

**OFFICER DECISION**  
**DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES**  
**23 JUNE 2023**

**CONSIDERATION OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE STATUTORY  
TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATIONS TO INTRODUCE RENTAL E-BIKE BAYS IN  
NORLAND 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 June 2023, the Council made a Key Decision to implement rental e-bike parking bays, and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with operators to ensure that all rental e-bikes be parked in marked bays.
- 1.2 To assist rental e-bike operators in restricting their customers to the proposed parking bays, the Council needs to ensure they are reasonably well distributed so that a user never has to walk too far to pick up or drop off an e-bike. The Council has therefore consulted on creating 164 designated rental e-bike parking bays to help control where dockless bicycles can be parked.
- 1.3 This report sets out the consultation responses received to the proposals in Chelsea Riverside 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 and so has proposed to create dedicated parking bays for use by e-bike hire operators and their customers in existing parking bays across the borough. This will allow the Council to bring more control to where bikes are parked and reduce the impact on pedestrians.

**4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 4.1 From 5 April to 17 May 2023, the Council undertook consultation on introducing rental e-Bike parking bays at 10 locations in Norland ward. Residents living near the proposals received letters signposting them to the consultation and the consultation was available on the Council's consultation and engagement hub.

Local ward councillors, residents' associations and community groups were made aware of the consultations by email.

- 4.2 In total, 124 responses were received. Table 1 summarises the responses received and the recommendation on how to proceed. Officers did not agree with the objections in respect of five of the ten sites with objections or support in part responses and the reasons for this are set out in Section 5. Having considered the objections to the Ladbroke Road, Lansdowne Road (B), Queensdale Road, Rosmead Road and St James's Gardens proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed with these five locations.

**Table 1 – Summary of responses received.**

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No. Objections</b>	<b>No. Support in Part</b>	<b>No. Support in Full</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Ladbroke Road	5	4	5	0	0	Do not proceed
Lansdowne Road - B	7	3	5	1	0	Do not proceed
Lansdowne Road - C	3	2	5	0	0	Proceed
Lansdowne Walk	2	2	5	0	0	Proceed
Norland Square	2	2	5	0	0	Proceed
Penzance Place	0	3	5	0	0	Proceed
Queensdale Road	11	4	5	0	0	Do not proceed
Rosmead Road	5	2	5	0	0	Do not proceed
St James's Gardens	9	2	5	0	0	Do not proceed
St Mark's Place	3	2	5	0	0	Proceed

## **5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

- 5.1 Appendix 1 lists the responses received to each location in full. Table 2 below illustrates the main themes of the objections or 'support in-part' responses received.

**Table 2 – Objections/support in-part responses by theme**

Scheme	Loss of parking space	Use an alternative location	No evidence of need	Poor behaviour by cyclists	Other
Lansdowne Road - C	1	0	0	1	2
Lansdowne Walk	2	0	1	0	1
Norland Square	2	0	0	0	1
Penzance Place	0	0	0	0	2
St Mark's Place	2	1	0	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>

5.2 Officer responses to the issues raised 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.

#### Officer Response

5.4 The proposal has arisen following requests from residents to combat the nuisance and hazard dockless rental e-bikes can cause, particularly for people who have impaired vision or are using wheelchairs or buggies. Boroughs that have introduced on-footway e-bike parking bays have found that they need to be at least the size of a car in order to accommodate the number of bikes that are in circulation (ten dockless e-bikes require a space similar to one car parking space). Most footways in the borough are either not wide enough to accommodate a bay this size or (due to other footway furniture such as cycle parking stands, Santander cycle docks, seating, planting, etc) or, where they are wide enough, do not have a sufficient clear space. Consequently, most bays will need to be on the carriageway. The borough's parking restrictions have evolved to the degree that where e-bike parking would be safe and not risk causing an obstruction will only be where cars can currently be parked in marked bays. This reduction in car parking is thus a necessary outcome if residents want the Council to control where dockless e-bikes can be parked. There are just over 29,000 residents' parking spaces in the borough – far more than available pay-by-phone bays - so the 164 originally proposed bay

conversions to dockless e-bike bays represents around 0.5 per cent. In comparison, residents' permit numbers are around 4 per cent lower now than pre-COVID.

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

- 5.5 One respondent suggested an alternative location for the St Marks Place proposal, on the paved area at the junction of Cornwall Crescent and Clarendon Road, but this has already been suggested as a location in Notting Dale ward.

### **No evidence of need**

- 5.6 One respondent said that there was little or no evidence of e-Bikes need in Lansdowne Walk

#### Officer Response

- 5.7 People who hire dockless e-bikes currently end their journeys wherever they want so it is inevitable that not all bays will be where they are currently being left. In discussions with the businesses currently operating a dockless model, it is apparent that they will only move away from this model 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 or relocating any bays that are poorly used.

### **Poor behaviour by cyclists**

- 5.8 Three respondents objected to the proposals in Lansdowne Road and St Mark's Place on the basis that cyclists exhibit poor behaviour such as footway riding, riding in parks that do not permit cycling or cycled the wrong way on one-way roads.

#### Officer Response

- 5.9 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.

### **Other comments**

- 5.10 Table 3 lists comments received sitting outside of the above themes, alongside officer responses.

