

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
ST HELEN'S 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 St Helen's 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 the Council 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 ten locations in St Helen's ward. Residents living near the proposals received letters signposting them to the consultation and the consultation was available on the Council's online consultation and engagement hub. Local ward councillors, residents' associations and

community groups were made aware of the consultations by email.

- 4.2 In total, 126 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 Kelfield Gardens, Oxford Gardens, Snarsgate Street, St Helen's Gardens and St Marks Road (I) proposals, officers are recommending not to proceed.

Table 1 – Summary of responses received.

Scheme	No. Objections	No. Support in Part	No. Support in Full	No opinion	Comment	Recommendation
Cambridge Gardens	2	1	6	0	0	Proceed
Highlever Road	3	1	6	0	1	Proceed
Kelfield Gardens	12	2	8	0	0	Do Not Proceed
Ladbroke Grove	2	1	5	0	0	Proceed
Oxford Gardens	8	1	6	0	0	Do Not Proceed
Snarsgate Street	8	1	5	0	0	Do Not Proceed
St Charles Square	3	1	5	0	0	Proceed
St Helen's Gardens	6	2	5	0	0	Do Not Proceed
St Marks Road (I)	5	1	5	0	0	Do Not Proceed
St Marks Road (J)	2	1	5	0	0	Proceed

5 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 – 10 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	Enforcement of E-Bike Schemes	E-bikes left on footways	Poor behaviour by cyclists	Other
---------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------

Cambridge Gardens	0	1	2	1	6
Highlever Road	0	2	2	1	8
Ladbroke Grove	0	1	2	1	6
St Charles Square	1	2	3	1	7
St Marks Road (J)	0	1	2	1	6
TOTAL	1	7	11	5	33

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.

Enforcement of rental e-Bike schemes

5.5 Some respondents objected to the proposals because they perceived that there is no enforcement of rental e-bike schemes and that the provision of designated parking bays for them may not achieve the intended outcome of reducing poor parking practices on footways.

Officer Response

5.5 Councils do not have the legislative power to effectively address the problem of rental e-bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. The Council expects to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with all operators, which would require all rental e-bike operators to specify a mandatory parking system

for users, setting out a plan of how this will be enforced, incorporating warnings and fines.

Rental e-Bikes left on footways

- 5.6 Some respondents objected to the proposals on the basis that e-bikes are a nuisance and often left on footways.

Officer Response

- 5.7 The main objective of the e-bike bays is to address this problem of rental bikes being left in inconvenient positions on footways. The proposals are intended to provide designated parking spaces for rental e-bike customers and once implemented, the operators will be guiding customers to these bays, with warnings and fines in place for non-compliance.

Poor behaviour by cyclists

- 5.8 The response from a St Helen's ward Councillor on behalf of all proposals objected on the basis pedestrians being knocked over due to people using e-transport on footways.

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.

	Comment	Officer Response
1	The existing e-scooter bay on Highlever Road has caused noise and nuisance. [Highlever Road proposal]	Officers are sorry to hear that this e-scooter bay is causing a noise nuisance. We have previously had a complaint about the noise generated by the e-scooter companies servicing this bay during the night and as such restricted operators to daylight servicing only. Please get in touch at escooters@rbkc.gov.uk with the times and type of noise complaint and we will address this with the operators. Anti-social behaviour can unfortunately, happen anywhere, including at any location where people may choose to leave their bikes, however officers believe

		the benefit to introducing e-bike parking bays outweighs the risk of this.
2	The existing e-scooter bay on Highlever Road has not stopped e-scooters being dumped on footways. [Highlever Road proposal]	Officers have not received other complaints about e-scooters being dumped on footways in this area. In general, the evidence suggests that the designated bays involved in the rental e-scooter trial achieve very high compliance levels, and we hope that this will translate to the new designated e-bike bays.
3	The example of waste disposal is analogous, whereby people continue to leave their rubbish in the street at all times day and night despite our bin areas and 2-day collection. [St Charles Square proposal]	Whilst the provision of e-bike bays may not completely eradicate pavement parking, this is not a reason to decide against install rental e-bike parking, and making it much easier for people to park an e-bike appropriately.
4	There are already too many bays - two already on St Marks Road [All St Helen's proposals] [Ward councillor]	Officers are unaware of any rental e-bike or e-scooters bays on St Mark's Road. The Councillor may be observing operator- initiated 'virtual bays', which are not authorised by the Council. The new designated e-bike parking bays would replace all other parking options for e-bike operators and their users.
5	I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours? [All St Helen's proposals] [Ward councillor]	The Council currently has no agreement with the e-bike operators and receives no financial contribution from them. Once designated e-bike bays are in place, operators will sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council which includes a financial contribution, the amount of which has not been identified and will be largely guided by the number of designated bays we are able to provide following consultation. Operators do not charge e-scooters or e-bikes on-site. They are removed for charging and then deployed to the designated bays. Income to the Council as part of the rental e-scooter scheme is considered commercially sensitive.
6	How many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?	No fixed penalty notices have been issued by RBKC to any e-bike operators.

