

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA
TRAFFIC ORDER - CONSOLIDATION OF EXISTING RENTAL E-BIKE BAYS FOR
E-BIKE AND E-SCOOTER USE, AND CREATION OF ADDITIONAL
MICROMOBILITY PARKING BAYS ACROSS THE BOROUGH.
CONSULTATION REPORT BY THE TRANSPORT PROJECTS MANAGER
AUGUST 2026

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Between 27 May and 17 June 2026, the Council consulted on:

- consolidating the borough's existing rental e-bike bays for e-bike and e-scooter use and
- proposing additional dedicated parking bays for use by e-bike and e-scooter hire operators and their customers, in existing parking bays across the borough.

The full proposals across the borough can be viewed [here](#). Each new location proposed was selected by the Council to plug gaps in the network of existing bays, or to provide relief to those existing bays that are experiencing regular overspill of e-bikes into adjacent parking bays, or onto footways.

1.2 This report sets out the consultation responses received to the proposals, 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 Highway and Regulatory Services proceed as set out in Table 1, creating 27 additional micromobility bays.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 The parking of rental e-bikes on narrow footways or in car parking spaces causes a significant nuisance to road users. In June 2023, the Council made a Key Decision (KD) to implement rental e-bike parking bays and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with rental e-bike operators to stipulate that all rental e-bikes be parked in designated bays. In support of this, 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 2024 the Council added 54 bays, bringing the total to 187 marked bays.

3.2 In general, the creation of the bays has meant that the proportion of bikes on footways remains lower, even as the actual number of e-bikes on our streets has grown in line. However, many of the designated bays are regularly over capacity, with bikes being left adjacent to the bay, either on the footway or in adjacent car parking spaces.). The Council's enforcement officers undertake enforcement action against rental e-bikes left in a dangerously obstructive

position but the mismatch between demand for and capacity of designated parking bays remains a major challenge. The Council wishes to make it easier for users to park e-bikes in designated spaces by plugging gaps in the network of existing bays.

- 3.3 The consultation also proposed to consolidate existing rental e-bike bays for e-bike and e-scooter use, in line with the proposals for the new bays, and with the expectation that bays will be dual use as part of incoming legislation.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 From 27 May and 17 June 2026, the Council undertook consultation on two proposals: 1) introducing new rental micromobility (rental e-bike and e-scooter) parking bays at 54 locations in 17 wards (no bays were proposed in Earl's Court ward) and 2) consolidating existing rental e-bike bays for e-bike and e-scooter use. 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, community groups and statutory consultees were made aware of the consultations by email.

Proposal One - New rental micromobility bays

- 4.2 In total, 567 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Of the 54 proposals, having considered the high number of objections to the Allen Street, Bedford Gardens, Brewster Gardens, Crowthorne Road, Fernshaw Road, Gertrude Street, Kelso Place, Kensington Square, Latimer Road, Palace Gardens Terrace, Pembridge Place, Pembroke Gardens, Phillimore Gardens, Royal Avenue, Scarsdale Villas, Stanhope Gardens, Stanley Crescent, Tedworth Square and Thorndike Close proposals, officers recommend **not** proceeding with these 19 locations.
- 4.3 Officers have also recommended **not** proceeding with the eight proposals at Cheyne Row, Elm Park Gardens, Embankment Gardens, Flood Walk, Onslow Square, Ovington Street, Sirdar Road and St Lawrence Terrace for the following reasons:
- Cheyne Row: a narrow one-way street and the proposed site is opposite a National Trust property.
 - Elm Park Gardens: the proximity of a personalised disabled bay and tables and chairs on the footway.
 - Embankment Gardens: officers understand that Transport for London plans to propose an e-bike bay nearby on Chelsea Embankment.
 - Flood Walk: officers now expect to relocate this bay to the rear of Chelsea Old Town Hall when structural work there has been completed.
 - Onslow Square: the proximity of St Paul's Church and Royal Marsden/Royal Brompton Hospitals leads to significant risk of the bay overflowing.
 - Ovington Street: officers were not previously aware of the proximity of the proposed site to a residential entrance.

- Sirdar Road: proximity to Avondale Park school
- St Lawrence Terrace: proximity to the exit of the Instituto Espanol School and a residential crossover which risks being blocked.

- 4.4 Twenty-seven locations are recommended to proceed. The officer responses to the objections raised in relation to these locations are detailed below in Section 5. Ward councillor comments received during the consultation are reported separately in Appendix 1. One location, Ladbroke Terrace has been recommended to proceed despite receiving ten objections, responses to those objections are covered by Section 5, it also received one 'support in part' and one 'support in full' response. Two objections appeared to misunderstand the proposals, and since the consultation, officers have received correspondence from Pembridge ward Councillors and understand that proceeding with the change as proposed now has their support. Officers consider that it will achieve the desired outcome of protecting the nearby disabled bay from encroachment by e-bikes currently overflowing from the adjacent e-bike bay. Appendix 4 lists the responses received to this proposal in full.
- 4.5 Some respondents asked that their response be applied to every proposed new micromobility bay location in the borough. This amounts to a comment on the policy of providing e-bike and e-scooter parking bays, which was introduced through the 2023 KD. Whilst people are free to express this position it is not strictly relevant to a consultation on specific sites. We have therefore included responses from people who asked for their position (five in support, seven in objection) to be applied to every proposal in the borough (Appendix 3) with officer responses in Section 5; we have not included these in the location-specific figures in Table 1.

