

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
STANLEY 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 Stanley 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 four locations in Stanley 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, 109 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the four proposals, officers did not agree with the objections in respect of three of them and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. The Edith Grove 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
S536a. Edith Grove	0 (12)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S536b. Elm Park Road	9 (21)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S536c. Fernshaw Road	12 (24)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0	Proceed
S536d. Netherton Grove	3 (15)	0 (2)	1 (8)	0	Proceed

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides comments received from ward Councillors to the proposals.
- 5.2 Appendices 2 – 6 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.

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 proposal in Elm Park Road 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 One respondent to the Fernshaw Road proposal 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 Some respondents suggested alternative locations. One respondent on the Elm Park Road proposal suggested the bay would better sited 'Half way down Elm Park Gardens, or at the entrance to Carlyle Square, or use SYL instead'. One suggested 'Non-residential areas/roads for e-bike parking. One suggested using a 'P&D bay on Elm Park Garden', one suggested it should be 'Near Fulham Road/Old Church Street' and one suggested 'look at alternative locations for this on street ebike parking space such as Mallord Street'.
- 5.17 Three respondents had suggestions to relocate the Fernshaw Road proposed bay; one suggested 'Edith Grove/Fulham Road, one suggested the Corner of Fulham Rd/Edith Grove, whilst another said 'Access needs to be retained to the hospital'.
- 5.18 On the Netherton Grove proposal one respondent suggested a better site would be 'Outside Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, opposite existing bike racks'.

Officer Response

- 5.19 It is not expected that a further round of consultation will be required using suggestions for alternative locations.
- 5.20 On the Elm Park Road proposal, suggested sites in Elm Park Gardens, Carlyle Square and Mallord Street offer no material advantage over the proposed site. There is no Single Yellow Line in the area that could be used without adversely affecting visibility at junctions or space available for waiting and loading, pay by phone bays in this area are valued for offering parking space to visitors and tradespeople who are unable to use residents' parking space. There is no suitable site in the carriageway for a bay at the junction of Fulham Road/Old Church Street.
- 5.21 On Fernshaw Road two respondents suggested using a location at the junction of Fulham Road/Edith Grove, this is an existing virtual bay and the intention of these proposals is to reduce pressure on footway parking and place more e-bike parking in the carriageway. The proposal is not expected to have a negative impact on access to the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, considering its existing use as a car parking bay with no issues. Rather it will allow more people to use e-bikes to access the hospital, we have evidence of high demand for this journey type.
- 5.22 On Netherton Grove one respondent suggests a better site would be outside the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, the footway there is already very congested and there is no suitable site in the carriageway.

Other comments

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

Table 2 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.

	Comment	Officer Response
1	One respondent said that the proposal served no benefit other than to increase Council revenues. (Elm Park Road proposal)	This proposal is intended to improve the dockless hire service and reduce the incidence of footway parking, not to increase revenue. Income the Council receives from operators is not linked directly to the number of bays provided, in the same way that the residents' parking permit fee is not linked to the number of residents' bays available.

2	<p>One respondent said there was no demand for rental e-bikes at this location as it is a quiet residential road with no shops or restaurants (Elm Park Road proposals)</p>	<p>An effective parking network must include bays close to where people live as well as at 'destination streets'.</p>
3	<p>One respondent said the proposal was not suitable as traffic frequently backs up along Old Church Road. (Elm Park Road proposal)</p>	<p>High volume, slow moving traffic does not present an unduly high risk environment for cyclists. Encouraging cycling may contribute to reducing traffic volumes in the area.</p>
4	<p>One respondent said that e-bikes were capable of higher speeds than regular bikes and therefore pose a greater risk to children and elderly residents. (Elm Park Road proposal)</p>	<p>Hire e-bike maximum speeds are regulated by law and are not higher than speeds achievable on a non-powered bicycle. There is no restriction on the use of motorised traffic, which can achieve much higher speeds, in areas with large numbers of children and older people.</p>
5	<p>One respondent believed that e-bike and e-scooters batteries present a fire hazard, citing incidents reported in the Press.</p> <p>They further commented that the installation of an e-bike bay with its accompanying signage and infrastructure would detract from the aesthetic appeal of our residential area. (Elm Park Road proposal)</p>	<p>Hire e-bike battery technology is professionally managed by operating companies. Batteries are not charged on street (it is while being charged that privately imported batteries have been known to be a fire risk).</p> <p>This proposal will have no accompanying signage or infrastructure other than the 'Cycle Hire Only' legend painted on the carriageway. Similar to a Car Club or Disabled parking bay.</p>
6	<p>One respondent said there was a bike rack less than 100 meters away. (Elm Park Road proposal)</p>	<p>There is an in-carriageway Sheffield stand bay for private bikes nearby, this proposal is not intended to reduce private cycle parking capacity, both forms of parking space are well used and in demand.</p>
7	<p>One respondent was concerned why Fernshaw Road and Edith Terrace were chosen as suitable starting points for e-bikes as they are surrounded by four major roads. (Fernshaw Road and Edith Terrace proposals)</p>	<p>E-bike users will make their own decisions on whether the surrounding roads are suitable for their level of cycling experience. Perception of hazard is not a good reason to avoid providing parking facilities.</p>
8	<p>One respondent said there is an underutilised e-bike parking facility on the wide footway nearby at the corner of Edith Grove and Fulham Road. (Fernshaw Road proposal)</p>	<p>There is a virtual bay at the location described. The Council wishes, where possible, to encourage carriageway e-bike parking and to reduce the number of e-bikes left on the footway. This particular location has received complaints of overstocking and</p>

