

**LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN  
SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES DIRECTORATE  
REGENERATION AND PLANNING DIVISION**

**MATTERS FOR DECISIONS BY THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES (REGENERATION & PLANNING)**

**NON KEY DECISION – JUNE 2016**

| REPORT TITLE  | RECOMMENDATION  | WARD/S        | APPROVED BY  |
|---|---|---------------|--|
| Implementation of bikehangar units at various locations across Camden | <p>That the Assistant Director of Regeneration and Planning approves, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements, the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implement in total 21 (126 secure cycle parking spaces) bike hangar units at 14 separate locations across London Borough of Camden.</li> <li>▪ Not to implement in bikehangars at 5 separate locations consulted upon</li> </ul> | Various Wards | <p><b>Frances Wheat</b><br/><b>Assistant Director</b><br/><b>Regeneration &amp; Planning</b></p> <p><i>Frances Wheat</i></p> |

# **PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF BIKEHANGARS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS ACROSS LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN**

## **NON KEY DECISION OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION & PLANNING**

### **SUMMARY OF REPORT:**

This report outlines the Council's proposal to implement 21 bikehangar units that would accommodate 6 cycles each across 14 locations in Camden. The units would be implemented by either removing existing parking bays or single yellow line at the 14 locations detailed in section 3.0. This follows the Council receiving over 250 requests for the bikehangar units to be implemented following the successful implementation of 2 units in College Place for the first time as a trial in Camden in 2014.

The report outlines the results of the public consultation and makes recommendations based on officers' consideration of the feedback received during consultation and taking into account Council transport objectives.

### **AFFECTED WARDS:**

Various Wards

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 London Borough of Camden has a policy of providing cycle parking across the borough in a strategic way, to meet London's increasing cycle use. This is generally focused in key destinations where the majority of trips are generated, however there is an increasing demand to meet cycle parking needs of residents in more residential areas. Specific requests for new cycle parking are assessed and included in the programme of works where possible and appropriate.
- 1.2 Camden has a cycle parking programme which started in 2010/11 with the aim to provide a comprehensive network of secure bicycle parking. There are areas of the borough such as in Hampstead and Covent Garden where it is difficult to significantly increase cycle parking provision due to constraints in footway space.
- 1.3 In addition, there is a growing demand from residents living in high density dwellings (such as high rise flats or large Victorian housing with multiple occupancy spread over several floors), with limited space for sheltered and secure cycle parking within their properties. Lack of covered, secure long term cycle parking is a deterrent to people using bicycles. The European initiative of using a sheltered cage to store bicycles removes this barrier to cycling.

- 1.4 In order to address the issue, following a public consultation exercise, Camden implemented 2 bikehangar units in College Place for the first time on a trial basis in September 2014. This trial received positive reviews from those using it and has not generated any complaints from residents post-installation. Since the installation of the trial, the Council has received over 250 requests for bikehangars from residents across Camden. These requests have been logged and areas identified where there is the greatest demand for bikehangars. In total 19 areas were identified where the bikehangars could be implemented as result of the requests received.
- 1.5 A key objective of the Camden Transport Strategy is to improve cycling facilities for those both living and visiting and working in Camden. The Council believes the introduction of secure cycle parking facilities would reduce cycle theft and thus facilitate the increase in journeys made by bike; this would help reduce congestion and its harmful effects on Camden's streets.
- 1.6 Each secure cycle parking hangar would hold six cycles and be accessed from an area on the footway by opening a corrugated steel door. This door will be secured by a cylinder lock with a two point closing mechanism.

## **2.0 MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE BIKE HANGARS**

- 2.1 The proposed scheme would be managed and operated by a third party to reduce the ongoing costs and resources to the Council. At the current time there is only one provider of this service, Cyclehoop; and the Council would award a contract to them for a three year period to manage and operate the bike parking on the Council's behalf. The total cost per unit currently stands at £3,000 which includes installation costs. Cyclehoop's role would be to manage the registration of users, issue keys and collection of yearly subscription fees and replacement key fees from users.
- 2.2 In order to ensure the scheme is successful and in line with Camden's Transport Strategy there would be registration criteria for users to meet. The criteria would prioritise residents that:
- Live on the street (or adjacent one) where the bike parking is provided.
  - Do not have a Controlled Parking Zone Permit, (or would be prepared to give theirs up).
  - Do not have suitable outside space to store a bike.
- 2.3 Each user would be required to pay a one off £25 refundable deposit for a key in addition to an annual subscription of £30 per year direct to Cyclehoop. Users also have to commit to using the equipment in a responsible manner and agree to terms and conditions set out by the management company Cyclehoop. The Council would also contribute