Table 1 – Summary of responses received.

Ward	Scheme	No. Objections	No. Support in Full	No. Support in Part	No opinion	Recommendation
All	Consolidation of existing rental e-bike bays for e-bike and e-scooter use	8	4	4	0	Proceed
Abingdon	Scarsdale Villas	6	2	0	0	Do not proceed
	Allen Street	29	1	0	0	Do not proceed
	Pembroke Gardens	10	2	0	0	Do not proceed
Brompton & Hans Town	Ovington Street	1	0	0	0	Do not proceed
	Cadogan Place	0	0	0	0	Proceed
	Cadogan Square	0	0	0	0	Proceed
	Hans Place	0	0	0	0	Proceed
Campden	Palace Gardens Terrace	91	3	0	1	Do not proceed

Proposal Two – allowing rental e-scooters to park in e-bike bays

- 4.6 A total of 16 responses to this proposal were received, of which eight were objections, four were in support and four supported in part. Appendix 2 lists the responses received to this proposal in full.

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Proposal One - New rental micromobility bays

- 5.1 Officer responses to the objections or 'support in part' responses are detailed below. Officers have not responded to out-of-scope comments. Appendix 2 lists the responses received to each location in full.

Loss of parking space

- 5.2 Some respondents were concerned at the loss of car parking space to accommodate an e-bike parking bay.

Officer Response

- 5.3 Most footways in the borough are not wide enough to accommodate e-bike bays without unduly impacting on pedestrian movement. The system of requiring all rental e-bikes to park in designated bays consequently means that a reduction in car parking is necessary. There are just under 29,000 residents' parking spaces in the borough – far more than available pay-by-phone bays - so the 54 proposed bay conversions to dockless e-bike bays represents less than half of one per cent, if all proposals proceeded. Following the consultation officers propose to proceed with only around half of that number of e-bike bays. In comparison, residents' permit numbers are around 14 per cent lower than they were in 2013 suggesting that there is capacity in the borough to convert car parking to other uses.

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

- 5.4 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. Some commented that there is no enforcement of e-bikes, either against the operators or their customers.

Officer Response

- 5.5 The main objective of the micromobility bays is to help address the problem of rental bikes and scooters being left in inconvenient positions on footways. Whilst some users are still opting to end rides on footways, the creation of the bays led to a reduction in the number of e-bikes left on pavements and is the only way we can provide for rental e-bikes to be parked without causing obstructions. 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.

- 5.6 However, enforcement officers can undertake enforcement action against rental vehicles left in a dangerous (as opposed to nuisance) position using the Highways Act 1980 Section 149(2) (permitting local authorities to immediately remove items that are causing a hazard or danger to highway users). If residents observe a e-bike or e-scooter left in a dangerous position, this can be reported to ebike-enforcement@rbkc.gov.uk for removal.

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 traffic 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. If residents do observe an e-bike or e-scooter left in a dangerous position, this can be reported to ebike-enforcement@rbkc.gov.uk for removal.

There is already a hire e-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 users will be more likely to comply with designated e-bike parking bays if there is a reasonable density of parking bays so that they never have to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The sites selected in this consultation were identified to plug gaps in the network or to relieve pressure on oversubscribed bays nearby. 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, a user who has rented a dockless e-bike cannot end their hire at a Santander cycle hire station Santander cycle hire now accounts for only around one in eight rental bike trips in the borough.

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 Visual appearance is a matter of subjective taste, and while some people may prefer to see parked cars at the kerbside rather than parked rental e-bikes, these e-bikes are nonetheless commonplace across London. There is no evidence that the presence of rental micromobility 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. Our regular street cleaning and monitoring ensures that any localised increase in littering should be in short duration.

Install the e-bike bay in an alternative location

- 5.14 Some respondents suggested installing the bay(s) at alternative locations. Officers are not expecting to undertake any further rounds of consultation to use suggestions for alternative locations, but officer responses to why the proposed locations are or are not suitable are provided in the table below.

Ward	Location as proposed	Proposed alternative location	Officer's Response
Holland	Fairfax Place	Holland Road. Respondent believes parking bay here are difficult/dangerous for cars to park in anyway. Russell Road. (no reason given).	Both Holland Road and Russell Road are dominated by property frontages, the flank wall of the site in Fairfax Place is considered less intrusive. Holland Road is a busy red route and one-way northbound only for cyclists.
Notting Dale	St Mark's Road	Further up St. Mark's road towards Oxford/Cambridge Gardens to reduce impact of noise and anti-social behaviour.	It is not anticipated that the proposed e-bike bay would generate noise or anti-social behaviour levels noticeably different from those typically experienced elsewhere within RBKC.
Royal Hospital	Sloane Gardens	Holbein Place	Officers propose to remove the virtual bay by Sloane Gardens and to extend this carriageway bay. The suggested location of Holbein Place would lead to loss of Pay-By-Phone bays which are in high demand in this area.