	[All St Helen's proposals] [Ward councillor]	
7	A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces. [All St Helen's proposals]	Officers consider the high levels of parking bay compliance experienced during the trial rental e-scooter trial as indicative that a similar approach will lead to high levels of e-bike parking compliance. The marking of parking bays involves very minimal financial cost.
8	We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen. [All St Helen's proposals]	Whilst the Council does not hold data on operators' profitability, officers have observed swift action by operators to remove inappropriately parked rental e-scooters and expect similar response times once the designated e-bike parking bays and Memorandum of Understanding is in place. In the event that one or more operator ceased trading, the remaining operators would continue using the designated bays. If at any time a bay were considered underutilised, officers would consider consulting on it's return to residents' parking.
9	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. [All proposals]	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.

Appendix 1: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Cambridge Gardens

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Support in Part One

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 has 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.

Support in Full Five

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Six

Is there a way we can report really badly parked bikes and the bike companies can fine the person?

Appendix 2: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Highlever Road

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

While I support the use of bicycles instead of cars, I do not believe that painting a rectangle on the street will keep e-bikes or e-scooters from being left on the pavement. I already have an e-scooter parking bay across from my property. It has caused an increase in noise in the area and not kept people from

dumping e-scooters on the pavement. Unless enforceable penalties on individuals and the companies are applied, I don't see the point of providing space on the road when parking for cars is disappearing.

Support in Part One

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.

Support in Full Six

Yes, all in favour of designated spaces IN THE ROAD, NOT ON THE PAVEMENT, where they are left indiscriminately, making hard for those in wheelchairs and taking children in buggies.

Appendix 3: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Kelfield Gardens

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

I am concerned about the proposed e bike bay location in this area.

Existing bike and scooter bays are already present in the area of wallingford/kelfield, on the St Quintin Roundabout and St Marks Roundabout/Kelfield Gardens.

Wallingford Avenue is quieter than the major roads around it, St Quintin, St Helens, Oxford Gardens, and Highlever, These roads are holding the majority of the traffic in the area and are, as suggested in your proposal, a better solution for an e-bike bay. Rarely e-bike or scooters are seen in this specific part or the neighbor. Is unlikely that are left on the pavement and, if and when it happens, is 1 or two bikes max which can be easily moved. There is no need for an e-bike space that will increase the number of bikes in the area, noise and anti-social behaviors.

The owners of the houses closest to the proposed bay are old couples who have been living and enjoying this quiet area for 40 years. They do not need a useless bay that will only create problems and no advantage to them.

The proposal includes other locations, such as the end of Highlever and St Helens (both good for the proximity to the park) and Oxford Gardens, which, in my opinion, represent much better options. However, this should only be considered if local residents affected by the proposal are happy with it. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Objection Four

THIS AREA DOESNT NEED E-BIKE BAY. The one on St. Quintin roundabout is quite large and can accomodate several e-bikes.

Wallingford/Kelfield is a Quiet and residential area which will be severely impacted by people dropping and collecting bikes at any time of the day. It will attract more traffic, more noise and also more risks.

This area (wallingford avenue and kelfied) is already served by the e-bike bay in st. quintin roundabout (3m walk).

From the map I can see there are other locations (top of Kelfield gardens corner with St. Helens road) which is a more suitable locations: 1) as is closer to shops, is closer to the park and to the tube station. This will be a better position vs. the one at the corner between Wallingford avenue and Kelfield. (If a positive response for that location from affected neighbors is received).

Having both e-bike bay is unnecessary and will not add any benefit, on the contrary will only increase traffic, disruption and potential anti-social behaviors.

In addition i would also invite to consider how safe will be to have a series of bike one close to the other considering the below:

The number of fires caused by lithium-ion e-scooter and e-bike batteries in the UK has surged almost 150% over the past year*. In London alone, firefighters attended 88 fires caused by e-bikes in 2022 – an increase of 80% on the 49 responded to in 2021

I would also highly encourage the council to look at what Merton did to tackle the e-bike issue and charge riders who don't follow rules.

<https://news.merton.gov.uk/2022/12/16/council-agrees-action-plan-with-lime-to-tackle-e-bike-obstructions-on-merton-streets/>

Lastly - as I said earlier - this area is very quiet and I would avoid to have too many e-bikes bay around houses. They can be used by gang and criminals as an efficient and anonymous transport after a criminal act to quickly disappear. see below.

<https://www.stolenride.co.uk/e-bike-enabled-crime-in-london/>

Objection Five

It will attract antisocial behaviour and further the crime that is not able to be controlled in the area.

Objection Six

There is No need to. No one in the close area uses e-bike. Also the e-bike area would bring to these roads more people especially during the night. We have already had many issues with cars stolen and intruders. No need to bring additional non resident in the area. If you install e-bike area you should think of installing 24/7 camera to monitor the usage and damages.

Objection Seven

I am opposed to this because most of the residences around this location are single family homes and parking is already challenging. Most of these homes for bicycle storage and this multiple bicycle unit would be better suited on Saint Quinton Avenue, or North Pole Road where there are more flats.

Objection Eight

Wallingford Ave and Kelfield Ave are quiet streets filled with families with young children. There's typically very little activity other than residents of those streets. Drawing the public to this corner would pose a risk to the children and create new noise factors, especially in the evenings when putting them to bed.

Objection Nine

Bikes are constantly left on roads and pathways which is dangerous to pedestrians

Objection Ten

Is a residential area. Mainly families with young kids. In particular the bay you are proposing will be opposite to a house lived by a couple in their 80s. It will create disruption and noise at any time of the day for them. We don't see bikes left over the pavement in this part of W10, is very quiet and this bay is likely to disrupt the daily life of the people living in the proximity. Is not needed and it will create issues (i.e. more cars, more noise, more people).