		obstruction of the footway. The proximity of the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital creates significant demand for e-bike parking space in this area.
--	--	---

Appendix 1: Ward Councillor Comments

No comments received

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

Objection One

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

Objection Two

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

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

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

Objection Three

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

Objection Four (The Boltons Association)

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

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

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

Objection Five

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

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

E-bike 'explodes' outside Buckingham Palace

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

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

Please keep E-bikes off the streets of Kensington.

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

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

We have reservations concerning this proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objection Seven

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

Objection Eight

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

Objection Nine

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objection Ten

I object ebikes

Objection Eleven

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

Objection Twelve

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

Support in Part One

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

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

[Additional Comments]

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

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

Support in Part Two

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

Support in Full One (WestWay Trust)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for taking the WestWays views into consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Support in Full Three

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

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

Support in Full Four

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

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

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

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

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

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

Support in Full Five

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

Support in Full Six

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

Support in Full Seven

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

Officer responses to objections

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

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

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

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

Rental e-bikes are an eyesore

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

Proposals do not benefit residents

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

Proposals should not replace people's personal disabled parking bays

None of the proposals are proposed in disabled parking bays.

Dangerous cycling

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

E-bike/e-scooters are fire hazards

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

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

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

Opposed to the principle of providing designated e-bike bays

Provision of designated e-bike parking bays is Council policy following a Key Decision¹ in June 2023. The Council has no plans to revoke this policy at the present time. Even if the Council did not provide designated e-bike bays, the e-bikes would remain on the Council's streets as it has no powers to prevent the companies operating.

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

Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Edith Grove

No site-specific responses were received.

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

Objection One

We object to the proposal, because it would lead to a reduction in Residents' Parking Space in an area where it is very difficult to find a parking space in the evenings.

We have monitored the effect of the initial provision of ebike spaces and it has not produced any reduction in the number of ebikes dumped on the pavements.

Thus losing Residents' Parking Space to provide ebike parking gives no advantage other than to increase council revenues by selling space that Residents have already paid to use to ebike companies.

Objection Two

This section of Elm Park Road is one way from Old Church Street. It is a very busy corner with west bound traffic using it as a rat run to avoid traffic lights at the junction with King's Road and to cut through to Beaufort Street and beyond. Already many cyclists travel the wrong way (east) along this section of the road and often on the wrong side of the road, presenting a danger to unsuspecting pedestrians and a hazard to motorists turning in from Old Church Street. Ebike parking on this corner will exacerbate the problem.

Ebikes do not have docking stations. As can be witnessed all over London, many ebike users seem to have little consideration for others and can't be bothered to park the bikes responsibly at the end of their journeys. The pavement here is not very wide. I envisage bikes being left on their sides rather than upright and once the proposed parking spaces are full, bikes will either encroach on the remaining residents' parking space or be abandoned on the pavement, making life very difficult for pedestrians, especially the elderly and the young pushing prams.

A solution must be found to reduce the hazard that badly parked ebikes currently present to pedestrians. While I support dedicated parking spaces for them, I don't think a busy corner is an appropriate spot. A more suitable location may be half way down Elm Park Gardens, where the road is wider, or at the entrance to Carlyle Square which carries far less traffic than Elm Park Road. Even better, perhaps a section of single yellow line can be converted to ebike parking, rather than further reducing the number of residents' parking spaces .

Objection Three

This location is unsuitable for e-bike parking.