Other comments

- 5.15 Other comments received sitting outside of the above themes are illustrated in the table below, alongside officer responses.

Comment Summary	Officer Response
------------------------	-------------------------

1	Treverton Street There is already ongoing disruption from the school entrance being moved to Treverton Street and the school's attempt to make it a restricted zone.	The presence of a School Street closure does not preclude the introduction of an e-bike parking bay. We have other examples of e-bike bays within School Street zones.
2	Elvaston Place Proximity to diplomatic premises and concerns over security.	There is no obligation to consult with diplomatic premises and there is no evidence to suggest that an e-bike bay would pose more security risk than a car permitted to park in this bay currently.

Officer responses to objections to the principle of rental e-bike bays

No mention of shared electric wheelchairs or mobility scooters

Officer Response

- 5.16 The Council is unaware of any of the current operators in the borough operating shared electric wheelchairs or mobility scooters. If operators wanted to introduce these types of shared vehicles, the Council would consider the appropriateness of the existing parking bays for this purpose, or whether alternative facilities should be provided.

Bays should have physical barriers at either end to discourage the bikes spilling over into the residents' parking or prevent them from falling on cars

Officer Response

- 5.17 Evidence from boroughs that have implemented barriers suggests these do not prevent overspilling onto footways or adjacent parking bays.

E-bikes should operate under a docked system

Officer Response

- 5.18 The Council has no powers to prevent operators operating, and no powers to force operators to operate under a docked model. The operators remain responsible for tidying of designated bays and ensuring they are not over capacity.

Impact on Emergency Services and Waste Collection

Officer Response

- 5.19 The Council is unaware of reports of micromobility vehicles preventing the emergency services or waste collection colleagues from operating. The Council can undertake enforcement action against rental e-bikes left in a dangerous (but not nuisance) position using the Highways Act 1980 Section

149(2). Such bikes can be reported to ebike-enforcement@rbkc.gov.uk for removal.

Micromobility bays pose an unacceptable level of high-frequency noise and, vibration,

Officer Response

- 5.20 It is not clear how electric bikes and scooters pose more noise or vibration than motor vehicles able to use the Council's streets at present. Indeed, it is generally accepted that electric vehicles are quieter and not subject to the emissions of idling diesel or petrol vehicles.

Proposal 2) – allowing rental e-scooters to park in e-bike bays

Opposed to the principle of e-scooters/e-bikes / Users are irresponsible

Officer Response

- 5.21 The Council has no powers to prevent e-bike or e-scooter operators operating, nor their customers using micromobility vehicles. Provision of designated e-bike parking bays is Council policy following a Key Decision¹ in June 2023 as a means to try and reduce the impact of micromobility vehicles left on the street. If bays were not provided, these vehicles would remain on the Council's streets – predominantly on footways - as it has no powers to prevent the companies operating.
- 5.22 Whilst some people who cycle or scoot may exhibit poor riding behaviour, this is not a reason to refuse to install rental micromobility parking, in the same way the Council would not refuse to provide car parking because some people who drive contravene traffic rules.

E-bike operator concern regarding spaces being over-filled if e-scooter operators can use formerly designated e-bike only bays

Officer Response

- 5.23 The Royal Borough does indeed permit four separate e-bike operators, capped at 600 bicycles each. There are two e-scooter operators in the borough operating up to 300 vehicles per day between them. The existing number of dual-use micromobility bays in the borough is expected to be 265 with a capacity of 12 vehicles each. This is before any of the new micromobility bays are implemented as a result of the proposals set out in the main body of this report. Provided that all e-bike operators respect the cap set out in their Memorandum of Understanding with the Council, the parking bay provision is sufficient for all operators, even accounting for more 'down time' for e-scooters. The Council has no plans to increase permitted fleet caps until operators are able to demonstrate better management of their fleets.

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 1: Ward Councillor Comments

Ward Councillor	E-Bike Bay	Comments	Officer Recommendation
Cllr Georgia Hardisty (Pembroke ward)	Ladbroke Terrace	I wish to object to the proposed relocation of the e-bike bay on Ladbroke Terrace. I welcome the intention to address the ongoing issues affecting the existing disabled parking bay. However, I believe that the current proposal will not resolve the underlying problem. Instead, it risks transferring it to a location where the consequences for traffic flow and highway safety are likely to be more severe. As officers will be aware, the existing e-bike bay regularly overflows beyond its designated area, with bikes frequently occupying adjacent highway space and encroaching on the disabled parking bay. Despite widespread concern from residents and councillors, enforcement options have proved limited. The practical reality is that the volume of bikes often exceeds the capacity of the bay provided. The proposal would relocate the e-bike bay to the opposite side of Ladbroke Terrace while reinstating the residents' parking bay opposite. Although this may alleviate pressure on the disabled bay, it merely transfers the overflow issue to a more sensitive location. The proposed site sits adjacent to highway improvements that were specifically introduced to improve vehicle movements and safety at the Holland Park Avenue end of Ladbroke Terrace. Former Pembroke councillors worked alongside highways officers to remove a parking space and extend double yellow lines near the junction to create a passing place. This enables vehicles turning into Ladbroke Terrace to pull in safely, allow oncoming traffic to pass, and improve access to and from Holland Park Avenue. Given the established pattern of e-bike overspill, there is a significant risk that bikes will occupy this double yellow line	Proceed.