Objection Eleven

1- While I appreciate the benefits of e-bikes, I believe that this particular location is not suitable for such a facility. I don't see a lot of e-bikes parked on the pavement in this area, therefore I don't see why this dedicated bay should be created. It will damage the quality of life of the residents tremendously.

2- the space identified is under trees, is not a favorite spot by residents to park their cars to avoid having their cars covered in bird's droppings.

The bike in that bay will be covered in bird droppings regularly. Users will use only clean bikes and will leave the dirty ones in the bay. This will create an unsanitary and unpleasant environment for residents and visitors who live in this location and enjoy walking around St. Helens.

3- The area is mainly used by residents and very quiet during the day and the night. The installation of this bay will create an incentive for non-residents to access the area, parking their cars and taking these bikes to reach their local destinations (i.e. tube station, shops, etc). This will lead to an increase in traffic congestion in an area which has very limited traffic congestion as mainly residential and locals don't use the car often, favorite transport service is walking! Furthermore, the constant access of people dropping or collecting the bikes from the bay - directly outside 2 houses - will make it difficult for people to relax and enjoy their homes, will reduce the amount of space available to park cars for residents in particular when resident parking restrictions are not in place (i.e. weekends).

5- the e-bike station will be accessible to non-residents, which may lead to an increase in the number of people hanging around the area. This could create noise, anti-social behavior and safety risk for residents, particularly at night and weekends.

6- I am concerned that the e-bike station will be used as a gathering place. This could create a nuisance for residents and may even lead to an increase in crime in the area. The owners of the corner house opposite to the bay are couples in their 80s.

For all these reasons, I strongly urge you to reconsider the installation of the e-bike station on our road. I believe that there are more suitable locations for such a facility, and that the installation of the station in this particular location will have a negative impact on the quality of life for residents in the area. St Helens is a very quiet area and we need to make sure we protect it. There are no shops, restaurants or social places for a reason. Residents love this area exactly for its peace and the council has to respect it and protect it.

[Additional Comments]

i have already expressed my concerns. I would like to share some links where is clear how e-bikes are also used for anti-social behaviors.

<https://ebiketips.road.cc/content/news/tiktok-videos-showing-how-to-hack-lime-bikes-result-in-them-being-dumped-with-impunity>

<https://www.securitynewspaper.com/2023/04/14/how-people-are-hacking-stealing-lime-e-bikes-and-scooters-to-convert-them-to-personal-bikes/>

<https://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/police-seize-electric-bike-hesters-7873242.amp>

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/escooters-thefts-assaults-police-uk-b1837716.html?amp>

I dont want to deal with this. I dont want to spend my weekends nights being woken up by group of kids trying to unlock the e-bikes just outside my house.

I will much prefer to deal with one or two bikes, which are from time to time left on the pavement, rather than a consistent problem created by a nonsense dedicated bay. There are no e-bikes left consistently in this area therefore a bay would only attract problem to resident without offering any benefit. Please dont go ahead with this dedicated bay, all the resident i spoke to are against.

Objection Twelve

I do not support the installation of any e-bike parking spaces across the Borough. There are already too few residents parking spaces.

Support in Part One

I fully support in principle the creation of designated e-bike parking spaces. The current practice of discarding them on the pavements is very dangerous for many pedestrians, particularly older and disabled people. I am currently using crutches after surgery and these bikes are a real hazard.

I would prefer the ebike spaces to be on the roads in sectioned off portions of resident parking bays. Most pavements are not wide enough for bike parking as well as safe pedestrian use.

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.

Support in Full Six

Pavements too narrow to leave bikes on. Easy access to bikes, as we do not have a Santander cycles docking station nearby.

Support in Full Seven

[No comment supplied]

Support in Full Eight

[No comment supplied]

Appendix 4: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Ladbroke Grove

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Support in Part One

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 Oxford Gardens

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

As it is, this is a very busy corner outside a residential premises. This would not be ideal for residents in 187 Oxford Gardens & also 1 Highlever Road and it will mean an increased number of people making noise or loitering outside people's properties- front door/window/garden wall. This will also mean an increase of litter in our streets.

Perhaps using under the flyover at Westway? There are many people in the community who will benefit from having an E-bike docking stations there as this is a focal point for local residents- you have Westway Sports centre, local businesses, schools and underground station.

In my honest opinion, I believe implementing a docking station at this location has more weaknesses than strengths- particularly the increased risk it has on motor vehicle users being involved in a collision.

[Additional Comments]

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern and dissatisfaction regarding the recently proposed plans to construct a dockless bike hire station directly outside my residence at 187 Oxford Gardens, W10 6NE. I would like to bring your attention to the negative implications that this decision would have on me, my neighbors, and the local residents.

Firstly, the proposed location of the bike hire station would significantly impact the peaceful and tranquil nature of our residential area. As a resident who has lived in this property for over 30 year, I have specifically chosen this neighborhood for its calm and serene environment. The introduction of a bike hire station would introduce a constant influx of people, leading to increased noise levels and potential disruptions to our everyday lives. The sudden surge of visitors and the associated commotion would create a considerable disturbance, compromising the peace and privacy of the local residents.