**Table 3 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1	It's very convenient to be able to drop a bike	It is felt that ending the ability to leave a hire bike almost anywhere is an important

	<p>anywhere. In my experience people are considerate with where they park them, to the side of pavements with enough space to navigate around. Personally, I think this will over complicate this situation and ease of using the e-bikes which would be a shame.</p> <p>[Lansdowne Road C proposal]</p>	<p>step in reducing the nuisance many people experience with bikes parked on footways.</p>
2	<p>We are devastated to learn about the proposal for E-bike parking on Lansdowne Road and Rosemead Road. We are already dealing with huge amounts of tourists and influencers taking photos and setting up on our front steps. It's a massive invasion of our privacy and with the introduction of the e-bikes it will only get worse.</p> <p>[Lansdowne Road C proposal]</p>	<p>Even if it were the case that an e-bike parking bay may bring more tourists to the area than at present, this could already happen as presently rental e-bike customers can park anywhere. A designated bay will mean that these bicycles will not be left on footways.</p>
3	<p>In Penzance Street we have the mosque, which at times attracts large numbers using the pavement.</p> <p>[Penzance Place proposal]</p>	<p>The proposals are to introduce a designated rental e-bike parking bay in the carriageway, within an existing car parking bay. Therefore there should be no impact on pedestrians using the footway – in fact, the proposal should be beneficial to pedestrians.</p>
4	<p>Scheme should be trialled in a couple of areas to see whether it works.</p> <p>[All proposals]</p>	<p>Since June 2021, the Council has been part of the London rental e-scooter trial which uses designated parking bays as the only places e-scooters can be parked. Officers have observed high compliance with parking of these vehicles and therefore believe that a similar approach can be adopted for rental e-bike parking bays, without the need for a further trial.</p>

## Appendix 1: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Ladbroke Road

### Objection One

We object to losing another residents parking space in our street. We already struggle to find parking near home. Many days we park a long way and walk home. This is because Ladbroke Road is used for parking by people from further away as they commute to the Holland Park tube station from further north in the ward and park for the day.

### Objection Two

RE:- PROPOSED eBIKE PARKING BAY IN LADBROKE ROAD W11 corner of LADBROKE GROVE We are elderly residents living in this area for 43 years and use this pavement in this road daily - Ladbroke Road is narrow enough as it is for pedestrians let alone ebikes . This would be a dangerous area - around the corner -for this bay.

The Street ebike parking space would be more suitable for the wide pavement and wide road area of Ladbroke Grove. Please consider this request

### Objection Three

Also supported by [redacted]. I had previously written to you to suggest the e-bike bay be further down Ladbroke Road, but I think (redacted's) suggestion is a better one

### Objection Four

I agree entirely with the comments made by [redacted], her suggestion of positioning the e bike bay outside the old police station is entirely preferable, for all the reasons she has stated. I park on Ladbroke Road, near the site of the proposed new bay, when I can. However the shortage of parking means that as often as not, I need to find a park in one of the other streets nearby. This is simply transferring the problem to residents of those streets by me having to take one of their parking spaces. This problem will be only be made worse by losing another park to a bike bay.

I have trouble understanding why this would be done when there is an entirely more suitable place for the bay to go, that is, outside the police station, with no loss of car parks and indeed better safety for those returning bikes by virtue of being better lit and less isolated. It also does not result in any inconvenience to pedestrians.

Please do feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss further.

### Objection Five

Please add our voices to the chorus for more orderly E-bike parking, as detailed in the note below. We are increasingly finding bike abandoned in the vicinity of our front gate. The very welcome increase in use of these green vehicles calls for more orderly parking. The solution suggested below is sensible and readily implemented.

We strongly suggest that it be implemented. Thank you for your consideration of this very local issue.

### Support in Part One

As long it is on the road and not on the pavement.

I am writing to support [redacted] proposal that the e-bike parking bay should be put on the footway on the eastern side of Ladbroke Grove outside the old Police Station. While I had approved the original plan to have it at the corner of Ladbroke Road and Ladbroke Grove, I believe that this a far better solution as it doesn't take out a much-needed residents' parking bay.

### **Support in Part Two**

Forgive me for not using your online reply form, but I wanted to copy this to my neighbours so that they can let you know what they think. I also wanted to attach a photograph.

e-bikes are frequently left on the pavement outside my house, so I am generally supportive of this exercise. However, I believe that there is a much better place for this particular bay.

I live in a terrace of five houses in Ladbroke Grove, just round the corner from the proposed bay. We have a single yellow line in front of our houses, so we all rely heavily on finding spaces in the residents' bay round the corner in Ladbroke Road, which is the one you propose to use. Unsurprisingly, this bay, which is the one nearest us, is heavily used, especially as it is already partly taken up by a space for motorcycles. Any further reduction in the bay would, therefore, be extremely unwelcome and a serious inconvenience.

A better alternative that would, I believe, be more convenient for everybody is to put the bay on the footway on the eastern side of Ladbroke Grove opposite our houses and outside the old Police Station. The footway is extremely wide at this point, so there is plenty of space. There is already a series of very under-used cycle racks on the pavement (I have rarely seen them used by more than a couple of bikes at any one time). It would be very easy either to take the three northernmost racks away (still leaving five) and to put an e-bike bay instead; or to put an e-bike bay just north of the racks, where there should be enough room between the lamp-post and the tree – see photo.

Please could you give serious consideration to this alternative.

### **Support in Part Three**

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.
4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

#### **Support in Part Four**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.



The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers

who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

## Appendix 2: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Lansdowne Road - B

### Objection One

We object to losing another residents parking space in our street. We already struggle to find parking near home. Many days we park a long way and walk home. This is because Ladbroke Road is used for parking by people from further away as they commute to the Holland Park tube station from further north in the ward and park for the day.

### Objection Two

We are elderly residents living in this area for 43 years and use this pavement in this road daily - Ladbroke Road is narrow enough as it is for pedestrians let alone ebikes .

This would be a dangerous area - around the corner -for this bay.

The Street ebike parking space would be more suitable for the wide pavement and wide road area of Ladbroke Grove.

Please consider this request

### Objection Three

Forgive me for not using your online reply form, but I wanted to copy this to my neighbours so that they can let you know what they think. I also wanted to attach a photograph.

e-bikes are frequently left on the pavement outside my house, so I am generally supportive of this exercise. However, I believe that there is a much better place for this particular bay.

I live in a terrace of five houses in Ladbroke Grove, just round the corner from the proposed bay. We have a single yellow line in front of our houses, so we all rely heavily on finding spaces in the residents' bay round the corner in Ladbroke Road, which is the one you propose to use. Unsurprisingly, this bay, which is the one nearest us, is heavily used, especially as it is already partly taken up by a space for motorcycles. Any further reduction in the bay would, therefore, be extremely unwelcome and a serious inconvenience.