to the ongoing management and operation of the system and would pay Cyclehoop £360 for the 3 year period (this amounts to £30 per bike per year). This represents a small subsidy to the users of the bike parking to help get the system up and running. If the bike parking is successful and becomes permanent, the council would stop paying this subsidy after the initial three year period and users' annual subscription would increase from £30 to £60.

- 2.4 Although the units are secure, the Council will need to prepare for the possibility that a bicycle may be stolen from the units. Cyclehoop has advised us that neither they nor the Council would be liable for any theft or damage to bikes using the facilities and all users would be clearly advised of this at the time of registration. Further information relating to this issue is outlined in section 9.0 of this report.
- 2.5 Officers considered the most popular locations identified through initial contact by residents looking for a solution to their cycle parking needs. Following this a site visit was carried out to determine a feasible location for the secure parking facility and the proposed locations were selected based on the aim of meeting the following criteria:
1. Minimise the impact to loss of parking
  2. Proposed in close proximity to the requestors
  3. Ensure the hangar does not conflict with existing street furniture
  4. Avoid placing the hangar directly outside a properties windows or door.
  5. Not to place the hangar in a location that may be considered unsafe.

### **3.0 PROPOSALS**

- 3.1 The proposed locations of bikehangars together the changes required to accommodate on each street selected is detailed below:
- 3.2 **BH-02\_Primrose Gardens (Belsize Ward)** - Remove 6 metres of residents parking and install two 2.5 metre wide bikehangars. This would result in a loss of one residents' parking space.
- 3.3 **BH-03\_Estelle Road (Gospel Oak Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents' parking bay at Estelle Road junction with Savernake Road and remove a further 3 metres of residents' parking at Estelle Road junction with Mansfield Road. The parking bays will be replaced by two 2.5 metre wide bikehangars. This would result in a loss of one residents' parking space.
- 3.4 **BH-04\_Rochester Road (Cantelowes Ward)** - Removal of 6 metres of single yellow line outside Cherry Tree Court and install two 2.5 metre wide bikehangars.

- 3.5 **BH-05\_South Hill Park (Hampstead Town Ward)** – Remove 6 metres of residents’ parking bay and replace with 2 bikehangar units. This would result in the loss of 1 residents’ parking space.
- 3.6 **BH-06\_Ospringe Road (Kentish Town Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of shared use (permit holders and paid for parking bay) parking bay outside 1-16 Ospringe Road and replace with one bikehangar unit. Remove 3 metres of permit holder parking bay at Ospringe Road junction with Lady Magaret Road and replace with one bikehangar unit. This would result in a loss of one permit holder’s parking space and one shared use parking space.
- 3.7 **BH-07\_Montpelier Grove (Kentish Town Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of resident parking bay and replace with 1 bikehangar unit at Montpelier Grove junction with Falkland Road. This will result in a loss of one residents’ parking space.
- 3.8 **BH-08\_College Place (St Pancras & Somers Town Ward)** - Remove 6 metres of single yellow line and replace it with 2 bike hangar units outside 1 – 24 Stonehouse.
- 3.9 **BH-09\_Westbere Road (Fortune Green Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents parking bay and replace it with 1 bike hangar at Westbere Road junction with Mill Lane. This will result in a loss of one residents’ parking space.
- 3.10 **BH-11\_Goldhurst Terrace (Swiss Cottage Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents’ parking bay and replace it with 1 bike hangar unit at Goldhurst Terrace junction with Fairhazel Gardens. This will result in a loss of one residents’ parking space.
- 3.11 **BH-12\_Ryland Road (Kentish Town Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents’ parking bay adjacent to 24 Ryland Road and replace with 1 bike hangar unit protected by bollards. Remove 3 metres of existing residents’ parking bay at Ryland Road junction with Prince of Wales Road and replace with 1 bike hangar unit. This will result in a loss of two residents’ parking space.
- 3.12 **BH-13\_Plender Street (St Pancras & Somerstown Ward)** - Remove a 6 metre redundant doctor’s bay and replace with 2 bikehangar units.
- 3.13 **BH-14\_Hastings Street (Cantelowes Ward)** - Remove of 6 metres of single yellow line outside 1-27 Hastings Street and install two 2.5 metre wide bikehangars
- 3.14 **BH-15\_Mornington Street (Regent’s Park Ward)** - Remove 6 metres of single yellow line and replace with 2 bikehangar units.