Furthermore, the installation of the bike hire station would likely result in an influx of parked bicycles cluttering the sidewalks and obstructing pedestrian pathways. This not only presents safety hazards for those walking in the area but also creates an eyesore that negatively affects the aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood. Such unsightly obstructions would undoubtedly reduce the desirability of our residential area, potentially impacting property values for myself and my neighbors.

In addition to these concerns, the potential increase in vehicular traffic caused by individuals accessing the bike hire station could lead to congestion and parking difficulties. The limited availability of parking spaces is already a challenge in our area, and the introduction of the station may exacerbate the problem. This could further inconvenience residents who rely on their vehicles for commuting, grocery shopping, or other essential activities.

Moreover, I would like to emphasize the safety concerns associated with the proposed bike hire station. As the station is located in close proximity to residential buildings, it could attract an influx of unfamiliar individuals to our area, potentially compromising the security of our community. Additionally, the indiscriminate parking and irresponsible use of the dockless bikes by some users may lead to accidents or damage to private property.

Given the aforementioned negative implications, I strongly urge the local authority to reconsider the proposed plans and seek an alternative location for the dockless bike hire station. It is crucial to take into account the concerns and interests of the residents who call this neighborhood their home. I kindly request that a thorough assessment of the potential impacts be conducted, including consultations with the affected residents, before making any final decisions.

I would appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and a written response addressing the points raised in this letter. I trust that you will consider the welfare and concerns of the local residents in your decision-making process. Thank you for your time and understanding.

Objection Four

Hello, we do not agree to having the e-bike installed outside of 187 Oxford Gardens address.

It will cause a disturbance to residents- The bike hire station would disrupt the peaceful residential area. This will lead to increased noise

It will cause clutter and obstruction- The parked bicycles would clutter sidewalks and obstruct pedestrian pathways. This will compromise the safety of residents and the elderly who may not be able to go around the parked bicycles. It is also detracting from the aesthetic appeal of the local area.

As you are already aware, there is already a problem with traffic and parking in the local area. This will also increased vehicular traffic and limited parking availability may cause congestion and inconvenience for residents- This can be seen at multiple bike docking stations in the local area and across London. Young people tend to carelessly dump the bikes.

The station's proximity to residential buildings raises concerns about security, while irresponsible bike use could lead to accidents or property damage.

I urge the local authority to reconsider the proposed plans and seek an alternative location. Conduct a thorough assessment, including resident consultations, before making a final decision. We have had written response within the 14 Flats of 187 Oxford Gardens and all residents agree it is not a good idea to install the bike station.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and request a written response addressing the raised concerns. Please prioritise the welfare and interests of the local residents in your decision-making process.

[Additional Comments]

Do not install the Dockless Bike Hire here. This causes a disruption to resident of 187 Oxford gardens. Big complaint from the neighbours on a paper downstairs at the communal space.

Objection Five

Formal complaint regarding council should not install a dockless bicycle space underneath 187 Oxford Gardens.

1. The structure of the apartment does not allow for easy access for bicycles and other forms of transport.
2. Bicycles parked underneath the apartment can cause a safety hazard.
3. Bicycles can also be subject to theft, vandalism, and damage.
4. The presence of bicycles in the area can lead to an increase of air pollution and noise pollution levels nearby.
5. Bicycles can be visual disruption to the area and may take away from the aesthetic of the area.
6. Guests and visitors may be discouraged to visit the property if bicycles have been parked under the property.
7. Anti social behaviour could be encouraged when public bicycle rentals made available outside a council estate.
8. alternative spaces are available for dockless bikes in borough. Do not use a popular busy street location.
9. It may create a cluttered and untidy landscape, detracting from the aesthetics of the area.
10. The bike bay installation might obstruct views of roads, businesses, nearby parks, and other places of interest, that could possibly make it unsafe for road users. Pedestrians could be forced off pavements and on to the road as cycle hire bikes are being poorly parked and abandoned on paths and this may put locals in harms way unnecessarily.
11. The noise and disruption caused by workers installing the bike bay could be a nuisance to local residents.
12. Could potentially cause air and noise pollution with the congestion at the 187 council estate.
13. It could increase foot traffic in the area, potentially leading to danger of overcrowding.
14. It could block access to Communal Council Estate Bin as well as the communal recycling bin and other important spaces such as communal garden.
15. The riders of the dockless bikes could be a danger to pedestrians, drivers, and other riders. Regardless how safe a driver someone is, the potential hazard always is from other drivers.
16. The bike bay installation could create an aesthetic eyesore, and lower the value of property in the area. Potentially decreasing the value of privately owned property surrounding 187 Oxford Gardens. The installation of bike bays may negatively affect the local amenity value of the area.
17. The bike bay installation could cause damage local utilities.
18. The change in traffic flow due to the bike bay installation can lead to increased traffic congestion and hazards and distract drivers and put their safety at risk.
19. The increased traffic flow caused by bike bays may present a safety hazard for pedestrians and cyclists alike.
20. The proposed bike bays will cause an unnecessary strain on local infrastructure.
21. TFL hire scheme requires bikes to be docked at the end of journeys, yet the cycle companies seem to allow them to be abandoned whenever and wherever the user's journey ends. This is often unfair for locals.
22. The proposed installation of bike bays could potentially have an adverse impact upon the wildlife in the area, as per The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
23. The land in question has ecological or environmental significance, and permitting development on it would damage natural habitats or resources.
24. The land is designated as a conservation area and allowing the proposed development would be a breach of the guidelines set out for the area.

