to the wider cycling policies that we all support.

I look forward to acknowledgement of this email and advice on how we can better raise our objections to these proposals.

#### **Objection Sixteen**

Please avoid the hire-bikes at Swan Walk Street. It is a quiet street and will destroy all the area .....

Thank you for your comprehension

#### **Objection Seventeen**

I am writing to express my serious concerns and to formally object to the proposed conversion of a 5-metre section of the existing residents' parking on Dilke Street into a dockless bike hire bay, as outlined in the recent council notification.

As a long-standing resident of Kensington and Chelsea, I fully support initiatives aimed at promoting sustainable transportation. However, I am concerned that this specific proposal has not adequately considered the full implications on local residents, particularly in terms of parking availability and the direct impact on our daily lives.

#### **Objection Eighteen**

I hope this letter finds you well. My name is [redacted], and I am a resident of [redacted]. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed installation of a dockless bike hire bay directly outside my home. This letter seeks to outline the significant impact this proposal would have on my studies and wellbeing due to the increased noise levels and reduced privacy and reduced safety the current proposal would cause and therefore why I object to it.

As a student, I am currently preparing for crucial examinations and will be in full-time study for the next 5 years, and a quiet environment is essential for my learning and retention. Unfortunately, the proposed location for the new bike hire bay is immediately adjacent to my bedroom/study window. The frequent use of the bay, especially during early mornings and late evenings, would undoubtedly lead to increased noise from both the bikes and their users.

This is in addition to the current disturbances from regular traffic and passersby, which already affect my concentration and sleep. I already suffer from diagnosed learning difficulties and this will make my attempt to gain an education even harder.



It is important to highlight that the increased noise could severely disrupt my sleep patterns, which are crucial for a young student's cognitive functions and overall health. Research consistently shows that interrupted sleep can significantly impair learning abilities and academic performance, a situation I am anxious to avoid especially during this critical period of my education.

Furthermore, the installation may not align with regulatory considerations that aim to protect the quality of life for residents. Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, local authorities have a duty to investigate and take steps to address any nuisances that could harm a resident's health or disrupt their enjoyment of their property. The placement of the bike hire bay, leading to potential noise pollution, directly conflicts with these protections.

I kindly urge the council to reconsider the proposed location of the dockless bike hire bay. I believe there are alternative sites that could accommodate the bay without adversely affecting residents' well-being. A location further away from residential windows, for example, would mitigate the noise impact on students like myself who require a peaceful environment to thrive academically.

I am fully supportive of initiatives that promote sustainable transportation and recognise the benefits of dockless bike hire schemes. However, I believe that these should not come at the expense of the residents' health and educational needs.

My own experience of e-bike bays is that it does attract use by predominantly younger males often late at night. Having an e-bike bay [redacted] would make me feel insecure and vulnerable in my own home and give me great concerns for my personal safety. It makes me feel anxious that strangers will loiter [redacted].

I appreciate your consideration of my concerns, and I am hopeful for a resolution that maintains the community's tranquility and supports its students. I look forward to your response and am available for any discussions or meetings that may help resolve this issue amicably.

### **Objection Nineteen**

I am writing to OBJECT to the proposed siting of a dockless bike hire bay in Dilke Street/Swan Walk/ corner of Clover Mews.

While I support the council's efforts to promote environmentally friendly transport solutions, I must emphasise the practical impact this proposal would have on the residents.

1. **Noise and Congestion:** The introduction of a bike hire bay will lead to increased foot traffic and noise, particularly if the area becomes a popular pick-up and drop-off point. This change could disrupt the peaceful residential nature of Dilke Street and Swan Walk.
2. **Security:** e-bikes attract younger and often less socially responsible types leading to noise at all hours, litter and an increase of crime and anti-social behaviour.
3. **Damage:** e-bikes are out of control and e-bike bays are often overwhelmed with bikes which spill outside the bay often toppling over damaging cars and causing a serious obstruction and danger to pedestrians and vehicles.
4. **Loss of Valuable Parking Space:** There is already immense pressure on parking in the borough and conversion of residents' parking into a bike hire bay will result in a loss of essential parking spaces. For those who rely on their vehicles for commuting, family needs, or due to mobility issues, this reduction could pose significant daily challenges and a reduction in quality of life.
5. **Increased Parking Congestion:** With fewer parking spots available, residents may have to park further from their homes. This can lead to increased congestion on neighboring streets, potentially raising safety concerns and making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.