		area and adjacent carriageway space. This will likely undermine the very traffic management measures that were introduced to improve safety and reduce congestion. Evidence elsewhere, including at the existing bay in Aubrey Walk, demonstrates that e-bikes can and do spread beyond the designated bay into neighbouring parking and highway areas when demand exceeds capacity. Before proceeding, the Council should explore alternative options that address the capacity issue rather than simply relocating it. One option may be to consider relocating the disabled bay to Notting Hill Gate, where it serves a general rather than individual user need, and using the existing location to provide a larger e-bike bay capable of accommodating actual demand. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the current proposal and undertake further work to identify a solution that genuinely resolves the existing issues rather than transferring them elsewhere.	
Councillor Natacha Tannous Ritchie (Pembridge ward)	Ladbroke Terrace	Georgia and I are very keen to find a solution that will stop the constant disabled bay obstruction on Ladbroke terrace. If moving the disabled bay is too lengthy a process, we will have to move the e-bikes bay across.	Proceed
Councillor Natacha Tannous Ritchie (Pembridge ward)	Pembridge Place	There are already multiple e-bike parking locations within a short walking distance of the proposed site, including an existing bay on Pembridge Square, as well as additional bays nearby on the edge of the residential area. These locations already serve residents and visitors without intruding into the heart of a quiet residential street. Many residents who use e-bikes report no difficulty accessing bikes at these existing locations. In the absence of clear evidence of unmet demand, it is difficult to justify introducing another bay at the junction of Dawson Place and Pembridge Place, particularly given the impact it would have	Do not proceed.

		on residential amenity and the character of the conservation area. 2. Noise, Clutter, Poor Parking Behaviour and impact on Families and Pedestrians Experience elsewhere in London (see Westminster's own e-bike report) has shown that e-bike bays frequently result in bikes being left outside designated areas, obstructing pavements and creating visual clutter. Westminster City Council's own review identified complaints relating to noise from servicing operations, audible locking and unlocking alerts, bikes toppling over, vehicle damage, and anti-social behaviour associated with some bays. Moreover, since nearby roads are restricted during school drop-off period ('school street'), this junction has become an important drop-off and pick-up point for families using local nurseries and schools (Wetherby and Pembridge Hall). Removing kerbside space and introducing a concentration of parked bikes risks creating additional obstructions in an area regularly used by parents with young children and pushchairs. 3. Impact on Community Safety Residents have experienced a number of burglaries and break-ins in recent years and have contributed towards additional private security patrols. The proposed location currently provides an important parking and observation point used by the neighbourhood security vehicle to monitor surrounding streets. Removing this position would weaken existing security arrangements for a facility whose necessity has not been demonstrated. 4. Better Alternative Locations Exist If additional e-bike capacity is	
--	--	---	--

		required, more suitable locations exist nearby, with higher levels of visitor activity and transport infrastructure. These locations would better serve users while avoiding unnecessary impacts on residential streets. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to reject this proposal and identify a more appropriate alternative location. Given the presence of an existing bay on Pembridge Square and other nearby facilities, the proposed bay appears unnecessary and would provide little additional benefit while imposing a disproportionate impact on local residents. Yours faithfully, Cllr Natacha Tannous Ritchie <i>Additional Comments</i> I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to let you know that both Pembridge Ward Councillors (Georgia and myself) have submitted objections to the proposed dockless e-bike parking bay at the junction of Dawson Place and Pembridge Place. I also understand that the Head of Pembridge Hall School may have submitted an objection (which is understandable given the potential impact on school drop-off arrangements in the immediate area), as well as feedback we have received from a number of residents on Dawson Place who have been complaining about it. In summary, our concerns are as follows: • The proposal risks exacerbating existing congestion and safety issues at school drop-off times, particularly given the use of Dawson Place for parking associated with the School Street scheme. • There are already several nearby e-bike parking bays, including on Pembridge Square and Pembridge Place, making this additional bay unnecessary. • The location is within a quiet residential conservation area where there is limited demonstrated demand. • The proposal risks adding unnecessary street clutter and negatively impacting the character of the	
--	--	---	--

		area. • More suitable alternative locations with higher footfall and visitor activity are available nearby. We would be happy to work with you to find alternative locations. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.	
Cllr Georgia Hardisty (Pembroke ward)	Pembroke Place	I am writing to object to the proposed dockless e-bike bay on the flank wall of 13 Dawson Place, immediately south of the junction with Pembroke Place. I set out below the principal reasons for my objection. Lack of demonstrated need There are already several e-bike bays within a short walking distance of the proposed site. Residents have identified at least four existing bays within approximately 250 metres, providing convenient access to shared e-bikes without the need to introduce additional infrastructure into this sensitive residential location. Several residents who regularly use shared e-bikes have confirmed that they do not have trouble locating or accessing bicycles through the existing network. In the absence of evidence demonstrating unmet demand, the justification for an additional bay at this location appears limited. Impact on residential character Pembroke Place and Dawson Place form a predominantly residential environment with relatively low visitor footfall and a distinctive residential character. The introduction of an e-bike bay would bring a permanent transport facility into a quiet residential setting, together with the associated concentration of parked bicycles and user activity. This would detract from the character and appearance of the street and would urbanise a location that derives much of its appeal from its residential quality and sense of tranquillity.	Do not proceed.