25. This is a long term installation that makes myself and the resident of 187 Oxford Gardens very concerned.

26. Recently there is a higher level of people using the bicycles without paying. This activates the bikes without accessing through a payment method. When doing so the bicycle becomes noisy with loud metal clattering noises with every cycle of the wheel. This can cause a nuisance to locals. This also evades the payment method that leaves the bicycle untraceable via Company.

27. Using the bicycles without paying is also against the law so could encourage opportunistic crime in the area.

28. Near west way sport center is a much more considerate place to include the dockless bike space. Not only does this avoid most of these problems, there is also much more convenience for people exercise to use a bicycle.

29. The proposed development may be causing a deterioration in the local area, leading to a lower quality of life for those who live in the area.

30. The dockless bike also takes up vehicle parking spaces. This must be take into consideration in case of emergencies. Untidy bicycle parking could cause a risk in an emergency situation that may slow, stop, or hinder access to 187 Oxford Gardens and surrounding buildings in the event of an emergency. If a fire engine (or multiple) require access to the property, we should avoid a life being at risk if a bicycle is blocking or hindering the entrance or exit. As local residents we should learn from previous safety negligence disasters such as Grenfell Tower. We do not want the same thing to happen again due to negligence from the local council.

31. The careless parking of dockless bikes could make it dangerous to navigate pavements especially for anyone with small children or a buggy, the elderly and anyone with a disability such as those using a wheelchair or with a visual impairment.

Additionally, you must also consider the impact on infrastructure and utilities, air and noise pollution, and the impact on neighbouring properties and businesses.

Please also note that at a few meters away at Oxford gardens primary school there is already a bicycle rack. And a Newley installed bike shed. Images attached.

Consider impact on local biodiversity and wildlife, or issues such as overdevelopment or overcrowding in a given area.

Residents have collectively partitioned in writing within the communal area at 187 Oxford Gardens. Please find attached an image of the partition from all 14 residents of 187 Oxford Gardens.

Collectively 187 Oxford Gardens have agreed that we do not want a Dockless Bike Hire Bay near the council estate.

The petition was printed 10 days ago and residents have had ample time to respond. All residents that responded, have voted Against the Proposal of the Dockless Bike Hire.

The result shows 15 votes of "NO".

And 0 votes for "YES".

This is a clear indication that none of us want the dockless bike hire bay at 187 Oxford Gardens.

Please find attached an image of the petition.

Objection Six

I don't mind the bikes as such but not at the expense of our resident parking. I have to pay a permit yearly in order to park outside my home. This isn't free from the council and I do not own a home with a driveway to keep my car in. I shouldn't have to pay for resident parking to then have it taken away and given to privatised rental e bikes. Please take one or both of the pay and display bays that are on this road instead. It is already difficult enough to park here on a normal day let alone if you keep reducing our resident permit spaces.

Objection Seven

We have already had parking spaces removed to accommodate the electric charging stations on the opposite side of the road and now you are proposing to have an E-bike parking bay directly outside 187 Oxford Gardens. I believe this is too much and is unfair and only happening as apart from one lease holder we are a social housing block. Has consideration been given to the fact that as well as the aforementioned electric charging bays we have a constant stream of builders vans parking outside to use the plumbers across the road, and also Borough residents regularly parking in order to use the Westway Sports Centre and now you are proposing to remove further parking spaces, it's really not acceptable? Whilst I understand the need for a solution to the E-bike problem I have also seen irresponsible users of such bays dump bikes/scooters within them and outside the boundary in a disorderly pile which is unsightly, dangerous and is something I do not want to look out on. Another more important concern I have is currently some E-bike (and scooter) users come speeding down Latimer Road and turn into Oxford Gardens still at speed without any consideration for pedestrians often with young children crossing from one side of Oxford Gardens to the other resulting in a number of `near misses` especially on the blind corner on the side of the plumbers therefore, the last thing we need is to encourage additional E-bike traffic outside this block. Please can I urge you to reconsider the proposal of using this particular site?

Objection Eight

I object to the plan to take a parking bay outside 187 Oxford Garden and replace it with a Commercial Cycle Hire parking bay. The residents pay hundreds of pounds for the parking facility yet nothing is done to actually penalise the firms who are making money on the hire bikes that often litter our pavements. The residents here wanted a lockable cycle pen for OUR cycles but got short shrift from our Council when we tried to enquire about this. Yet the minute Lime or Santander snap their fingers they get space for their commercial equipment. Why not force the Bike companies to fine or bar the last user of their

bikes if the bike they were using is left blocking the pavement in an unsocial manner. The last user can be found by matching up the offending bike serial number with the name on the hirers credit card. Judging by the number of lime bikes littering both parking spots and pavement the majority of users have no care for the other residents living in the street - so I don't see why our elected representatives and their officials are bending over backwards to reward this anti-social behaviour!

There is a sight handicapped couple living very close to the suggested parking plot at 187 Oxford Gardens - if the Hire bike users are so cavalier nowadays - in the way they dump their bikes near my home - why would they change their attitude if there was a designated parking plot! I can see those bikes spilling onto the pavement and causing a problem for the blind residents living nearby. The only way to stop the anti-social behaviour is the penalise those who don't care about how they dispose of these hirebikes.