A better alternative that would, I believe, be more convenient for everybody is to put the bay on the footway on the eastern side of Ladbroke Grove opposite our houses and outside the old Police Station. The footway is extremely wide at this point, so there is plenty of space. There is already a series of very under-used cycle racks on the pavement (I have rarely seen them used by more than a couple of bikes at any one time). It would be very easy either to take the three northernmost racks away (still leaving five) and to put an e-bike bay instead; or to put an e-bike bay just north of the racks, where there should be enough room between the lamp-post and the tree – see photo.

Please could you give serious consideration to this alternative.

### Objection Four

I agree entirely with the comments made by [redacted], her suggestion of positioning the e bike bay outside the old police station is entirely preferable, for all the reasons she has stated.

I park on Ladbroke Road, near the site of the proposed new bay, when I can. However the shortage of parking means that as often as not, I need to find a park in one of the other streets nearby. This is simply transferring the problem to residents of those streets by me having to take one of their parking spaces. This problem will only be made worse by losing another park to a bike bay.

I have trouble understanding why this would be done when there is an entirely more suitable place for the bay to go, that is, outside the police station, with no loss of car parks and indeed better safety for those returning bikes by virtue of being better lit and less isolated. It also does not result in any inconvenience to pedestrians.

Please do feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss further.

#### **Objection Five**

Also supported by [redacted]. I had previously written to you to suggest the e-bike bay be further down Ladbroke Road, but I think Sophia's suggestion is a better one.

#### **Objection Six**

- ugly (not really in keeping with a conservation area)
- bikes will be parked all over the place
- decrease resident parking( already difficult to find parking)
- Increase noise pollution and disturbance

#### **Objection Seven**

This will cause innumerable problems for residents, pedestrians and motorists. To start with, there is already a shortage of parking for residents at this end of Lansdowne Road as there are many flats. This is also an extremely dangerous traffic junction, as motorists on Ladbroke Grove continue to ignore the 20 mile per hour speed limit, and there are regularly incidents with cars pulling out of Lansdowne Road. There is also a large amount of pedestrian traffic on this part of Ladbroke Grove, and crossing Lansdowne Road is already tricky - bike station will obviously increase bike traffic and create massive problems in an already difficult junction. I and other residents strongly object.

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

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.

4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

### **Support in Part Two**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and

other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

**Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.



### Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Lansdowne Road - C

#### Objection One

The plan is to install 5 metres of car parking and instal a non-docking electric bike parking area outside our house. Its going to be:

- ugly (no really in keeping with a conservation area)
- bikes will be parked all over the place
- decrease resident parking (already difficult to find parking)
- increase noise pollution and 24hr disturbance

#### Objection Two

It's very convenient to be able to drop a bike anywhere. In my experience people are considerate with where they park them, to the side of pavements with enough space to navigate around. Personally I think this will over complicate this situation and ease of using the e-bikes which would be a shame.

#### Objection Three

We are devastated to learn about the proposal for E-bike parking on Lansdowne Road and Rosemead Road. We are already dealing with huge amounts of tourists and influencers taking photos and setting up on our front steps. It's a massive invasion of our privacy and with the introduction of the e-bikes it will only get worse. Why can't these stations be on Ladbroke grove and Westbourne grove, roads which are not quiet residential streets? Not to mention we already have totally limited parking capacity. It's terrible for us and our community.

Please please will you reconsider these two locations.

#### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.
4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener

### **Support in Part Two**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers

who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.



#### Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Lansdowne Walk

##### Objection One

1. There has never been a problem with hire bikes in this immediate area as it is not a "destination" where users leave their hire-bikes on the pavement, so is see very little need for such a bay here.
2. The proposed site is at a very popular pedestrian crossing point, just round a blind corner (from heading north on Clarendon Road) where the view is further obstructed by a letter box. In our experience, these bikes are often knocked over (or left on their side in the first place) so it will be very difficult for motorists and cyclists to see a potential obstruction, particularly at night.
3. As seems common with many of the council's policies, the proposed site will further reduce the number of residents' parking bays. This proposal, along with the council's desire to convert a number of bays into "electric car only" bays, will cause further nuisance. These bays currently under great demand at certain times and the situation will only get worse if the council continues to reduce their availability.
4. There are some very obvious nearby sites that would provide a better alternative. In this case, on the paved "triangle/island" at the junction of Clarendon Road and Lansdowne Walk.

In conclusion, there is no need for the cycle bay, its proposed site is dangerous, there are better alternatives 10 meters away and the removal of another residents' parking bay will cause further inconvenience to residents.

##### Objection Two

On a blind corner and risks having e scooters left in the road as obstacles

##### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.
4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

##### Support in Part Two

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers



who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.



## Appendix 5: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Norland Square

### Objection One

I object. This space on Norland Square is a Resident Bay. There are already too few of these in Norland for the residents to park in. Could you not use a pay-and park space on Norland Square instead? There is one just off Holland Park Avenue on the West side of the Square which would be convenient for cyclists.

There are many elderly people living around here who can no longer cycle and rely on their car to access local services, so please don't remove a resident bay when there are pay-and-park spaces available in an equally handy location. Thank you.

### Objection Two

I do not support the installation of an on-street ebike parking space here because it is in a Resident Permit space, of which there are already too few in the borough for the number of Permits issued.

Please may I suggest an alternative Pay-and-Park space close by?

Please could the ebikes be parked in the first Pay-and-Park space on the other side of Norland Square, i.e.

the East side of the Western Arm of Norland Square, across from the Estate Agent building, and just off Holland Park Avenue. ?

[Additional Comments]

1st of all, how will you ensure people park their e-bikes in designated bays when these bikes are not reliant on being docked to be hired or charged? The provision of bays will not ensure bikes are parked there but still left anywhere it suits the rider. I'd love to see this sort of antisocial behaviour curbed but am not convinced the proposals as they stand are the answer.