1. The e-bike parking will remove existing residents' parking in a location where it is already in short supply. This is a one-way road, with a single yellow line along the whole north side of the road and another single yellow along much of the south side. As a result, the road has only this one small section of residents' parking. I can tell you, from experience, that it is already too small to accommodate the vehicles owned by occupiers of the immediately adjacent

houses. Making it even smaller will cause significant daily inconvenience to residents, forcing them to circle around for parking and walk a longer distance to/from their homes.

2. To the best of my knowledge, the majority of homeowners in the vicinity of this residents' parking area who park their cars here are of pension age and some have mobility limitations. They will experience no benefit from the e-bikes, which they will never use themselves, but will be harmed on a daily basis because they will no longer be able to park their vehicles on this road, within a reasonable distance of their homes. The council's priority should be to support its tax-paying residents, not make life more difficult for them, with no quantifiable benefit either to them or anyone else.

3. This is a quiet residential road with no shops or restaurants anywhere in the vicinity, other than several blocks away on King's Road and Fulham Road. Who does the council think is going to choose to park their e-bike here? Someone cycling to King's Road or Fulham Road will not first come here to park before walking on. They will cycle up to their intended destination before discarding their bike there. Moreover, as mentioned above, it won't be the pension-aged residents of this road who will be using the e-bikes. If you must remove parking in the borough to make more space for e-bikes, at least choose a location that is likely to be useful.

4. It is increasingly clear that e-bikes as well as e-scooters present a dangerous fire hazard. There have been a number of incidents in London and elsewhere that have shown how the batteries in these devices can ignite spontaneously and burn extremely fiercely. These incidents have resulted in property damage and, in some cases, tragic loss of life. As a homeowner, I do not appreciate the council putting me and my property at risk by encouraging the clustering of these potentially deadly battery-operated vehicles, 24 hours a day, in a residential street, just feet away from family homes.

This is an ill-conceived plan that suggests, at best, a lack of thinking-through and, at worst, a disturbing level of contempt for local taxpayers.

I hope the council will think again.

Objection Four

Traffic frequently backs up along Old Church Road from the intersection with Kings Road. I think this location would be comparatively dangerous for cyclists given volume of traffic, filtering of bikes through stopped cars and cars turning left at speed from Kings Road.

Objection Five

Our home is at [redacted] Carlyle Square, directly across the street from the proposed e-bike location of Elm Park Street and Old Church Street. We oppose placing the parking space in this location as it is too close to our peaceful community. It would be noisy during all hours of the evenings and nights, disrupting the quiet enjoyment of our home and neighborhood. E-bikes, though quieter than motor vehicles, still generate noise, especially in groups. The constant coming and going of e-bikes would disrupt the peaceful ambiance of our neighborhood.

This installation is not in the best interest of the community for several compelling reasons.

Safety Concerns

- **Increased Traffic and Accident Risk:** The introduction of an e-bike parking station will likely lead to increased traffic in our neighborhood. E-bikes, capable of higher speeds than regular bikes, can pose a significant risk, especially in areas with children and elderly residents. The increase in e-bike traffic could elevate the likelihood of accidents.
- **Stranger Traffic:** Public parking spaces attract individuals from various areas, increasing foot and vehicle traffic. This influx of unfamiliar faces can raise safety concerns, particularly in a residential area where people expect a certain level of privacy and security.

Environmental and Aesthetic Impact

- **Noise Pollution:** E-bikes, though quieter than motor vehicles, still generate noise, especially in groups. The constant coming and going of e-bikes can disrupt the peaceful ambiance of our neighborhood.
- **Visual Intrusion:** The installation of a parking station, with its accompanying signage and infrastructure, can detract from the aesthetic appeal of our residential area. It could alter the character of our neighborhood, which we as residents cherish.

Property Value Concerns

- **Potential Decrease in Property Values:** The presence of a public e-bike parking space could potentially decrease property values. Prospective homebuyers might view the increased traffic and associated concerns as negatives, thus making our property less attractive.

Conclusion

- In conclusion, while we support sustainable transportation, the installation of a public e-bike parking space near our residence poses significant safety, environmental, and property value concerns. Alternative locations, preferably in non-residential areas, should be considered to balance the benefits of e-bike transportation with the well-being of our community.

Objection Six

The location picked is extremely inconvenient for local residents and also poses an enhanced risk for traffic accidents. First of all the parking space will take over a portion of the resident parking bay in an area where resident parking is necessary and often fully occupied, forcing residents to look for less convenient alternatives. There is already a bike parking space in front of no.76 which is always empty and could be converted more conveniently. Alternatively it should be located in one of the payment bays on Elm Park Garden.