6. **Safety Concerns:** Increased bike and pedestrian traffic could raise safety concerns, especially for children and the elderly in the neighborhood. The constant movement of bikes might increase the risk of accidents near our homes and all too often inconsiderate bike riders use pavements and are a real menace. Also, bikes are often placed randomly in the middle of the street and not at the actual bay area, leading to restrictions for residents to move in the already narrow street and particularly blighting the elderly, young and those with restricted mobility.
7. **Heritage Aesthetic Changes:** The bike bay will be an eyesore of bold and brightly branded bikes which will be in direct contrast to the charming aesthetic of this historic location. The installation of a bike bay will alter the visual aesthetics of the neighborhood. The presence of racks, signage, and possibly even advertising associated with the bike hire service would detract from the residential character of Dilke Street and Swan Walk.
8. **Environmental Impact:** While promoting cycling is environmentally friendly, the installation process and the infrastructure itself could have short-term environmental impacts, such as the disruption during installation and potential cluttering of public spaces. The position of the proposed bike bay is also where residents place their rubbish for bi-weekly collection and the bike bay will impede this ability leading to bikes and rubbish enmeshing together.
9. **Litter:** People often dump litter in bicycle baskets which end up on the street either blown by the wind or dumped by the next user of the bicycle.
10. **Lack of Consultation:** The council has not sufficiently consulted with the residents about this installation and there is a collective feeling of decisions being made without adequate input from those most affected. How long has the notice been up for this proposed e-bike bay? I only noticed it recently so, I wonder if residents have been given a chance to view and understand what is being proposed here. How many other replies have you received in this matter? Though the proposal is to locate the bay in at the very western end of Dilke Street, the location is directly in front of the entrances to 9 Swan Walk, so Swan Walk is one of the key streets affected by this proposal. There are nine houses in Swan Walk and how many have responded to your notice? Engaging with the community is crucial in ensuring that all viewpoints and concerns are considered. There is a telephone number on the Notice but it is impossible to get through on this number to actually speak to anyone about this matter.
11. **Better Alternatives:** There is very limited requirement for a cycle bay in this location and much better alternatives and so the council should consider alternative locations for this bike hire bay that do not negatively impact on residents's lives and the general residential parking situation. There may be other viable options nearby that meet the goals of increasing cycling without adversely impacting residents. For example, there is both greater demand and more space for e-bike bays in the Royal Hospital Road or the Embankment. Another suitable location would be the very southern end of Tite Street where again a bay could be located that would not directly affect the entrance to a private property.
12. **Legal and Regulatory Oversight:** The council should adhere to the regulations set forth in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ensuring that all changes are lawful, genuinely considerate of public opinion, and truly beneficial to the community.

The proposed e-bike bay is directly in front of my home at 9 Swan Walk and I simply do not understand why this location with so many negative aspects and in area of very limited demand has been chosen. For all the reasons given above, I urge the Council to withdraw this proposal and also avoid locating such bays directly in front of the entrances of private houses especially when more suitable locations are available.

**Support in Full One**  
No comment supplied

**Support in Full Two**

PLEASE MAKE CHELSEA GREENER BY ENCOURAGING CYCLES

**Support in Full Three**

I write as owner of [redacted]. I welcome the proposed ebike bay and wish to support the proposal. None of the objections raised by some of my neighbours seem to have any merit whatsoever.

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

No site-specific responses were received to the proposal in Ellis Street

## Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Markham Square

### **Objection One**

We object to the proposed e-bike parking bay with no docking facility. This is a particularly narrow road at this point. There are already traffic problems that arise from this narrowness often with considerable inconvenience and occasional damage to vehicles. e-bikes are frequently not parked in an orderly fashion and will exacerbate the existing problem if there is a concentration of bikes at this location. We believe that there will be an increased risk of accidents if this goes ahead and that the plan should not proceed.

### **Objection Two**

This is a one way system around the square and the road itself is very narrow and needs very careful navigation at the best of times. One poorly parked car creates chaos. A space for e bikes where suggested will inevitably spill into the narrow exit to the square as there is very little space at all and people leaving bikes are not always very considerate in how they do so. This is a recipe for a disaster in the traffic flow of the square! Please re site in a wider, less critical area.