2nd, the proposed Norland Square bay will use a resident parking space of which there are already too few for the number of permits issued. There is a pay and park space on the other side of the Square, just off Holland Park Avenue, which would be better suited to the scheme if it goes ahead.

### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.

4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

### **Support in Part Two**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure

for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

**Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

## Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Penzance Place

### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issues aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents' parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way they use them.
4. Put at its most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

### Support in Part Two

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

### Support in Full One (Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea)

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.



BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel

9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

**Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

**Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

**Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

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

### Objection One

This parking space is important to the operation of the Gurdwara on Queensdale Road and the Synagogue further up on St James' Square. There are already scant pay and display bays in the area, and so to repurpose existing ones for rental bikes is suboptimal.

A better solution would be to create a designated bay on the very large pedestrianised space running from Queensdale Road to the subway going to Shepherds Bush station. Alternatively, the opposite corner (across St Ann's Villas Road), near the telecoms cabinets, would be a better location.

### Objection Two

There are too many spaces that have been identified. It would make more sense, if there has to be one, for this to be at the other end of the street in the open paved over area.

### Objection Three

These e bikes are a pest, they are already dumped on the pavements and having bays for them will make no difference, as there is no reason for the Cycladic to return. We pay to park in our area, they pay nothing and are a pest

[Additional Comments RE: St James Gardens]

These bikes are already a pest with no rules for where to park, having a designated bay will cause more chaos and mean less parking for taxed vehicles with resident parking

### Objection Four

The pavement is particularly narrow at this point in Queensdale Road. E-bikes are already left leant against the tree on the pavement. In the event that the proposed site is over-subscribed, there will be E-bikes cluttering the pavements. A number of nearby residents have suggested to me, as the Norland Conservation Society (NCS) street representative, that a more appropriate site would be 100m to the west in the open area of Norland Road. The Norland Conservation Society agrees and supports this suggestion.

### Objection Five

I am deeply opposed to the proposed bike station on Queensdale Road. This is because there is so little parking available. Not only are there so few spaces but people from all over Kensington use the end of Queensdale Road to park to access Westfield. It is already a nightmare and the proposed bike station will make it even worse. I am still frustrated that parking spaces were removed from outside the Sikh Temple allegedly to improve access for disabled people but most the time they just leave their ugly biffa bins on the street for days at a time. Your proposed bike station is a terrible idea in this location. It should be moved to Addison Avenue where there are wide roads with ample space for this sort of thing.

### Objection Six

The parking in this part of Queensdale road is already under a lot of pressure for parking and this has been raised with the council on a number of occasions. We have lost parking due to multiple disabled spaces - which are rarely used, double yellow lines - which are often parked on by visitors, existing bicycle racks and meter parking for visitors. This area is already over used for parking outside of restricted hours by visitors and other residents due to its proximity to Westfield shopping centre. There are a number of alternative locations which could be used and would be more appropriate - including the large pedestrian square. We would strongly apples this as a location.

**Objection Seven**

We have received your letter dated 5 April regarding Rental E-Bike Parking Bay.

You have taken away some residence parking bay few years ago to create disabled parking at this end of Queensdale Road. I do not disagree to having Disabled Parking Bays at all.

However you created far more than necessary on this street.

I walk pass those 4 disabled parking bays that were created at the end of Queensdale Road, on the side of Sikh Temple (no.60 Queensdale Road?) on daily bases.

They are usually used by people who does not posses disabled parking permits.

They are mostly minicabs, cars with drivers in them killing time.

I have checked this morning at 8am and 3 of those bays were occupied by non disabled people's car. All of them with drivers inside. One parking bay was left empty. This is a daily situation and not one off special day. This clearly shows 4 disable parking bays you created are not utilized as you hoped and at least 2 should have been left as normal residence parking bays as residents here hoped.

Tale end of Queensdale Road parking bays are quite busy because people use them to visit Westfield and Temple.

I cannot see why you need to take away another residence parking bay to create E-Bike parking bay.

I understand the needs for creating special area for E-Bikes.

I suggest you use one of the disabled parking bay on the side of temple.

3 disabled parking bay is more than enough.

That is a fact. You will agree with us if you ever check the ins and outs of those 4 bays daily usage.

Therefore I strongly oppose you creating E-Bike parking Bay ON Queensdale Road.

I hope you will research the usage of disabled parking area on the side of temple and come to agree with me.

**Objection Eight**

I would be grateful if you would send me a copy of the proposed Order and other documents giving more detailed particulars of the scheme in respect of the above particularly in connection with the bay proposed for Queensdale Road.

I will send a separate message objecting to this proposal in Queensdale Road upon receipt of information. However I object in principle because this removes another Residents' Parking Bay from the west end of Queensdale Road. This end of Queensdale Road is already undersupplied with Residents' Parking Bays and suffers from overparking because of the proximity of Westfield and the Gurdwara. The bay would also create a blockage to the narrow pavement in Queensdale Raod as users are highly indisiplined in their use of designated space.

There must other spaces available which do not take up Residents' Bays and where there are wider spaces available. There is plenty of space available in the pedestrianised area off Norland Road at the west end of Queensdale Road and there is more logical space available in Addison Avenue.

**Objection Nine**

I am writing to object to the consultation regarding the installation of a 5 metre dock-less bicycle bay on the corner of Queensdale Road and 9 St Anne's Villas.

I object on the following grounds-

1. This would mean losing valuable parking space in an area which is already short on parking. The residents of QDR have been in long conversations with the council about this subject, as have the Sikhs from Khalsa Jatha Gardwara.

**Objection Ten**

I am a resident of Queensdale Road, W11 4SD. I live at the western end of Queensdale Road close to the proposed bicycle parking bay outside 9 St Anne's Villas.