I am an avid cyclist yet I have no sympathy for the hire companies or the hire bike users- they usually hog the road while wearing sound cancelling headphones and in road safety terms they are a menace to cyclist and other road users.

[Additional Comments]

Hi, I was merely suggesting as an afterthought that once RKBC has taken residents parking bays for e-hire bikes the next move will be to do the same for e-hire scooters. I would not be in favour of that either

Support in Part One

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.

Support in Full Six

[No comment supplied]

Appendix 6: Responses received for proposed e-bike bay in Snarsgate Street

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

Our street is a dead end street and because of this it's quiet and has a real residential feel where we know all our neighbours because it's a small street. Having lots of bikes and strangers coming to our street is not really appealing as most people who find our street and don't live in it choose to pee against the walls as they feel no one can see them so imagine if all the bike riders decide to do the same..

I am a bike rider and loved the idea of e-bikes docking down our side of North Kensington just not on the street that I live as it is very small.. why cannot it go around the corner somewhere on Latimer Road? Or farther down on Latimer Road that would be a much better option please don't take away our parking bays there are so few in our street already and also please think of us who live here I also speak on behalf of older neighbours who don't know how to use internet they oppose this idea too.

Objection Four

Already not enough car residents places.. why not using pay bays by industrial units?

Objection Five

Snarsgate Street has only 21 houses in it. There is negligible demand from the residents of Snarsgate Street for ebikes. Parking spaces in the street are in high demand. The proposal to replace 1-2 car spaces for the benefit of housing ebikes principally used by residents/visitors of Latimer Road is demonstrably unfair to residents of Snarsgate Street. I object to the proposal.

Latimer Place represents a better location on the basis that fewer residents would be impacted and it sits in the middle of Latimer Road (therefore benefiting ebike users to the north and south ends of Latimer Road).

Objection Six

Snarsgate Street has only 21 houses in it. There is negligible demand from the residents of Snarsgate Street for ebikes. Parking spaces in the street are in high demand. The proposal to replace 1-2 car spaces for the benefit of housing ebikes principally used by residents/visitors of Latimer Road is demonstrably unfair to residents of Snarsgate Street. I object to the proposal.

Latimer Place represents a better location on the basis that fewer residents would be impacted and it sits in the middle of Latimer Road (therefore benefiting ebike users to the north and south ends of Latimer Road).

Objection Seven

Snarsgate Street has only 21 houses in it. There is negligible demand from the residents of Snarsgate Street for ebikes. Parking spaces in the street are in high demand. The proposal to replace 1-2 car spaces for the benefit of housing ebikes principally used by residents/visitors of Latimer Road is demonstrably unfair to residents of Snarsgate Street. I object to the proposal.

Latimer Place represents a better location on the basis that fewer residents would be impacted and it sits in the middle of Latimer Road (therefore benefiting ebike users to the north and south ends of Latimer Road).

Objection Eight

For pity sake, please do not encourage people towards a small cul de sac, where foot traffic is low.

Why on earth would you not instead put them; either A outside what used to be the Post Office on the corner W10 6QL which actually currently has bike support bars, or B on the round about green directly opposite!

Support in Part One

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 St Charles Square

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

The creation of ebike parking spaces will not deter people from leaving ebikes in unsuitable places and will only reduce the small number of car parking spaces now available, making it even more difficult for local residents to live here. ebikes are not a positive addition to our lives.

The example of waste disposal is analogous, whereby people continue to leave their rubbish in the street at all times day and night despite our bin areas and 2-day collection. Penalties should be imposed for both offences.

Support in Part One

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 St Helen's Gardens

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

We have already lost a parking space on St Helens Garden, due to an extraordinary excessive waste of money spent on a 'rain garden' on the corner of St Helens Gardens and St Quintin Avenue, and inflicted a dangerous cross road, especially for children, the elderly, the disabled, wheelchair users, and sight

impaired people, we really do not need yet another obstruction. In the existing bicycle bays the bikes spill over into the pavement, causing much distress, especially to the aforementioned people.

Why was this gentrifying nonsense allowed in the first place? the only improvement is the pedestrian crossing on St Quintin Avenue, why wasn't one made on St Helens outside the Church and school?

PLEASE READ THIS COMMENT AND TAKE NOTE. THIS COUNCIL IS A DISGRACE AND HAS NO CONCERN FOR LOCAL PEOPLE AT ALL.

Objection Four

General concerns

As a cyclist, I celebrate efforts to make cycling in London as accessible as possible.

However, the lack of accountability in how e-bikes are treated means that they are often 'discarded' at the end of journeys, rather than treated with respect and parked in a way that is considerate to others.

[The attached photograph of a bike opposite the proposed bay illustrates the issue. In my experience it is as common to see this kind of carelessness, as it is to see them parked responsibly]

The result is that while these bikes are, I'm sure, a convenience to those who use them, they can be a significant nuisance to pedestrians and residents trying to park in designated bays, as well as being an eyesore.

Extending/updating the Santander Cycle network would be a better way of achieving the goal of getting more people onto two wheels. These are also greener – being made of metal, rather than plastic, and not containing batteries (i.e. on both counts easier to recycle).

Additionally, the bikes can be a magnet for anti-social behaviour, as youngsters 'looking for something to do' congregate around them and see whether any of them are hackable/moveable.