		Residential amenity and noise While individual bicycle journeys may generate only limited disturbance, the cumulative impact of repeated arrivals and departures, bicycle locking and unlocking alerts, conversations between users, and servicing activity should not be underestimated. Such activity may be entirely appropriate in commercial areas and on busier roads, but it is less suitable in a narrow residential street where residents can reasonably expect a greater degree of peace and quiet. The impacts are likely to be felt disproportionately by those living immediately adjacent to the proposed bay. Congestion and pedestrian movement Residents have already experienced increased traffic and pedestrian activity following the introduction of the School Street arrangements around Pembridge Square. The proposed bay would attract additional users to a junction frequently used by families and young children, particularly during school drop-off and collection periods. Community safety concerns The area has experienced a significant number of burglaries and break-ins in recent years, leading many residents to contribute towards additional private security measures to improve community safety. While there is no suggestion that e-bike users themselves are responsible for criminal activity, Westminster's own review of dockless bike and scooter bays acknowledges concerns raised in some locations regarding increased anti-social behaviour and crime-related activity associated with such facilities. Given the	
--	--	---	--

		area's recent experience of serious criminal incidents, these concerns warrant careful consideration when assessing the suitability of this location. Conclusion I therefore respectfully request that the Council reject this proposal and instead consider alternative nearby locations that can accommodate additional e-bike provision without imposing unnecessary adverse impacts on a predominantly residential street.	
Cllr Sam Mackover (Queen's Gate ward)	Kelso Place	I concur fully with VRARA's remarks [against the proposal].	Do not proceed.
Cllr Josh Rendall Cllr Kim Taylor-Smith Cllr Will Pascal (Stanley ward)	Fernshaw Road Gertrude Street	The three Stanley Councillors object to the following sites for the dockless/scooter bays • Fernshaw Rd SW10 • 31 Gertrude Street SW10	Do not proceed.

Appendix 2: Responses received from respondents to the proposed consolidation of existing rental e-bike bays for e-bike and e-scooter use (Borough-wide)

Objections

1	The roads where I live are littered with e-scooters and bikes to the point that they are unsafe. I pay for resident parking and more and more bays are becoming something else entirely. Either they are electric charging points or now a bay for bikes or scooters. I disagree with these and they are unsafe as they litter our roads I can't cross walk or park properly.
2	I oppose the installation of a micromobility bay at this location. The area already suffers from limited parking, traffic congestion, and pavement clutter. Adding e-bike/scooter infrastructure here is likely to create obstruction, noise, and safety concerns for pedestrians, especially elderly residents and families with children. A more suitable location should be identified away from residential homes and narrow pavements.
3	The use of these modes of transport have become the bane of London Streets. The people who use them have no respect for highway laws or damage caused to property or person. The way they are ridden & the speeds they attain are dangerous, to other road users & pedestrians. They are dumped randomly without consideration (even when they are given parking spots...spilling beyond their allotted spaces, into parking bays, pavements & the wider road.) I have seen them left in piles (in the road) like art installations/blocking access to roads & pavements, & dumped into the canals & the Thames . They are an eye sore in every area they are left, & this is made more apparent, when you travel out of London to areas where there are none. Parking bays for cars alone are not enough in this borough, especially with the allowance of motorcycles to park randomly within these spaces. And you are suggesting that spaces should now be reduced even further & into quieter areas, where more disruption may occur once these bays are allowed. I usually park my vehicle in Thorndike Close, where parking is already at a premium & I believe this will be yet another negative impact on residents, who have already spent years battling with anti-social behaviour...especially in the early hours. Boris Bikes are controlled & already allocated space & this is all that should ever be allowed for those that still wish to cycle, without owning a bicycle. The e-scooters should not even exist on the highways...especially when there are no laws to ensure they are used in a proper manner at all times.
4	Unless implemented across the whole of London users will continue to leave the bikes everywhere. So if only applied in RBK&C the outcome will be bikes everywhere AND fewer parking bays
5	Our core concern around the proposal to allow e-scooters to use all existing e-bike bays in the borough is the reality of how space is used and who will genuinely benefit from it. It is understandable the desire to equalise the parking options between e-scooters and e-bikes: in a comprehensively designed and managed system, this is the ultimate outcome. However, the material reality is that as one of the few boroughs to combine Mandatory parking as well as four separate e-bike operators, space in RBKC is already oversupplied, and the knock-on effects to residents and business owners are clear and present. With no increase in the fleet cap in several years for the two largest operators, Lime and Forest, and the inflow of bikes into central London on a day-to-day basis, they have had to increase operational resources to manage increasingly vanishing space. Although this proposal intends that the total fleet cap of e-scooters will not increase in the borough, they will now have access to bays which were solely for e-bikes. Those same bays will have greater