Additionally, the location of the proposed e-bike bay is in the narrower one way part of the street, very close to the corner of Old Church St. This corner is often congested, particularly in the evening because many cars parked on both Old Church St. and Elm Park Road (opposite to the proposed bay) on the single yellow line, potentially creating a serious obstacle to tuning into the street and posing a serious safety issue. I would therefore consider the council fully responsible of creating a road hazard in this location and potentially responsible for any accident occurring at the junction.

Objection Seven

We live in the most easterly part of Elm Park Road where already several resident bays have been taken out and finding a parking space is extremely difficult. We cannot afford to lose any more when there are many other areas where e-bikes can be parked.

I would add that none of the e-bikes are likely to be used by the existing residents, so who will benefit from this absurd proposal?

Objection Eight

Our home is at [redacted], directly across the street from the proposed e-bike location. Placing the parking space there would be noisy during all hours of the evenings and nights. We are concerned about strangers loitering near our home. We are also concerned about trash being left there. We recommend finding a location nearer to Fulham Road or Old Church Street. This location proposed is too close to a quiet neighborhood.

Additional comments:

We oppose this location because the sidewalk in this location is extremely narrow. We regularly walk our dog with our granddaughter in a stroller from our home on this narrow sidewalk. An e-bike parking area would further restrict our ability to walk through this area. Elm Park is only one-way traffic and very narrow. Cars turn quickly from Old Church Street onto Elm Park without slowing down. This would be a significant safety issue if pedestrians were required to cross the street and/or move into the street to get around bikes.

Additional comments #3:

We strongly oppose an on street ebike parking space on Elm Park Street. More specifically:

1. Elm Park is an extremely narrow one-way street. The sidewalks on Elm Park from Old Church Street are also very narrow and at times require pedestrians to walk on the side of the street. An on street ebike parking space will just make this problem worse.
2. Vehicles turn off quickly from Old Church onto Elm Park and make it difficult to cross Elm Park if the narrow sidewalk is not passable, which is often the case. We walk our dog on that stretch of Elm Park, walk our granddaughter in a stroller and roll a grocery basket. An on street ebike parking space would significantly reduce the passage space.
3. We are part-time residents and are concerned about safety whilst we are out of town. An on street ebike parking space at Elm Park will create noise outside our home and a significant increase in strangers right outside our home.
4. There already exists on street ebike parking spaces a short distance from this proposed Elm Park location, notably on Old Church Street near the Chelsea Arts Club, another one at the corner of S Parade and Old Church Street, and yet another at the corner of King's Road and Manresa Road.
5. We recommend the RBKC look at alternative locations for this on street ebike parking space such as Mallord Street.

Objection Nine

There is a proposal to add a bike rack to Elm Park road. I object.

There has been little or no thought given to this proposal. There is another bike rack less than 100 meters away which is usually empty as in this part of Chelsea bikes are “cut loose” and stolen from bike racks. Furthermore, the existing bike rack stops traffic on the corner of an already overly busy road which leads to constant honking of horns (which violates the Highway Code which says no honking while stationary), shouting and occasional fights.

I’m not a fan of cars but Elm Park Road needs things other than another bike rack which won’t solve problems.

Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Fernshaw Road

Objection One

It's already not possible to park in our street when returning home at night and the council should also not be reducing residents bays in streets like ours near the hospital where they have already recently been reduced with a higher than average number of spaces being recently allocated for disabled parking. It's also not clear why the Council thinks Fernshaw Road and Edith Terrace (which are surrounded by major 4 roads) are suitable starting points for e-bikes and we are concerned about our teenage daughter and her friends using e-bikes here to start a journey.

Objection Two

We are already very short of parking spaces for residents on Fernshaw Road and the surrounding area for which we have already bought a parking permit from the Council. In addition, we already have specified electric car charging points on the junction of Fernshaw Road and the Fulham Road and specially allocated motorbike parking spaces. Also, some residents have off-street parking on their properties which prevents the street being used for other residents' parking space as it would block their driveways.

Objection Three

It's unacceptable to continue reducing the number of parking bays available to residents as there are already insufficient residents bays in Fernshaw Road and the surrounding areas. In addition a number of residents bays in Fernshaw Road seem to have recently been converted to disabled parking and therefore the number available to ordinary residents has already been reduced.