- 3.15 **BH-16\_Millman Street (Holborn & Convent Garden Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of single yellow line outside 13 Millan Street and replace with 1 bikehanger unit.
- 3.16 **BH-17\_St Augustine's Road (Cantelowes Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of single yellow line and replace with 1 bikehanger unit.
- 3.17 **BH-18\_Belsize Avenue (Belsize Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents parking outside 32 Belsize Avenue and replace with 1 bike hangar unit. This would result in a loss of one residents' parking space.
- 3.19 **BH-19\_Sumatra Road (West Hampstead Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents' parking bay at Sumatra Road junction with Dennington Park Road and replace it with 1 bike hangar. This would result in a loss of one residents' parking space.
- 3.20 **BH-20\_Glenbrook Road (West Hampstead Ward)** - Remove 3 metres of residents' parking bay at Glenbrook Road junction with Sumatra Road and replace it with 1 bike hangar this would result in a loss of 1 residents' parking space
- 3.21 **BH-21\_Lissenden Gardens (Highgate Ward)** – Remove 3 metres of residents' parking bay and replace with one bike hangar unit. This would result in a loss of one residents' parking space.
- 3.22 All bikehangars will be protected by fixed bollards to prevent vehicles colliding into the hangars.

## Summary of Parking Loss

3.24 The table below summarises the overall parking loss by controlled parking zone if the above proposals are approved for implementation, the proposed loss in parking spaces can be reduced if the majority of residents' who apply for space within the unit give up their residents' parking permit which is one part of the qualifying criteria.

| <b>Overall Parking Loss by CPZ</b> |                   |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Controlled Parking Zone            | No.of spaces lost |
| CA-B                               | 3                 |
| CA-M                               | 3                 |
| CA-P                               | 3                 |
| CA-R                               | 1                 |
| CA-H                               | 2                 |
| CA-U                               | 1                 |
| CA-F                               | 2                 |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>15</b>         |

## 4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 The proposals described above were subject to a month-long public consultation which ended on 28 December 2015. Approximately 3,300 leaflets were distributed to local residents, businesses, local and statutory groups and Ward Members. The consultation leaflets are included in Appendix A. The consultation pack included the following:

- A leaflet outlining the proposal, showing a location map and a drawing of the proposed changes. The consultation was also published online.

### Consultation Analysis

4.2 Of the 3,300 letters distributed a total of 275 responses were received which represented, a response rate of 8.3%. All proposals received a clear response, either in favour or against the proposal; no responses indicated a no opinion. The tables below summarises the responses received for each proposal.

#### Tables 1-19; summary of responses

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Primrose Gardens (Belsize Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 11               | 27                   |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>12 (30%)</b>  | <b>27 (70 %)</b>     |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Estelle Road (Gospel Oak Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 8                | 6                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>9 (60%)</b>   | <b>6 (40 %)</b>      |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Ospringe Road (Kentish Town Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 7                | 7                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>8 (54%)</b>   | <b>7 (46 %)</b>      |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Montpelier Grove (Kentish Town Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 7                | 1                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>8 (88%)</b>   | <b>1(12%)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on College Place (St Pancras &amp; Somerstown Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 10               | 1                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>11 (91%)</b>  | <b>1(9 %)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Westbere Road (Fortune Green Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 6                | 0                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 1                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>8 (100%)</b>  | <b>0 (0 %)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Goldhurst Terrace (Swiss Cottage Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 6                | 4                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>7 (64%)</b>   | <b>4(36 %)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Ryland Road (Kentish Town Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 5                | 5                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>6 (55%)</b>   | <b>5(45 %)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Plender Street (St Pancras &amp; somerstown Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 1                | 0                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>2 (100%)</b>  | <b>0(0 %)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Mornington Street (Regent's Park Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 3                | 5                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>4(44%)</b>    | <b>5(56 %)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Millman Street (Holborn &amp; Covent Garden)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 3                | 27                   |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 2                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>6(18%)</b>    | <b>27(82%)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on St Augustine's Road (Cantelowes Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 2                | 1                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>3(75%)</b>    | <b>1(25%)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Belsize Avenue (Belsize Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 5                | 5                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>6(55%)</b>    | <b>5(45%)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Sumatra Road (West Hampstead Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 3                | 4                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 1                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>5(55%)</b>    | <b>4(45%)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Glenbrook Road (West Hampstead Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 3                | 4                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 1                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>5(55%)</b>    | <b>4(45%)</b>        |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars Rochester Road (Cantelowes Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 6                | 1                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>7 (88%)</b>   | <b>1 (12 %)</b>      |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars South Hill Park (Hampstead Town Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents  | 33               | 8                    |
| Statutory Groups   | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups   | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members   | 1                | 1                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>35 (80%)</b>  | <b>9 (20%)</b>       |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Hastings Street (Cantelowes Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 4                | 10                   |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>5 (34%)</b>   | <b>10 (66%)</b>      |