The Proposed Location

The above concern to do with the way that they are 'discarded' at the end of journeys makes the proposed site in St Helen's Gardens problematic. It is next to a section of pavement that is in constant use during school term time, by groups of children in transit to and from the Church Hall. It is also adjacent to a driveway.

Badly parked/discarded e-bikes (which are heavy and difficult to move) would cause problems for both pedestrians and car drivers if this site were to be used.

Already Existing Alternative

The recently completed £750,000 landscaping of St Helen's Gardens includes 10 bike racks at the junction of St Helen's and Kelfield and a further 3 at the junction with St Quintin Ave. These are currently empty most of the time, which means that there is significant spare capacity at the location already, if only people could be trained to use them. I wonder whether the same might not apply to other locations being considered in the Borough?

[The attached map highlights the location of these racks, and the photograph shows two of them ... perhaps the caption should be, 'nearly there?']

Loss of amenity

We can ill afford the loss of another residents' parking bay (all of which are occupied at peak times) and our council also has a duty of care to long-term residents who rely on (their increasingly green) cars for transport.

Servicing

I gather that these bikes are serviced during the night, creating noise and disturbance. While long term this is an issue that needs resolving, currently the random distribution of bikes (without designated bike parks) spreads this out across the area. A designated bike park would result in a disturbance for the same people for extended periods of time on a regular basis. That seems really unfair and surely the remit of our council is to protect residents from such anti-social behaviour?

[Additional Comments]

I've just submitted the below response online, but wanted to add an email in order to send the attachments that I mention in the text.

Best,
Steve Divall, St Helen's Church

General concerns

As a cyclist, I celebrate efforts to make cycling in London as accessible as possible.

However, the lack of accountability in how e-bikes are treated means that they are often 'discarded' at the end of journeys, rather than treated with respect and parked in a way that is considerate to others.

[The attached photograph of a bike opposite the proposed bay illustrates the issue. In my experience it is as common to see this kind of carelessness, as it is to see them parked responsibly]

The result is that while these bikes are, I'm sure, a convenience to those who use them, they can be a significant nuisance to pedestrians and residents trying to park in designated bays, as well as being an eyesore.

Extending/updating the Santander Cycle network would be a better way of achieving the goal of getting more people onto two wheels. These are also greener – being made of metal, rather than plastic, and not containing batteries (i.e. on both counts easier to recycle).

Additionally, the bikes can be a magnet for anti-social behaviour, as youngsters 'looking for something to do' congregate around them and see whether any of them are hackable/moveable.

The Proposed Location

The above concern to do with the way that they are 'discarded' at the end of journeys makes the proposed site in St Helen's Gardens problematic. It is next to a section of pavement that is in constant use during school term time, by groups of children in transit to and from the Church Hall. It is also adjacent to a driveway.

Badly parked/discarded e-bikes (which are heavy and difficult to move) would cause problems for both pedestrians and car drivers if this site were to be used.

Already Existing Alternative

The recently completed £750,000 landscaping of St Helen's Gardens includes 10 bike racks at the junction of St Helen's and Kelfield and a further 3 at the junction with St Quintin Ave. These are currently empty most of the time, which means that there is significant spare capacity at the location already, if only people could be trained to use them. I wonder whether the same might not apply to other locations being considered in the Borough?

[The attached map highlights the location of these racks, and the photograph shows two of them ... perhaps the caption should be, 'nearly there'?]

Loss of amenity

We can ill afford the loss of another residents' parking bay (all of which are occupied at peak times) and our council also has a duty of care to long-term residents who rely on (their increasingly green) cars for transport.

Servicing

I gather that these bikes are serviced during the night, creating noise and disturbance. While long term this is an issue that needs resolving, currently the random distribution of bikes (without designated bike parks) spreads this out across the area. A designated bike park would result in a disturbance for the same people for extended periods of time on a regular basis. That seems really unfair and surely the remit of our council is to protect residents from such anti-social behaviour?

Objection Five

Firstly I support the general principle of parking areas for E bikes.

But the bay proposed opposite 61 Saint Helens Gardens is inappropriate for the following reasons.

The street has recently be relandscaped and lost a residence parking bay on this side of the street used by flats above the shops opposite.

The proposed bay is also very close to the entrance to the church and when the bay is full, and when bike parking spreads it will encroach on the entrance impeding churchgoers on Sunday and schoolchildren who use the school Monday to Friday .

It is also a parking area used for disabled voters when the church hall is used as a polling centre at elections.

There is a far more appropriate area to use for a parking bay just round the corner in Kelfield Gardens right by the south side of the church, the end of the residence parking bay, which is far more suitable in terms of street clutter and won't offend the effect of the recent landscaping of Saint Helens Gardens.

Objection Six

As a result of the last year projects we lost a lot of customers, and there's no need for bikes space to be there we need more parking space for our customers, that can be in kelfied garden there's plenty space.

Support in Part One

Everyone struggles for parking spaces, without more being taken away. During the weekends and summer it is worse due to people parking to use St Marks Park. An ideal situation would be to use the pavement like the electric scooters in St Helens.

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 Mark's Road (I)

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Objection Three

The Residents Parking Bays on this section of St Marks Road(between Bassett and Oxford Gardens) were noted at 100% capacity overnight in the most recent RBKC survey. Recently a bike shed was installed reducing the resident parking capacity. The loss of a further residents parking bay would significantly reduce possibility of residents(many elderly) to park near their homes.