Please record my objection to this proposal. We are already very short of Residents Parking space in this area and the loss of a further 5m would have a very negative impact.

Furthermore this is not a natural drop off point for electric bikes and there are obvious alternatives. For example the wide pedestrian area on nearby Norland Road has plenty of unused space which could be sectioned off without significant loss of public amenity. It is also a natural drop off point, being directly en route to the Westfield Centre and Shepherds Bush stations.

The above suggested alternative is barely 100m from the proposed site near St Anne's Villas. I appreciate that it may technically be just over the boundary into Hammersmith & Fulham but feel that a little cooperation with the neighbouring council could achieve a much better solution for all concerned.

#### **Objection Eleven**

I am a resident of Queensdale Road, W11 4SD. I live at the western end of Queensdale Road close to the proposed bicycle parking bay outside 9 St Anne's Villas.

Please record my objection to this proposal. We are already very short of Residents Parking space in this area and the loss of a further 5m would have a very negative impact.

Furthermore this is not a natural drop off point for electric bikes and there are obvious alternatives. For example the wide pedestrian area on nearby Norland Road has plenty of unused space which could be sectioned off without significant loss of public amenity. It is also a natural drop off point, being directly en route to the Westfield Centre and Shepherds Bush stations.

The above suggested alternative is barely 100m from the proposed site near St Anne's Villas. I appreciate that it may technically be just over the boundary into Hammersmith & Fulham but feel that a little cooperation with the neighbouring council could achieve a much better solution for all concerned.

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

I do support your objectives. However what are the sanctions available to stop renters leaving the bikes/scooters where they find it most convenient? I note that there will be no docking stations so what is the incentive to seek out a parking bay? Do the operators have any technology to prevent the rental being terminated other than at an authorised parking bay? Does the Council have any powers to make this a condition of a licence to operate in RBKC? Why should these bikes have less control than the original bikes that never caused the problem of rogue parking because they had to be docked to end the hire?

[Additional Comments]

I do support the scheme BUT what will be the sanctions if renters just ignore it and continue to abandon their rented bikes and scooters where they choose? Will the licence for the operators ensure that renters cannot close their rental contract other than by leaving the bike in a licensed place? I note that there will be no docking stations.

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

I welcome the installation of the ebike parking space near this location, but the footpath here is very narrow, there's a tree which narrows the pavement even further and it's quite a busy footpath with numerous people walking to and from Shepherds Bush tube station and Westfield shopping centre. It would make a lot more sense to place the parking space around the corner, on the west side of St. Ann's Villas outside nos. 9 and 11, where the pavement is much wider.

#### **Support in Part Three**

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issues aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents' parking spaces.

2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.

3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way they use them.

4. Put at its most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

#### **Support in Part Four**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:



1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

**Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

**Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

**Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

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

### Objection One

The bay should not be in front of residential dwelling. There are more commercial areas where these bays can go. The area is a conservation area and will detract from the facade of our neighborhood which the council and residents have strived to maintain. It reduces the availability of residential parking which has already been curtailed.

### Objection Two

This is a protected conservation area and the proposal will make it visually unattractive and be very out of place. Given the stringent planning requirements it would seem inconsistent to then damage the local environment with the mess of dumped bikes.

It is a residential street with no shops nearby and it will cause intrusion and damage to the property on the corner of Rosemead and Lansdowne Road where the bikes have no wall to be left against.

There is no obvious destination for the people leaving bikes as there are no shops here there but will increase traffic to a private area with families who don't want higher numbers of strangers hanging around or loitering to pick up bikes at all times of day and night.

It takes out parking which is already at a premium and means we have to walk further and for people late at night this creates more risk of mugging which has been on the increase.

### Objection Three

We are already short of resident parking bays in the surrounding roads as well as in Rosmead Road. We have e-bike areas nearby already and I do not see why residents must suffer again with parking. I believe a lot of e-bikes are used by tourists, not residents, who have no understanding regarding the shortage of resident parking bays, nor, of course, do the companies supplying the bikes.

### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issues aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents' parking spaces.

2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.

3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way they use them.

4. Put at its most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

### **Support in Part Two**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

## Appendix 9: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in St James's Gardens

### Objection One

The synagogue is home to a busy kindergarten - during term time young children line up daily where the proposed e-bike bay would be located and it would create a safety hazard.

Residents parking has recently been reduced by the installation of two disabled bays outside the synagogue

As one of the closest resident parking bays to Westfield shopping centre, the Central Gurdwara Temple, The Majma-e Eslami Jahani mosque and St James Church there is a lot of demand for a very limited number of resident parking spaces and to further reduce that with a bike bay would be unreasonable and disrespectful to residents especially in a conservation area.

### Objection Two

Parking bays are already limited. Scooters are often used by young people who are careless with how and where they leave them. I cannot imagine having designated bays will make any difference. If they had to be docked that would be different but in this proposal they will surely topple over on one another and will invade yet another parking space. I would not feel safe parking anywhere near this bay. Additionally, there is quite a lot of vandalism currently on this road and no adequate CCTV. Leaving scooters here may add to that. I strongly object to this proposal

### Objection Three

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this consultation. I do fully understand how difficult it is to site these bike bays and the need for them however I would like to draw your attention to ongoing issues on the site you are proposing on St James's gardens between our home at 34 St Anns villas and the Portuguese Synagogue.

Since the installation of cctv cameras on the other side of St Anns villas on Swanscombe rd outside the parade of shops . We have been severe anti social behaviour along the flank wall of 34 St Anns villas where you are proposing to locate the bike bay. The behaviour has included drug dealing , theft from vehicles , anti social behaviour , theft of a vehicle and recently a knife point mugging to name a few examples. The steps down to our basement are regularly used as a toilet and for drug dealing. I am greatly concerned that the bike bay your are proposing at this location will only add to the anti social behaviour we are experiencing along with late night noise as often the youths are on hire bikes. The tree next to the proposed bay acts as a visual barrier which is partly why youths congregate there.