	stress placed on them, as the most popular locations will likely remain the same for both vehicle types. Without clear evidence that these e-scooters will be used, and from published data compared to e-bikes, the gap in demand is clear. E-scooters will sit unused, taking up space in bays which could have gone to e-bikes with utilisation many times their own. Without a doubt, this will only worsen those locations which see the highest number of complaints in the borough, with little tangible benefit.
6	We already have a bay in Edith Terrace which traverses Fernshaw Rd and as this is solely a residential area there is no need to further increase the capacity for bikes and yet again limit the amount of car spaces available. We have several disabled bays and recently have had many suspensions of car spaces due to road works. The reckless use of these bikes is a serious problem, Many bikes get left on the pavement when a few metres away there is a space in an allocated bay. I am becoming fearful of walking on the pavement as have been narrowly missed many time by rogue riders. I think the time has come to increase education and sanctions on the riders instead of encouraging them, giving more space is not going to improve the poor behaviour.
7	E-Bikes and scooters are very poorly regulated and operated. Even when users return their vehicles in designated bays, they are often not collected efficiently. So many bays are OVERFLOWING with bikes, causing potential damage to surrounding parked cars, physical danger to pedestrians etc. RBKC should be working with the Mayor's office to regulate the bike companies!!
8	There need to be more limits on how many bikes and where / how they are parked. Right now it is chaos with too many bikes strewn about.

Support in part responses

1	In view of the experience in Bina Gardens last year when a mass of deliveroo etc riders invaded the street and behaved in an anti social way, I would recommend that the bays are initially for a trial period of say 2 months, and if any bays are taken over by vast numbers of delivery etc drivers the bay is then cancelled. This is to protect the environment and the residential character of the area
2	There are already enough spaces in the Borough and this is not the problem. Bikes are dumped into pavements and in the middle of crossing obstructing passage on purpose, not for lack of dedicated bay (which are often empty). This has become a real and serious problem actually. Users can do as they want without consideration for other people because there is no control or enforcement from the authorities (how many tickets raised?) and from the companies (they should ban users breaking the law from the service but they have no intention to do so, missing the related revenue). The only way is to indefinitely seize the ebikes to force the company to cooperate or blocking their authorization to operate. There is also the increasing dangerous use of the ebikes by user jumping red-lights. The council and local police should do more to address this problem and to enforce the law. Another request is to have visible recognition numbers on each ebike in order to be able to identify the users.
3	My house door in front of Gilston Road is the worst example of how this can be operated. The door, pavement and the street is parked randomly with tens of bicycles. Blocking entry, blocking road, using every as a trash bin. I have 100 pictures to present to you. It is dangerously, not in line with what needs

	to be achieved and it sets a very bad example. It should be taken away from this street. If it is a necessity, around the corner, priority walk entrance at least has no door gate.
4	Increased micromobility, e-bikes and bike storage infrastructure as well as electric vehicle charging points are fantastic. However, the council needs to ensure that anti-social behaviour, bikes blocking sidewalks etc. is addressed and work with the operators to ensure this

Supportive responses

1	[No comment supplied]
2	Fully supportive. It's the future of green transport but is currently an issue for all residents, whether e-bike users or not. Supportive of all parking bay conversions suggested, in principle.
3	They provide an excellent alternative to using personal cars and public transport, especially at rush hour times. Any proposal that supports their use while also increasing the chances that pathways remain clear is a very good idea.
4	[No comment supplied]

Appendix 3: Responses received from respondents wishing their responses to apply to all proposed locations in the Borough