| <b>Proposal to implement bikehangars on Lissenden Gardens (Highgate Ward)</b> | <b>In favour</b> | <b>Not in favour</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Residents   | 4                | 6                    |
| Statutory Groups  | 1                | 0                    |
| Local Groups  | 0                | 0                    |
| Ward Members  | 0                | 0                    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>5 (45%)</b>   | <b>6(55%)</b>        |

### **Consultation Analysis**

The consultation results shows that overall responses received are in favour overall for the proposal to install bike hangars (74% in favour and 26% against); however this varies by location. For example, College Place has received 90% support whereas Millman Street has received 90% opposition. Therefore it's important to consider each location in turn and respond to the concerns expressed by those who have objected to the scheme. This has been undertaken in sections 4 and 5 of the report.

### **Comments received from respondents:**

#### **Comments received from Ward Members**

- 4.4 **Councillor Julian Fulbrook (Holborn & Covent Garden Ward) responded** in favour of the proposed bikehangar in Millman Street.
- 4.5 **Councillor Awale Olad (Holborn & Covent Garden Ward) responded** in favour of the proposed bikehangar in Millman Street
- 4.6 **Councillor Flick Rea (Fortune Green Ward) responded** stating that she welcomes the schemes extension on Westbere Road and would be very interested to receive update on the uptake especially the relinquishing of residents' parking permits.

- 4.7 **Councillor Phil Rosenberg (West Hampstead Ward)** responded in favour of the proposed bikehangers in Glenbrook Road and Sumatra Road and stated that this was a good project.

#### **Comments from local and statutory groups:**

- 4.5 **Camden Cycling Campaign** commented that they support the initiative and would like to see the bike hanger installed as soon as possible.

#### **Comments from residents:**

Although 152 people responded in favour of the proposed scheme, 123 did not and raised the following concerns regarding the bikehangers:

- 42 residents commented that parking is already heavily occupied and the loss of more parking spaces isn't acceptable
- 27 residents commented that bikes can easily be attached to existing street furniture bikehangers that replace parking spaces are not required
- 26 residents commented that the bikehangers would attract vandalism and create noise, cctv should be considered
- 20 residents commented that the bikehangers are unsightly and do not complement the existing streetscape
- 35 residents commented that the bikehangers shouldn't be sited in conservation areas because they visually damage the streetscape and queried whether planning permission was required.
- 4 residents commented that there shouldn't be a registration fee and the cost of using the hangar shouldn't increase

## **5.0 OFFICER COMMENTS TO THE CONCERNS RAISED**

### **Parking loss**

- 5.1 In choosing each location officers have where possible followed the criteria explained under paragraph 2.5.
- 5.2 Analysis of the 2011 census data illustrates that cycle journeys in Camden have increased by 2.8% and the number of households without a car has increased from 56% to 61% which represents an increase of 17% in the last ten years. The increase in cycle journeys across the borough coupled with the increase in number of households without a car suggests that more space would be required for more sustainable forms of transport such as cycle parking. The Council has already installed cycle parking in many locations across the borough on the footway; however it has become increasingly difficult to continue to significantly increase cycle parking provision due to constraints on

footway space in a number of areas e.g. Covent Garden, Fitzrovia, Hampstead and Highgate.