Also one of the car parking spaces in the bay you are proposing for the bikes is now a dedicated disabled bay along with a further space just outside the Synagogue as a result of the loss of these two spaces residents parking spaces along this stretch of St James gardens are in very short supply with residents having to park on single yellow lines road or further up on the garden square or side streets. The loss of a further space will only make matters worse. On a Sunday for example when Westfield shoppers are out in force parking is difficult and during the week parents visiting the nursery also make parking difficult

As a last point ,as my neighbour, I am mindful of the additional security needs of the Synagogue they may have security concerns regarding the location of this propose bike bay.

Whilst I am mindful that I am not an expert on cycle bays could I suggest that if there is a genuine need for a bay that you consider the residents parking bay across St Anns villas on Swanscombe rd . This bay is long and once past the lamp post there is no property directly behind it , it is in full view from several

angles (passing police patrols ) but is also located near the CCTV cameras something that has proved successful in displacing the anti social behaviour (if sadly only to outside our home).

Please accept these comments in the spirit they are intended I appreciate the need for cycle bays however it is important that they are sited suitable locations.

#### **Objection Four**

The bikes are a nuisance and a hazard with aggressive inconsiderate riders on both roads and pavements - the councils should be more considerate to residents and voters

#### **Objection Five**

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the notice and I wish to object strongly to the development of a dockless bicycle parking bay at the location described, for the following reasons:

The location identified is sited a matter of feet away from the entrance to Holland Park Synagogue. In recent years, the security of the synagogue has become an extremely serious matter, as there are sadly people who wish to cause harm. There is a need to employ security staff at all times the synagogue is open for its community, which occurs in the following ways:

1. Each Saturday, typically from 9am until 1pm. Also during numerous Festivals, taking place throughout the year. Security is required for every one of these occurrences.
2. Every Monday to Friday during school term time, the Synagogue houses a nursery of 55 children. The proposed dockless bicycle parking bay would cause disruption for parents and guardians dropping off, then collecting their children from nursery. Limiting the parking by the Synagogue, in addition to parents/guardians needing to navigate buggies, etc around a potential congregation of people and bicycles will cause a great deal of disruption. Security is needed at all times whilst the nursey is open.
3. Every Sunday, during term time, the Synagogue also houses a Sunday school, for approximately 20 children. Once again, security is needed for the protection of this group.

Sadly, as the Synagogue is a target for those wishing to cause harm, we must object in the strongest manner to this proposed development. It would severely compromise the security and make what is already a difficult job keeping the community safe, including many children attending nursery and Sunday school, even harder.

Adding a dockless bicycle parking bay would lead to significantly more people assembling right by the synagogue, and act as a potential cover for those wishing to cause harm.

We must continue to take the threat to our health and safety continues to be taken seriously, whilst as recently as early April we had to involve the police with a serious threat to our community's wellbeing, right by the Synagogue.

I hope you understand why this is such a serious and important objection to the planned development.

#### **Objection Six**



(1) I don't understand why this spot has been chosen when there are much more obviously suitable locations eg. the wide pavements across the road outside Swanscombe House/ Nourish Hub on St Anns Villas OR the large pedestrianised area outside the Stewart Arms Pub on Norland Road.

(2) I don't understand why residents parking bays need to be lost instead of some of the pay bays further into St James' gardens Unlike residents bays, the pay bays in St James' Gardens are not directly outside peoples houses (they are on the garden side) and the loss of these would not affect residents ability to park.

(3) St Anns Villas is a key local road through which many of the local utilities run (in particular sewage and water) and as such it is dug up for improvement/maintenance works much more often than the surrounding roads. When this happens the residents have to move their cars to the surrounding roads and therefore need as many residents' spaces as possible. This is also true in relation to increased local car visitors related to Westfield, events at the Synagogue and the Sikh Temple in the area. This is a high density residential area and it is difficult enough for local residents in these roads to park without losing residents bays.

(4) In addition, the space marked out for the proposed ebike parking space is right next to a disabled bay (one incidentally which is often in use by us and others). I am extremely concerned that ebike users need only get "close to" the parking space and not actually within its limits meaning that there will be lots of potential obstacles in the way for those using the disabled bay. Given the underlying reason that the ebike parking spaces are required in the first place is the generally thoughtless behaviour of their users I can't believe that this is going to change - my expectation is that there will be bikes on the road "around" the ebike parking spot and potentially on the pavement "around" the ebike parking spot and not necessarily in it. This will affect not only the adjacent disabled parking space users but also access to adjacent residents bays as well as surrounding houses and the synagogue/synagogue nursery.

### **Objection Seven**

I act for [redacted], the owner of [redacted]. My client and I have done a substantial amount of further research, after receiving your Borough's leaflet mentioning the borough's proposal to purportedly clear up the clutter of E-bikes currently being left a-strewn on pavements and roads, which we all acknowledge is a substantial problem and a health hazard.

Your Traffic Orders team have been very helpful in clarifying what the borough's intended proposals may be. First, my client concurs with the sentiments that these E-bikes need to be managed and decluttered from the current hazards they create amongst the most vulnerable in our society; namely blocking wheelchair users and the elderly with mobility issues who use walking sticks and Zimmer frames and who invariably find themselves frequently coming across dangerous barriers on the pavements. For those users with further sight issues, the hazards are even more dangerous. Unfortunately, you seem to have accepted the E-bikes companies assertions that they should be allowed to keep their existing business models. You have not made it a condition precedent, that the rentals firms should be obliged to have individual bike racks in the proposed road bays as the Santander Bikes currently do (and I note they do not have issues with street clutter, because unsurprisingly their users have a financial incentive to return the bikes to individual lockable bike racks!) This is a critical requirement of any proposed E-Bike scheme, without which the scheme fails its purported *raison d'être* of reducing and managing the clutter. As such, these current proposals in this format are worse than the already dreadful current clutter situation we have, as they will exacerbate the existing clutter with additional clutter, albeit now in the roads as well!