Objections

1	Although in principle this serves a myopic approach to mobility needs in 2026, and, your proposal cites wheelchair users first in your argument for the proposed approach . There is no mention of shared electric wheelchairs or mobility scooters using these bays for shared mobility wheelchairs and scooters. Mobility scooters and electric tricycles used in Europe will be here soon as the general population reaches a demographic of having access and need to this type of mobility aid. We are indeed “Baby Boomers “ , born after WW2 and there are a lot of us. As cars are being phased out of Central London and the answer for people like myself with M. S. , a fully integrated mobility scooter hire is coming here soon and Alinker is working the Mayor to provide a hybrid solution of hire for people with Mobility need, as they have in the Netherlands. Therefore, an omission of any inclusive mobility shared vehicle is not inclusive and why I would like my objection to made. An overhaul of the Parking system to be upgraded to keep shopping local and support local business is paramount alongside people who need to be able to contribute to this valuable Community spending. I would like to be more involved in this Consultation and as I am a retired Civil Servant V&A Museum, I do have time as part of my value to offer to this part of setting up for the future of RBKC Town Planning with inclusivity. As an aside the Royal Borough has become so disconnected since Covid and a lot of public monies being used over and over on photos and no follow ups, new managers, no coherence and starting over every time. I have an example for a simple replacement Communal Garden Tap. 3 years later and 4 managers and 30 photographs later, Elm Park Gardens West, North sides does not have the tap/ connection replacement and RBKC planted new plants in each flower bed 2 months ago.
2	While I am not against rental bikes as a concept (other than the fact that it encourages cycling without a helmet), your idea to remove residents’ parking for this purpose is fundamentally flawed. Firstly you are removing parking from residents and therefore ratepayers to the benefit of a private company to expand its business. There is only so much space that can be used for parking and you are skewing the supply in favour of Lime and their ilk. Almost more serious is tacking such bays on the end of car parking bays. No driver that has any thought for the condition of his car would park in such a bay. Here is an example of an almost daily state of affairs in the bay at the eastern end of Aubrey Walk: You will note that the cycle bay starts just to the right of the heap of bikes behind the word ‘only’ and extends to the left, so all of the bikes you can see except for those in that left end heap, are in residents’ parking. This is not a one off, it is like this most of the time. It gets tidied up (but not moved out of the residents’ parking) once in a blue moon and within a couple of days we are back to this. Here is a picture of this bay today, it was tidied yesterday: Already there are 3 bikes in the residents’ parking. The Landrover is probably safe but an ordinary car? Think of the damage a lime bike will do if it falls on the front of your car. The result is that most people avoid the spaces in the residents’ bay next to the adjacent bike bay because of this danger. The result is we lose not the one or two space (hopefully not more) for rental bike parking, but also several car parking spaces adjacent to it which are blighted by the inevitable damage that parking there will invite. In a more sane world, if for example you put a token barrier- a metal hoop at the junction of the cycle bay and the residents’ parking, this would discourage the bikes spilling over into the

	residents' parking or prevent them from falling on cars, but I very much doubt this would work. So, if you must increase the real estate offered to Lime and their competitors, please don't attach this to existing residents' parking, and don't take it from existing residents' parking spaces! *Additional Comments* Thank you for your response. My comment is of course an objection/ concern! Aubrey Walk was used as an example as it precisely mimics the proposed alterations in other locations and clearly illustrates the folly of what is proposed for them.
3	As a pedestrian family with mobility issues, my main concern about more of these bikes and scooters is that, being dockless, they are abandoned in rhr road, on pavements and in harm's way generally. Trying to negotiate the pavements with wheelchairs, pushchairs or even a disabled scooter can become impossible. I frequently see our wonderful Chelsea pensioners struggling to get around until people kindly move these bikes and scooters strewn across their path. These items need to be docked. People shouldn't be released from further payment inly ehcn the bike or scooter is safely docked WHERE THEY ARE REQUIRED TO BE. Creating these places for them is great, but getting people to use them is equally important. Solving this issue by docking requirements would solve the main problem most reaidents have with them, and allow mobility for pedestrians too.
4	I am writing to OBJECT strongly to more residents' parking bays being converted to e-bike parking areas: : "More residents parking bays due to be assigned to e-bikes and scooters. The council is consulting on a further set of bays to be set aside for e-bikes. All existing dockless bike bays in the borough are also proposed to be converted into shared-use for both dockless bikes and e-scooters. Anyone who has any comments on these proposals (or would like further information) can email trafficorders@rbkc.gov.uk before 17 June 2026." Unless and until RBKC stipulates that e-bikes must be collected and returned from and to Docking stations, they will continue to be a major problem in our W10 area. Bikes are left in residents' bays, my car has already been damaged in Highlever Road. There are usually 5 or 6 bikes parked in the residents bay adjacent to the bike bay. If you park your car anwhere near the e-bikes there is the danger of them being pushed or falling over and damaging cars. The situation is already badly organised to the detriment of residents. Please change the legislation so that e-bike providers must provide docking bays to try and keep the situation under control. Converting more parking bays to e-bike bays will spread and increase the problem.
5	I am writing regarding the above proposal. There is already a great difficulty with parking for residents in our area, and to loose any parking bays would add additional pressure to the already challenging position residents experience parking. I would be most grateful to reconsider this proposal. I would oppose this proposal due to many local residents not using this service and the impact on our residents.
6	I object to the removal of residents and visitor parking for Dockless bike & scooter bays.
7	I am writing to formally submit my objection to additional dedicated parking bays for e bikes and scooters in the borough.

	As a local resident, I object to this installation based on the following cumulative transport, safety, and obstruction grounds: * Severe Cumulative Loss of Parking: Resident parking in the borough is already at a breaking point. On-Street Obstruction and Danger from Existing Cycle Provisions: The existing rental bicycle parking arrangements throughout the borough are already completely mismanaged and out of control. As shown in the attached photograph, these dockless bicycles are constantly dumped haphazardly inside resident parking spaces, Pay and Display bays, and all over the public pavements. Impact on Emergency Services and Waste Collection: This mountain of abandoned bicycles creates a major physical hazard. Pedestrians are forced off the footway, and drivers face severe visibility issues trying to manoeuvre around them. Crucially, these abandoned bikes regularly narrow the functional highway, causing documented delays to emergency service vehicles and Council waste collection trucks. Introducing more space for E bikes & scooters will only compound this existing traffic flow crisis. Loss of Residential Amenity: The compounding reduction of general parking spaces inflicts an unfair burden on local residents. Furthermore, positioning of additional bays directly outside residential homes introduces unacceptable levels of high-frequency noise, vibration, and idling. Sufficiency of Existing Alternatives: Adequate cycle parking facilities already exist if used correctly within the immediate North Kensington and Ladbroke Grove area, making this further encroachment on resident spaces entirely unnecessary. * I strongly urge the Council to reject this proposal. The local infrastructure in the borough cannot absorb further losses to parking, nor can it handle more vehicular congestion. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of the final decision regarding this TMO.
--	---