The reality is that because of the dockless nature of the proposed bays no one, having seen the number of bikes that have fallen over, either blown over by wind or being incorrectly parked, is going to want to park in a bay adjacent to ebikes without any protection between the bikes and their cars.

So the reality is that the reduction in resident parking in this proposal will not be limited to one bay. The proposed site currently only has capacity for three cars. One car space at the Oxford Gardens is proposed for ebikes, and part of the middle bay will be left vacant to allow for bikes falling over, meaning that there will only be one car space left fully available.

An alternative suggestion is to use the area north of the new bikeshed outside 91 St Marks Road which was residents bay but is now marked as double yellow, and is already in de facto use for this purpose. The benefits would be that it would not effect other residents bays as the bike shed acts as a partition.

[Additional Comments]

However without any support or assistance to keep them upright I wouldn't want to park my car in a bay next to the e-bikes. I've seen too many of them that have fallen over, either through the stand not being properly set up, or by the wind.

Objection Four

Residents on this part of St Marks Road have already lost parking spaces over the years. Firstly with the introduction of roundabouts at Bassett and Oxford junctions. Then more recently a bikeshed outside 91. We also have a new charging point outside 85 / 87. This is causing problems because the parking bay that it is intended for is constantly in use and now electric vehicles are parking in front of the access gate to off street parking at 87 (I can provide a photo). We are at capacity here - electric vehicles or otherwise. Please choose a more suitable location.

Objection Five

We already have a bike station 20 yards away. This is a highly residential area and we need more resident parking here. It is very difficult to find parking for residents. How can you keep on issuing resident parking permits, then cut down the spaces.

Support in Part One

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 Road (J)

Objection One [Ward Councillor objection]

We already have access to numerous e-bike and e-scooter stands in St Helen's ward, in fact it is getting ridiculous. Two already on St Marks Road, now RBKC is proposing three more?

I have spoken to residents and RAs, we have reached saturation point and do not want any more anywhere. They are either left straddling the pavement or not used at all, bringing utter chaos to the streetscape. We have a large proportion of elderly and mobility or sight- impaired residents who are afraid of tripping over the wretched abandoned bikes and scooters, or of being knocked over due to anti-social behaviour with people using e transport on pavements.

While writing I would like some feedback please on how much the Council is recouping from e-scooter and e-bike income. It must be a lot to drive residents insane with the constant mess. Do you know they charge them on the street at night, waking the neighbours?

It is utter chaos and badly planned.

[Additional Comments]

I would indeed like my comments recorded against the proposals in the consultation, against all proposed sites.

As stated previously we do not want ANY MORE e-bikes or e-scooters in St Helen's. I was nearly knocked flying just today by a bike on the pavement. We are close to having a very serious accident for either users or pedestrians.

Until they are properly regulated we want an absolute minimum in St Helen's ward - and certainly NO MORE.

Objection Two [St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association]

Below is the response from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helens Residents Association, covering parts of St Helens and Dalgarno wards.

"The St Quintin and Woodlands neighbourhood is made up of comparatively wide streets and pavements, laid out in the early 20th century. The area now experiences significant problems of dockless e-bikes being left by their users blocking the pavement and making life difficult for those with mobility problems, along with wheelchair users.

We have read the 2018 Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice for Operators in London and would interested to know how many Fixed Penalty Notices are issued by RBKC to operators, or other sanctions applied?

The section of the Code on Operations includes the following paragraphs:

7.1. Where an Obstruction occurs, the Dockless Bike or Bikes involved must be moved to a compliant parking space within the timescales set out in Section 6.3. Failure to comply may result in removal, a formal warning, FPN or prosecution.

7.2. In certain circumstances where Dockless Bikes are deposited on the highway so as to cause a danger to other highway users, the relevant Highway Authority has reasonable grounds to remove the bike(s) including if they are obstructing the view to users of the highway.

7.3. What constitutes a Danger is considered on the facts of each case, but large number of Dockless Bikes left and likely to fall across the footway so as to cause a trip hazard may be considered a Danger. Large scale obstruction may also be considered a danger where a substantial part of the footway is blocked. The decision to remove bikes for reasons of Danger may be taken for location specific reasons; such as a high level of footfall in an area or the level of security concern.

7.4. The highway authority may seek to limit or control the number of Dockless Bikes allowed in specific areas due to the likely impact on other highway users and on any other reasonable grounds.

7.5. Where Dockless Bikes have been removed either by a Highway Authority or emergency services, the Operator will be liable to pay all associated reasonable costs. On the TLRN, the cost of a bike being removed could be up to £235.

A 'shared' and dockless bike scheme relies on Londoners acting as responsible citizens. We are not convinced that adding numerous parking spaces for e-bikes is going to change public behaviour. We suggest that installation of new parking spaces should involve trials or pilot schemes in advance of a wider rollout, before large sums of public money are spent on providing such areas, at the expense of existing roadway, pavement or residents parking spaces.

We have no knowledge of how profitable such schemes are proving to be for the commercial operators in the Borough (DOTT, HumanForest, Lime and Tier). We worry that if margins are insufficient to ensure that operators swiftly remove discarded bikes, harm to pedestrians and to the image of our streets will only worsen.

Support in Part One

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.