We are supportive of the Boroughs aim to decarbonise the Borough and to reduce future generations dependence on the motor car in the city, but not in effect at the detriment of those who do not have the practical options of choosing to no longer use their cars and residents of the borough.

We would suggest that the only safe way to deal with e-bike litter would be to adopt the Santander model for all obvious business reasons. Your proposals cannot be expected to do so.

As an aside, beyond my client's unique inconvenience due to his locational proximity to the E-bay, it strikes us that having an E-bike bay next to the Sephardi Synagogue and Nursery, which is in continuous use, with no doubt SUVs double parking for pickUps and drop offs is likely to create additional blockage on St James' Gardens' as drivers try to manoeuvre/double park around the E-Bike bay. It is also poorly lit. We know a more preferable location which is better lit and has CCTV and is on the busier road (to take the E-bike footfall) Swanscombe Road, just off St Ann's Road and would suggest you "relocate" the proposed e-bike bay there should you proceed to implement the proposal. There is also an existing food store here, which makes more sense, as we assume many cyclists may be buying consumables there in any event.

A final point is what an unregulated further expansion of E-bikes may do in regards to crimes and antisocial behaviour. It is accepted unfortunately that many criminals now use E-bikes, bicycles and E-scooters as their vehicle of choice. Having a bay located in St James's Gardens and one assumes a cluttered bay at that, will likely lead to those of nefarious intent from congregating in the proximity and may in itself then lead to further crime in the area, be it car break-ins and/or burglaries.

I note that Westminster Council are taking a very vigilant approach precisely against the aforementioned E-bike, E-scooter littering and are indeed currently prosecuting the rental companies. I enclose an article referencing this.

We welcome the boroughs' intentions but not the particular proposals. They should be rethought with our above comments in mind.

#### **Objection Eight**

Because sadly I don't believe that the people who are currently abandoning the bikes / scooters on the streets will take the time to park them correctly. Parking near us is always a challenge due to the proximity to Portobello Road which is why removing the suggested spaces near us is of real concern.

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

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issues aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way they use them.
4. Put at its most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

### **Support in Part Two**

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.

We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

## Appendix 10: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in St Mark's Place

### Objection One

Because sadly I don't believe that the people who are currently abandoning the bikes / scooters on the streets will take the time to park them correctly. Parking near us is always a challenge due to the proximity to Portobello Road which is why removing the suggested spaces near us is of real concern.

### Objection Two

St Marks Place is a very short road. We have relative big motorbike parking area already that takes place from cars. Also, in our street we have several disabled drivers but as our street is very short the numbers of blue badge holders/disabled drivers are relatively large in percent wise. We only have one disabled bay for blue badge holders so all residential parking bays are significantly important to keep as they are at the moment. Our street is in the corner of both Blenheim Crescent and Cornwall Crescent which both are equally longer streets, approximately 6 times as long as St Marks Place. In my opinion and some other disabled drivers living in our street or immediate vicinity, it would make more sense to allocate electric scooter bay either in Blenheim Crescent or Cornwall Crescent. Thank you.

### Objection Three

The streets in Norland Ward, particularly those in the crescents closest to Ladbroke Grove station where the housing is made up of flats rather than larger houses, are already in high demand for parking. Several residents parking spaces on Cornwall Crescent/nearby roads have been lost after recent changes to yellow lines, diplomatic reservation, Santander bike racks and personal bike storage. The loss of further spaces should be avoided where possible. There is a large area of pavement at the junction of Cornwall Crescent and Clarendon Road and this would be a better location for new e-bike storage. It's used at Xmas time for Xmas tree storage/disposal but at other times of the year, this pavement is unused and has low footfall. Please reconsider relocating the e-bike storage there.

### Support in Part One

My comments apply to all of the proposed sites in Norland.

I'm pleased that the Council acknowledges that there is a significant problem with far too many users of e-bikes simply dumping them where it suits them, with seemingly no regard to other people. They are fast becoming the new "shopping trollies".

However, I think there are four issues that also have to be considered:

1. What will be the sanction for users who fail to leave them in the new designated spaces? Too many current users seem happy to flout rules (highway code, etc.) so what is the sanction to make them comply? What role will the bike companies play in this? What will be the sanction for their non-compliance? If these issue aren't built in from the start, all that you will achieve is taking away a number of residents parking spaces.
2. Too many e-bike users seem to think that the rules of the road don't apply to them. In Norland we have far too much riding on the pavement - a clear danger to pedestrians - and far too much ignoring of red lights. We need far better enforcement of the rules by the Police and this simply isn't happening enough to change cyclist behaviour. Riding on the pavement simply isn't acceptable. E-bikes are extremely heavy and will do pedestrians significant harm.
3. Why on earth can't e-bikes be subject to the same fixed docking system as the Santander cycles? Sadly, anything other than that - particularly without meaningful sanctions - is unlikely to change the behaviour of that proportion of current users who are just extremely selfish and dangerous in the way use them.

4. Put at it's most basic, if part of the objective of cycling is to try and help our fat population get thinner (which is certainly a good thing) why is using an electric machine that does much of the work for you better than using a traditional bike like the Santander cycles where you actually have to do the work yourself? Why not just scrap e-bikes and promote more Santander cycles? That would truly be a lot greener.

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

These comments apply to all the parking bays being converted to e-bike parking spaces. How will the new e-bike bays stop people leaving bikes anywhere on the pavement as they do now? What penalty will there be for people who continue to leave them on the pavement and how will it be levied? Shouldn't the hire companies be made responsible to go round and collect the bikes, as they know where they are? People may use the e-bikes for short journeys, I can't imagine people giving up their cars to use e-bikes. The loss of so many parking spaces will put even more strain on those that remain. People pay for their Residents' Permits and, already, more permits are sold than there are available spaces, so this proposal is not fair to them. In summary, those who leave their bikes where they get off them won't change their habits. Residents will be forced to struggle even more for parking, and the Council will continue to collect revenue from permits and fines from people who feel forced to park in empty or under-used e-bike bays. Rather than apply this scheme wholesale and risk a potentially expensive disaster, please trial it in a couple of areas first to see whether it actually works.