- 5.3 The proposals are in line with the objectives set in Camden's Transport Strategy, which are to reduce pollution in the borough by promoting environmentally friendly and active forms of transport such as cycling. Utilising existing street furniture to lock bikes is not an option as this would often reduce the available footway width for pedestrians and in some cases result in a safety hazard. Where possible sections of single yellow lines have been utilised to provide space for bikehangers, however this has not been possible in a majority of locations due to the need to retain sections of single yellow line to provide passing space or in some cases there are no sections of single yellow lines that can be considered for removal. Across Camden parking has been removed for similar schemes such as electric vehicles bays and on carriageway cycle parking stands, in order to promote more sustainable forms of transport. In addition, the provision of a secure unit for storing bicycles will benefit twelve residents where 2 units are provided. The criteria prioritises users that are willing to give up a controlled parking zone permit, which may potentially result in up to twelve car parking spaces becoming available which would compensate for the loss of parking where 2 units have been installed.

**Vandalism and noise:**

- 5.4 In response to safety concerns and the installation of CCTV cameras, the Council has been reassured by the supplier that the secure cycle unit is theft proof and features a robust fire-proof steel construction. The door is secured with a 2-point closure with a euro cylinder lock and offers a "burglar proof" solution for storing cycles. It has been awarded the Dutch police quality mark, which is also awarded to houses, blocks and neighbourhoods that meet specific set of safety requirements. . The bikehangers located on College Place have not suffered from any vandalism or theft despite concerns being raised during consultation The Council would therefore not install CCTV cameras to monitor the units as this would not present value for money. Instead the management company will monitor any levels of crime and vandalism and report to the Council if necessary.
- 5.5 Although the units are secure, there is still the minimal possibility that cycles may be stolen. As such officers have obtained guidance on the Council's liability for damage caused to any of the units and theft of cycles from the units (see section 9Comments of the Borough Solicitor). Any graffiti on the unit will be addressed in the usual way of tackling graffiti in the borough. Costs for the removal of graffiti are expected to be similar to the Legible London signs which cost approximately £100 a year to maintain. On concerns related to noise, the units should not lead to unacceptable levels of noise; opening and closing the units would generate similar noise to opening car doors and therefore should cause minimal disruption to residents.

## **Visual impact of bikehanger units**

- 5.6 In total 12 of the 19 locations are in conservation areas, therefore officers do agree that the impact of the hangers on the streetscape is important given that we are now proposing to increase their numbers across the borough with many more requests pending feasibility and consultation. Officers have been in discussion with Camden Cycle Campaign and internal colleagues from Arts & Tourism to seek options on softening the visual impact of the unit. The outcome of these discussions was to propose a green hangar or to install planters on either side of the hangar, rather than a black one which may soften the look. Officers also engaged in writing with the residents who objected to the look of the hangar in Millman Street, Primrose Gardens and Mornington Crescent not many residents' responded but the views of those responded was that they are in opposition to the hangar regardless of any improvements to the look and believe that there is sufficient cycle infrastructure in Camden already.

## **Planning permission requirement**

- 5.7 In relation to the enquires related to whether planning permission is required and if they can be sited in conservation areas, the Council's planning and legal services department have stated that bikehangers can be installed without the need for planning permission by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 12, Class A (a) of the General Permitted Development Order.

## **The cost of the secure unit**

- 5.8 The units if approved users would pay the subscription fee of £30 will be paid to cycle hoop directly which covers the administration costs of managing the scheme. If the scheme is proven successful, then it may be possible for local residents to self-manage, similar to what is happening in London Borough of Lambeth. However for this trial scheme (which will run for a period of three years) Cyclehoop will be responsible for the administration of the hangars. In response to comments regarding discounts and residents with low income, the Council cannot unfortunately offer any discounts as the proposed cost is considered to be reasonable.
- 5.9 In response to comments that there should be no registration fee and that the fee should not be increased in future; due to the limited funding available for schemes such as this, and the constraints on existing budgets it would be necessary for the project to be self-sustaining and not require on-going financial support from the Council.