Responses in support

1	Thank you for sharing the proposed micromobility parking bay proposals for consultation. I support the principle of introducing properly managed bays for dockless bicycles and e-scooters, particularly if this helps reduce pavement clutter and improves short-distance travel within and between neighbouring boroughs. I would however be grateful if you could clarify the current requirements and practical conditions for residents wishing to use e-scooters within RBKC and Westminster. For example: • Which operators are currently authorised within RBKC and Westminster? • Are rental e-scooters permitted to travel freely between the two boroughs? • Are there any restrictions on parking or ending journeys across borough boundaries? • Are privately owned e-scooters permitted, or only authorised rental schemes? • Is there a minimum age, driving licence or insurance requirement for users? I ask because my regular route is between Kensington and Belgravia (Westminster), and during the summer period this could become a practical alternative to short car journeys. Many thanks in advance for your clarification.
2	I strongly support the proposed changes. The bikes are a welcome and popular addition and need to be given appropriate space to ensure they can be parked safely and properly

3	[Redacted] forwarded on to me your S613 proposal for additional e-bike bays and I just wanted to write to you in support of the proposals. As an e-bike commuter myself I will find the Whitchurch Road bay particularly helpful, and I know our residents will also benefit from the additional bays outside St Thomas Jones school where there is currently little access to e-bike parking. Could I clarify though, on the below markup there is an area in red, which I believe to be the Whitchurch Road proposed bay, there is a section of green bay marked opposite. Could I confirm that this is not a proposed section and that the green refers to a different type of parking infrastructure?
4	I am a resident of the block of flats at 42 Lansdowne Crescent. I have reviewed the proposals to increase the number of e-bike bays in the area and I am very much in favour as I regularly use the bikes to get around London. The one thing I would ask is whether there could be one close to the junction of Lansdowne Rise and Lansdowne Crescent, or Lansdowne Rise and Lansdowne Road? This area seems to be somewhat left out of all these new bays going in.
5	I support the Council's proposals to expand micromobility parking provision and respectfully request that the existing carriageway bay marked "SOLO M/Cs ONLY" outside Unit 9, Latimer Industrial Estate, 343-453 Latimer Road, London W10 6RQ be assessed for redesignation as a shared-use dockless bicycle and e-scooter bay. This location represents a notable omission within the proposed network. Whilst the consultation identifies numerous new bays across predominantly residential areas, there remains limited dedicated provision serving the Latimer Industrial Estate and western side of Latimer Road, despite the area's role as a significant employment, commercial and creative workspace hub. The Council's consultation recognises the need to create a coherent parking network, improve parking compliance and reduce instances of bicycles and scooters being left in unsuitable locations. The Latimer Industrial Estate presents an opportunity to further those objectives by providing infrastructure in a location that generates consistent daily movements from workers, visitors, contractors, customers and local residents. Unlike many locations proposed within the consultation, this request does not seek the loss of additional resident parking. The highway space is already allocated to parking through the existing motorcycle bay. The proposal simply seeks a more efficient allocation of that space to reflect changing travel patterns and increasing demand for micromobility facilities. The location is particularly well suited because it sits between residential neighbourhoods, employment uses and public transport connections, including Latimer Road Underground Station. It therefore has the potential to function as an effective first and last-mile transport hub, extending the reach of public transport and reducing pressure on short vehicle trips within the local area. The proposal would also assist in addressing a recurring issue associated with areas that lack formal micromobility provision. Where no designated parking exists, bicycles and e-scooters are more likely to be left on footways, against railings, adjacent to entrances and within areas of pedestrian movement. Providing a dedicated carriageway-based parking facility would support better parking compliance, improve the appearance of the public realm and reduce unnecessary street clutter. From a kerbside management perspective, the proposal represents a proportionate and efficient use of public highway space. A single motorcycle bay serves a relatively limited number of users, whereas the same area can accommodate a substantially greater number of bicycle and e-scooter journeys throughout the day. The redesignation would therefore increase the overall transport utility derived from an existing parking allocation without requiring any additional highway land. Furthermore, the Council is actively seeking to support employment activity, regeneration and sustainable growth within North Kensington. The provision of micromobility infrastructure within

	the Latimer Industrial Estate would complement those objectives by improving accessibility to local businesses and employment uses whilst helping to integrate the area more effectively into the borough's emerging micromobility network. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the existing "SOLO M/Cs ONLY" bay outside Unit 9, Latimer Industrial Estate be included within the Council's assessment of locations suitable for redesignation as a shared-use dockless bicycle and e-scooter parking bay.
--	--