### **Objection Three**

This objection is made on behalf of The Markham Square Association which represents over 50 houses and flats in Markham Square.

We object to the proposed siting of an e-bike dockless parking bay at the exit from Markham Square.

Our objection is based upon the narrowness of the highway at this point. Having observed the dockless bays situated in the vicinity (such as at the junction of Burnsall Street and the King's Road and the Cheltenham Terrace/King's Road junction) it is clear that abandoned e-bikes are parked randomly and carelessly in and around the designated bays, extending beyond the parking bays themselves onto neighbouring car parking bays and indeed even the highway and adjacent pavement. Any intrusion onto the road here would make the narrow one-way thoroughfare impassable. Any abandonment upon the pavement would block the only pedestrian access as there is no pavement on the square garden side.

We have some experience of this at the entrance to the square where there is a bay for bikes on the pavement. Bikes are often left blocking the pavement or road.

For these reasons we believe that an e-bike dockless parking bay in Markham Square would be unsafe and should not proceed.

### **Objection Four**

Narrow one-way system in unique conservation Square. No way cyclists will bother to correctly cycle round square to get to proposed bay. Loss of residential parking.

**Objection Five**

I object to the proposal to create a dedicated parking bay in Markham Square. The proposed location of the parking bay along the garden railings is next to the narrow, single lane exit of the square. Incorrectly parked or abandoned e-bikes will obstruct vehicular traffic, create a nuisance for pedestrians, and cause upheaval for nearby residents and quite likely, cause damage to the garden railings.

There is no commitment by RBKC to monitor such parking bays or limit the number of e-bikes. Instead, RBKC relies on the geo-fencing technology employed by the three e-bike businesses. The parking bay scenario depicted on the consultation pages is misleading because it does not reflect reality. E-bikes are frequently parked randomly outside the dedicated parking bays, spilling onto other residential parking bays and adjacent pavements – demonstrating the ineffectiveness of geo-fencing.

If the proposal goes ahead, it will not the question of when, but how often, traffic will be hindered in Markham Square causing unnecessary frustration for drivers and upheaval for pedestrians and nearby residents.

**Objection Six**

I object to the proposal to create a dedicated parking bay in Markham Square. The proposed location of the parking bay along the garden railings is next to the narrow, single lane exit of the square. Incorrectly parked or abandoned e-bikes will obstruct vehicular traffic, create a nuisance for pedestrians, and cause upheaval for nearby residents and quite likely, cause damage to the garden railings.

There is no commitment by RBKC to monitor such parking bays or limit the number of e-bikes. Instead, RBKC relies on the geo-fencing technology employed by the three e-bike businesses. The parking bay scenario depicted on the consultation pages is misleading because it does not reflect reality. E-bikes are frequently parked randomly outside the dedicated parking bays, spilling onto other residential parking bays and adjacent pavements – demonstrating the ineffectiveness of geo-fencing.

If the proposal goes ahead, it will not the question of when, but how often, traffic will be hindered in Markham Square causing unnecessary frustration for drivers and upheaval for pedestrians and nearby residents.

**Objection Seven**

I agree with the submission of The Markham Square Association.

**Objection Eight**

We fully support and endorse the views submitted by the Markham Square Association as submitted:

This objection is made on behalf of The Markham Square Association which represents over 50 houses and flats in Markham Square.

We object to the proposed siting of an e-bike dockless parking bay at the exit from Markham Square.

Our objection is based upon the narrowness of the highway at this point. Having observed the dockless bays situated in the vicinity (such as at the junction of Burnsall Street and the King's Road and the Cheltenham Terrace/King's Road junction) it is clear that abandoned e-bikes are parked randomly and carelessly in and around the designated bays, extending beyond the parking bays themselves onto neighbouring car parking bays and indeed even the

highway and adjacent pavement. Any intrusion onto the road here would make the narrow one-way thoroughfare impassable. Any abandonment upon the pavement would block the only pedestrian access as there is no pavement on the square garden side.

We have some experience of this at the entrance to the square where there is a bay for bikes on the pavement. Bikes are often left blocking the pavement or road.

For these reasons we believe that an e-bike dockless parking bay in Markham Square would be unsafe and should not proceed.

**Objection Nine**

Street is too narrow.