In addition, as Fernshaw Road and Edith Terrace are next to main roads which are not safe for cyclists (Gunter Grove, Edith Grove etc), to try to encourage e-bikes in this location seems unwise.

Objection Four

We are already very short of residents' parking spaces in this area and to lose any more to E-Bike cycle parking bays would make it even more difficult to find anywhere to park near where we live.

My wife and I are old and are not able to make use of E-Bikes and already pay a substantial sum of money to the Council for a residents' parking permit which is increasingly difficult to find on our street.

Objection Five

Fernshaw road has already a lot of parking problems as parking spaces keep being allocated! its not a very long street and has very little parking spaces. we have e bike cycle parking bays very close and we don't need more!

Thank you for understanding,

Best wishes

Objection Six

Parking is already impossible on Fernshaw with the inclusion of 2 new electric bays and multiple dwellings/cars in Fernshaw mansions: the street also has 7 disabled resident bays: we are in desperate need of pay and display bays for trademen NOT cycle bays.

Objection Seven

Dear Sir, Madam

I am writing to you as a 30y resident of RBKC and a frequent user of e-bikes, utilizing services provided by Forest, Lime, and Tier. My experiences have offered me a deep familiarity with the local e-bike parking infrastructure, prompting me to express my strong opposition to the proposed e-bike parking space on Fernshaw Road.

Reasons for Opposition:

1. Proximity to Existing Facility: There is an underutilized e-bike parking facility merely a few yards away, at the corner of Edith Grove and Fulham Road. This spot, situated on a wide pavement, has consistently proven sufficient and accessible, negating the need for an additional space in close proximity.
2. Safety and Accessibility Concerns: Fernshaw Road's narrow layout has already contributed to vehicular damage and poses a risk to residents' safety. Introducing an e-bike parking space in such a constrained area risks exacerbating these issues, particularly for drivers and pedestrians navigating around improperly parked bikes.

3. Impact on Vulnerable Community Members: Our neighborhood is home to elderly individuals and children, heightening the necessity for safe, unobstructed pathways. The presence of an e-bike station could introduce barriers to mobility, especially for a local resident who relies on a wheelchair for her daily commute to Chelsea and Westminster Hospital.

4. Increased Congestion: The delivery and maintenance of e-bikes involve vehicular traffic that Fernshaw Road, a primarily residential street, is ill-suited to accommodate without significant disturbance to the community.

Conclusion and Recommendation:

Given these considerations, I urge you to relocate the proposed e-bike parking away from narrow, residential areas like Fernshaw Road, in favour of locations with ample space and existing demand, such as the vicinity of Edith Grove and Fulham Road. Such a decision would prioritize the safety and well-being of Chelsea's residents over the commercial interests of e-bike companies.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I am eager to support initiatives that enhance sustainable transportation in our community, provided they also safeguard the interests and safety of its residents.

Sincerely,

Objection Eight

We are against this proposal for Fernshaw Road, due to the lack of parking.

There are already 7 spaces reserved for disabled use and 2 more bays have recently been lost for the installation of electric charging points. There are 14 flats in Fernshaw Mansions, located in a central position, adding to the parking problems.

There are also cars parked by residents in neighbouring streets. We ourselves have, on many occasions, had to park elsewhere - sometimes late at night.

In addition traffic is already quite heavy in the road and bicycles would be obstructive, especially when leaving and arriving.

The loss of yet another parking bay must have a negative effect on the street.

Objection Nine

These bikes and their riders are an utter menace and any increased use of them is criminal

Objection Ten

There is less and less residents parking and NO ONE puts the bikes back they are left everywhere making it difficult to cross the road - the hospital NEEDS parking / or patient drop off areas NOT bike DUMP zones I am forever watching sick / cancer patients / elderly people struggle to walk to hospital entrance and trying to get past all the bikes etc etc

Objection Eleven

I strongly oppose the proposal to add an e-bike parking space on Fernshaw Road for the following reasons:

1. LIMITED SPACE AVAILABLE, REDUCTION OF CAR PARKING SPACES, INCREASED CONGESTION:

Fernshaw road is a residential street that already has limited parking space available. Introducing e-bike parking could further reduce space for traditional vehicles, causing inconvenience to residents who rely on yellow lines and car parking bays.

Fernshaw road already suffers from congestion and a lack of parking spaces as it is; when there are football games taking place at Chelsea Stadium, because our street is the last one open to car circulation, many cars park on yellow lines, making it harder for Fernshaw residents to park on their own street.