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

I am submitting this consultation response on behalf of Better Streets for Kensington and Chelsea (BS4KC), an organisation made up of RBKC residents also representing the views of people studying or working in the borough.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

BS4KC welcomes and fully supports the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough. Dockless cycle hire bikes are providing convenient and sustainable travel options for many RBKC residents as well as those studying, working or visiting the borough. Their popularity is very much evident when walking down any street in the borough and these proposals rightly address some of the unintended consequences of dockless hire bike schemes. As such the proposals fully align with the RBKC plan of being a greener, safer and fairer borough;

1. Supporting and enabling greater use of dockless hire bikes as replacement for short car journeys is sustainable, improves local air quality and supports improving health and wellbeing
2. Providing dedicated parking bays off the pavement improves the safety for pedestrians and for those hiring bikes as they will have designated spaces
3. In a borough where the majority of households do not have access to a motor vehicle, meeting the needs of those wishing to not travel by car and repurposing some kerb space dominated by parked cars is fairer and goes towards meeting the needs of more RBKC residents and visitors

With the introduction of any new service there is a need to provide suitable infrastructure. It is recognised that dockless cycle hire bikes have in most places no designated parking provision therefore users usually leave them where their ride ends. Some make efforts to park the bike without causing obstruction however in most cases users do park the bikes on pavements (as do the hire companies in some cases). This invariably causes obstruction to pedestrians and impacts most on those who have mobility issues. On busy streets it causes pedestrian congestion with so much space taken up by cycle hire bikes (and other pavement clutter). Increasingly hire bike users are attempting to not cause obstructions on the pavement however there is no designated infrastructure for them so even the most well meaning users who leave the bikes between parked cars or in the carriageway also end up causing unintended inconveniences and risks. Designated cycle hire bays would address the vast majority of current issues associated with dockless hire bike schemes.

The proposals to create designated cycle hire bays on the carriageway are wholly appropriate to meet the needs of those wanting to make use of sustainable and healthy travel choices while managing the impact this has had to date on pedestrians and on pedestrian spaces.

The majority of households in the borough do not have access to a motor vehicle, in some wards this is the significant majority, therefore it is right for the council to be reviewing how space is effectively used to meet the travel needs of those who do not drive or choose not to drive short distances. At the moment the kerb space in residential areas is dominated by increasingly large motor vehicles, it is fair and proportionate that some of this space be designated for on street cycle bays.

Carriageway cycle bays:

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

A map of proposed locations would have been helpful to provide an easy view of coverage for proposed locations, some comments:

1. There should be extra provision for bays outside or near tube stations or busy connection points, often cycle hire is part of a multi-modal journey and providing convenient connection with public transport is important. It is also outside tube stations where dockless bikes are often left by companies and users in significant volumes, this causes significant pavement congestion.
2. Bays should also be conveniently located near schools, GP's, hospitals and other such places to enable greater short local journeys to be made by bike than driving
3. It should be the aim to have such bays on every road with a maximum walking distance to ensure cycle hire provision is convenient for everyone across the borough, user compliance will also increase if bays are easy to find and are visible
4. It would be good for bays to have residential cycle parking facilities adjacent with planting to improve kerbside space
5. The bays should have planting or bollards to clearly designate bays for cycle parking and provide protection for cycles parked in the bays and avoid vehicles encroaching, parking or stopping in such bays

BS4KC continues to raise the need for the council to provide safe cycle routes along main roads East-West and North-South road corridors, this is especially needed as the popularity of such hire schemes increases and more people choose to cycle.



We therefore fully support all the proposed locations listed in the consultation and do not consider any objections based on the concerns around car parking provision should impede the approval of any of these locations, the benefits significantly outweigh any perceived inconvenience to a small number of drivers who may need to find alternative car parking on occasions. Such concerns are mitigated by the sheer number of options open to car drivers at present through the generous resident permit scheme, PAYG bays and car parks located across the borough.

### **Support in Full Two**

I am submitting this consultation response in a personal capacity.

This response covers all the proposed locations for rental bike bays.

I fully support the proposals brought by RBKC to introduce dockless cycle hire bays in the carriageway across the borough for the following reasons;

1. Provide convenient designated locations for hire users
2. Are space efficient where they replace one car parking bay (often used by one car for most of the day) cycle bays enable greater utilisation with capacity for 6+ bikes and will have a greater turnover of use given they are hire bikes
3. Addresses many of the concerns expressed by residents and others about the impact of dockless hire bikes on pavements and impact on pedestrians
4. Improve pedestrian experience and safety
5. Improve the safety for hire users using the carriageway at present for parking
6. Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists (negating need to mount pavement to park bikes)
7. Alleviate the increasing instances where bikes are parked between cars or in carriage way by providing designated fit for purpose infrastructure
8. Will promote sustainable travel in the borough, convenience is a key enabler for increased active travel
9. Proven to be effective as carriageway bays already implemented by other London authorities e.g. City of London

### **Support in Full Three**

I support ANY location for ebike parking spaces. These bikes just tossed around all over the place are the bane of our lives and a serious hazard for wheelchair users, pushchairs and just pedestrians as a whole

### **Support in Full Four**

I think it is better to have designated spaces to leave these bikes rather than to have them littered all over the pavement causing pinch-points and trip/fall hazards. The City of London as done similar for quite a while and the bikes are much tidier yet still readily available so this proposal works. Collaboration with the bike providers whereby GPS is used to charge people who leave them other than in designated areas incentivises compliance.

This is a general comment which applies to all of the proposed sites, but your consultation document insists on appending comments to one particular site. This has been appended to the site nearest to where I live but applies to all.

### **Support in Full Five**

I support the installation of on street bike parking spaces in all the places proposed. The use of cars in RBKC should be reduced in any case.