**5.10 Comments specific to proposals BH-02\_Primrose Gardens, BH-16\_Millman Street, BH-14\_Hastings Street, BH-10\_Lissenden Gardens and BH-15\_Mornington Street**

**5.11 BH-02\_Primrose Gardens:**

5.12 Officers received a large number of objections to the proposals to implement 2 bike hangar units in Primrose Gardens by removing 1 residents' parking space. The majority of residents' objecting to the proposal commented that the residents' parking on Primrose Gardens is heavily occupied and that bikes can be locked up to existing street furniture. Officers acknowledge the objections received however in response state the implementation of 2 bike hangars would result in a loss of 1 residents' parking space but would create 12 secure cycle parking facilities which could encourage residents' to use bikes as a more sustainable form of transport which meets the objectives set out in the Camden Transport Strategy.

5.13 Given the level of objections received officers are recommending that this location is not approved for implementation.

**5.14 BH-16\_Millman Street:**

5.15 Residents of Millman Street submitted a petition during the consultation stage with 27 signatories against the proposal to implement bikehangars on Millman Street on the grounds that the bikehangars are unsightly and planning permission should be sought before placing the hangars in conservation areas.

5.16 Officers acknowledge the objections received and can confirm that officers have received similar objections from residents in other areas where the Council has consulted on the bikehangars regarding the visual impact of the bikehangar. Officers understand that due to the high level of requests for the hangars and consequently the high amount that will be implemented it's important to ensure that the hangars fit in well with the existing streetscape. Officers have been in discussion with Camden Cycle Campaign and internal colleagues from Arts & Tourism to seek options on softening the visual impact of the unit. The outcome of these discussions was to propose a green hangar or to install planters on either side of the hangar, rather than a black one which may soften the look. Officers also engaged in writing with the residents who objected to the look of the hangar in Millman Street, Primrose Gardens and Mornington Crescent not many residents' responded but the views of those responded was that they are in opposition to the hangar regardless of any improvements to the look and believe that there is sufficient cycle infrastructure in Camden already. In relation to the option of installing planters officers made a decision not to progress with this due to the high level of cost of installing them at £1000.00 each at that there it's highly likely that a vehicle could collide with them as they are low in height.

5.17 In addition to the above 2 locations given the high level of objection received towards bike hangars for the same reasons as outlined above officers recommend that bike hangars are not to be approved for installation at both Lissenden Gardens, Hastings Street and Mornington Street.

## **6.0 OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 Having considered the responses to the consultation and provided responses above to the main concerns raised on the proposals, officers are recommending that the Assistant Director for Regeneration and Planning approves the implementation of 19 bikehangar units at the 14 locations identified. Officers are recommending that bikehangars are not implemented at the following locations:

1. Primrose Gardens
2. Millman Street
3. Mornington Street
4. Hastings Street
5. Lissenden Gardens.

## **7.0 COMMENTS FROM ENGINEERING SERVICES**

7.1 Engineering Service did not have any objections to the proposals as long as the necessary steps were taken to protect the units using bollards to prevent vehicles from colliding with the units.

## **8.0 COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE**

8.1 The works including purchasing and installation of the cycle unit, any processing of traffic orders and associated works will be covered within TfL LIP funding within the Corridors and Neighbourhood programme under budget code CDCN7299. The Council will not receive any revenue for this proposal as all the members who sign up for secure cycle parking space will pay the charges outlined in paragraph 2.3 above to Cyclehoop directly.

## **9.0 COMMENTS FROM THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR**

9.1 In order to establish a claim for negligence against the Council for damage to the bikes or theft, it must be shown that the Council owed a duty of care to the bike owner and that the risk of damage to property or theft was reasonably foreseeable. The Council would have to establish that they took reasonable steps to prevent the damage/theft occurring. This is likely to involve ensuring that the storage is fit for purpose and regularly maintained.

9.2 The Council's liability for damage or theft of the bikes should be covered in the agreement/licence provided to all persons wanting to utilise the storage facility. We would advise that any agreement entered into should include an exclusion/limitation of liability clause to ensure the owners of the bikes store them at their own risk. Whilst there are certain duties of care that cannot be contracted out of (e.g. the Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 implies a term in contracts for the exercise of reasonable care and skill in the provision of goods and services), the Council's standard form clauses will cover this. The regular maintenance of the units and with the use of liability exclusion clauses the Council's exposure to liability should be minimal.

#### Attachments

Appendix A – exemplar consultation leaflet of one of 19 locations consulted upon

Design Engineer: Tabrez Hussain (Transport Strategy Service)  
Email: [tabrez.hussain@camden.gov.uk](mailto:tabrez.hussain@camden.gov.uk)  
Date: 10 June 2016