In addition to this, we recently saw the reduction of the number of car parking bays on Fernshaw road: one was converted to a disabled parking space, two were converted to "electric vehicles only" that are very rarely used. So losing a yellow line that can be used after hours to park would be detrimental to the street.

2. EYESORE ON A RESIDENTIAL STREET: What attracted us to Fernshaw road when we bought our house 10 years ago was the fact that it was a calm residential street, lined with old trees compared for example to Gunter grove or Edith Grove that are high traffic roads. We can see that e-bikes are dumped in parking spaces all around Chelsea and London. I use the word "dumped" on purpose. More often than not, the bikes lay flat on the road, or on top of each other. They are rarely parked properly, they fall (or are kicked) and stay on the ground. The e-bike parking facilities would detract from the aesthetic appeal of the street, and potentially lower property values and diminish the overall attractiveness of the street.

3. SAFETY CONCERNS: Not only would the addition of an e-bike bay be unsightly, it would also be dangerous. Invariably, the bikes will get dumped not just on the road but partly on the pavement which is narrow. This could pose safety risks for pedestrians, especially children, mothers with prams and the elderly, who frequently use the sidewalks. Published data from other boroughs (Chiswick for example) show that around 20% of journeys end with bikes being improperly parked. I believe Kensington and Chelsea should make their data public.

3. WE ALREADY HAVE A MOTORBIKE SPACE ON FERNSHAW. WE DO NOT NEED TO ADD ROWS OF E-BIKES ON TOP.

4. NOISE, DISTURBANCE, VANDALISM: When bikes are serviced, the street would see more congestion and noise disturbance caused by the loading/unloading of e-bikes from the maintenance vans. Theft or vandalism of e-bikes is rampant and we do not wish to attract vandals to a residential street that is not as well lit as the two main arteries around the corner such as Fulham road or King's road.

5. THERE ARE MUCH BETTER SOLUTIONS ON THE CORNER ON HIGH TRAFFIC ROADS. Why would you choose a small residential street (Fernshaw Road), when there is space to expand the street e-bike parking on the corner of Fulham road & Edith Grove? The pavement there is particularly wide and could take more bikes. Similarly, on the King's road, in front of the big multi-storey building at Number 536 King's road, the pavement is 3 times as wide as on our street, leaving ample space for a row of e-bikes.

6. LACK OF REAL CONSULTATION: I found out about the consultation totally by chance because a neighbour had heard of it. In talking to other neighbours, it turned out that none of them had been notified. As residents of Fernshaw Road, the very least we would expect is to receive a very clear communication on the proposal. It seems no effort was made to notify Fernshaw Road residents, no letter or leaflet were sent to us.

Objection Twelve

I live in Fernshaw road. I do support burning in London. With that said, I do object to the bay being put on Fernshaw road.

Reason are as follows:

- e bikes have recently been in the news due to fire issues and therefore object to putting a bay on the road due to the risks these bike pose. Here is just one example: <https://news.sky.com/video/moment-e-bike-bursts-into-flames-at-sutton-train-station-13109759>
- Edith Grove corner: for several months 10-20 e bikes have been kept on the corner. This made it difficult to actually walk around the corner. It was not maintained or looked after and it was/has been a really problem.
- It is already a very busy road - with the football stadium near by we get all the cars from the game on the street and the private drivers sitting in their cars waiting for their clients. We can't also be expected to then absorb quite a lot of e bikes to crowd up the space even further.
- This is right near my front door and being that it is not under control at Edith grove makes a case that it will be left for the residents to deal with the inconvenience of all the bikes.

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

Objection One

1. A cul-de-sac is not where people get off bikes. I have NEVER seen an abandoned bike in Netherton Grove. People take bikes to places eg on the Fulham road. The best place is outside Chelsea and Westminster hospital adjacent to the existing bike racks
2. It is unclear whether it would involve losing any residents parking bays which are already in short supply. If it is merely the yellow line between parking bay and the ambulance exit that is less of an issue but the key point is 1. above.

Objection Two

Parking is already very tight on this street. Residential parking spaces have been changed to disabled bays for hospital visitors. Of course this is right, but it makes the situation difficult for residents, and it will become worse if more parking bays are removed.

Objection Three

There is already very little residential parking on the street as bays have been removed (understandably) to convert to disabled bays for hospital visitors. Please do not further remove residential parking spaces.

Support in Full One

As mentioned on the telephone, living on Netherton Grove has become a nightmare with non stop traffic coming up and down our cul de sac, parking across our gates and running their engines. It is probably one of the most polluted roads in London.

So we would welcome a bike parking bay