**Objection Ten**

We have already seen in Burnsall Street that bikes get left on the pavement and even on the highway. This pattern of behaviour represents a real risk, both to pedestrians, old and young, and to road traffic, both regular private and commercial traffic and emergency vehicles. Such potentially dangerous obstructions are unacceptable.

**Objection Eleven**

The road is far too narrow and one way. If the bikes are not parked carefully they could easily block the exit to the square.

**Objection Twelve**

It will cause inconvenience to the residents.

**Objection Thirteen**

We object on the basis of the Markham Square Association submission you have already received.

The way in which the hire bikes are strewn about on the ground which I see at other nearby bicycle parking bays would make it impossible to walk into or out of the square without having to walk in the road. Clearly the bicycle hiring companies have not got the manpower to drive around and pick up the bikes in a timely fashion and this will only get worse with these proposed extra bays.

**Objection Fourteen**

The street is too narrow

**Objection Fifteen**

I have had the benefit of reading the objections submitted by the Markham Square Association and I agree with those objections

**Objection Sixteen**

Markham Square is a narrow street close to the supermarket M&S and some food stores. There are many nonresidents' car parking there. Especially in the summer. It's so much noisy enough. The new e-bike location will make the resident aero more noisy.

**Support in Full One**

No comment received

## Appendix 7: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Royal Hospital Road

### Objection One

There is already very limited parking in this area due to visitors to the Kings Road, the Garden House School, Burton Court etc and travellers using the Sloane Square tube station. As a resident I regularly have major issues finding a parking place anywhere near my flat.

Another issue is the random way these hired bicycles are left on the pavement and road in a very haphazard manner. Can the Council find a way of ensuring they are kept in a more orderly fashion/ removed more swiftly?

### Objection Two

This location is in frequent use by Chelsea Pensioners, often using wheelchairs. Anywhere that has an ebike parking space will result in blocking the pavement.

### Objection Three

I am in principle not in favour of the creation of additional ebike parking spaces until some fundamental issues are addressed. I suspect that the increased use of ebikes is substitutional, not incremental demand, replacing the Santander bikes. Given that Santander bays are widely distributed throughout the area and many stand under used, the spaces they occupy should be given over, either in their entirety or on part, to ebikes instead of new bays being allocated, often in current residential parking spaces for which residents pay. Until a fully researched and statistically supported case is presented, which would justify the allocation of new bays, I believe no action should be taken.

### Objection Four

First, it is on a major road and Bus route, often used as a diversion when the Kings Road is blocked.

Second, during certain times, e.g. Chelsea Flower Show, there is even more pressure on traffic and parking.

Third, performance to date of the use of these bays appears haphazard and uncontrolled. One only has to look at Sloane Square and Cheltenham Terrace to find Bikes overflowing the designated areas into Residents Parking, pavements and often on their side. Allocation in those areas has not worked.

Users still leave bikes where they wish, without any penalty.

Fourth, There is already pressure on local parking for residents and this would increase it.

### Objection Five

I am against the e-bike parking space in this location given the negative impact on parking for residents parking. There is already considerable pressure on parking for cars and loss of parking spaces will make things even worse.

Putting bike parking next to car parking risks damaging cars given the undisciplined way in which bike users leave bikes.



**Support in Part One**

I pointed that the bike bay you have placed in Franklins Row would cause issues and indeed it has caused immense problems in that Residents Parking Bays are blocked so is the pavement and road frequently. It's already hard to park with in Borough commuters parking for the station and school run cars bringing the road to a standstill and filling residents bays completely. The same will happen with this bay.

If you put a bay in Royal Hospital Road it has to be administered and properly controlled as bikes are dumped anywhere. Will the council undertake this?

**Support in Full One**

Dear RBKC,

thank you for all your work on ebikes. They are here to stay, and official parking spots are much better than the old system where ebikes could be parked anywhere, on any pavement! It will be hard to find official parking spots that will make everyone happy. But writing on behalf of Royal Ave Residents Association we SUPPORT more parking spots, particularly to relieve the pressure on Cheltenham Terrace, which is very overcrowded. And we are grateful that you are not putting a new ebike parking spot on the Royal Ave Piazza, where we already have 20 Santander Bikes/stands, 6 metal cycle parking stands, and quite a few e-bikes parked temporarily, perhaps while the rider pops into McDonalds or Itsu (ebikes can pause for 15 minutes in a non official place).

**Support in Full Two**

No comment received