| | |
|---|---|
| Brent | **Healthy Streets & Parking**<br>Active Travel Programme<br>Delegated Approval Report<br><br>Report for Head of Healthy Streets & Parking |
| **Wards Affected**:<br>Alperton, Barnhill, Kenton, Kingsbury, Northwick Park, Preston, Queensbury, Stonebridge, Sudbury, Tokyngton, Welsh Harp, Wembley Central, Wembley Hill. | |
| **Title: Dockless Bike Parking Bay Implementation Programme – Phases 4 & 5 Locations** | |

**Approved by:**

| Role | Title | Name | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Author | Electric & Shared Mobility Programme Coordinator | Christopher Egeonu | 30/07/2025 |
| Reviewer | Transportation Planning Manager | Tim Martin | 11/08/2025 |
| Approver | Head of Healthy Streets & Parking | Sandor Fazekas | 03/09/2025 |

## 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report summarises the outcome of public consultation conducted between 30 June and 20 July 2025, for the installation of dockless cycle parking bays at 61 locations in the Alperton, Barnhill, Kenton, Kingsbury, Northwick Park, Preston, Queensbury, Stonebridge, Sudbury, Tokyngton, Welsh Harp, Wembley Central and Wembley Hill wards. This is the fourth phase of a wider programme to implement 200 dockless cycle parking bays across Brent by end of summer 2025.

1.2 In considering the outcome of the consultation, the report recommends the Head of Healthy Streets & Parking gives approval to progress with the installation of dockless cycle parking bays at 50 of the 61 locations listed in this report and to review/re-consult on the siting of parking bays at 11 locations.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

2.1 An e-bike hire scheme managed by Lime has been operating in Brent since November 2019. Currently operating with 500 bikes deployed across the borough, the scheme has become an established part of the borough transport network and has proved popular with users, with around 2 million trips made within the borough to date.

2.2 Despite its popularity, the scheme does give rise to regular complaints about how it operates, with issues around inconsiderate/unsafe parking of bikes - particularly on footways. To address this and other operational issues, the Council has reached agreement with Lime whereby they have committed to part fund the implementation of a network of 200 on-street cycle parking bays across the borough, to be delivered in phases by July 2025.

2.3 The Council has been working closely with Lime on identifying suitable locations for clearly designated on-street cycle parking bays across Brent, where bikes can be deployed and hired/returned. Locations have been informed by usage data supplied by Lime and Council data on complaints, with a focus on the need to provide parking outside stations, in town centres, and at other key trip generators within the borough (including locations with high level of pedestrian activity). The costs of implementing these cycle parking bays will be met by Lime, with some funding also provided by TfL.

2.4 For phases 4 and 5 of the programme, locations for 61 on-street parking bays have been identified, providing space for c.488 dockless hire bikes. Details of the proposed locations are set out in Table 1, below, and in Appendix A. Most bays are proposed to be located on the carriageway, replacing a mix of formal and informal car parking spaces. Footway bays are proposed in 11 locations where there is deemed to be sufficient footway width available and where it is considered that no suitable alternative on-carriageway location exists. Where parking bays are proposed on the carriageway, protective bollards will be installed to prevent incursion from other vehicles. A Design Risk Assessment (DRA) has been undertaken for all proposed locations, with appropriate mitigation measures proposed where risks have been identified (see Appendix B). Road Safety Assessments have also been undertaken at all proposed locations.

*Table 1: Proposed Phases 4 & 5 Dockless Bike Parking Bay Locations*

| Street | Priority Location | Ward | Carriageway/ Footway |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ealing Road 1 | Alperton Station | Wembley Central | Footway |
| Harrow Road | Sudbury & Harrow Road Station | Sudbury | Carriageway |
| Windermere Avenue | South Kenton Station | Preston | Carriageway |
| Ealing Road 2 - Jct with Chaplin Road | Alperton | Wembley Central | Footway |
| Ealing Road 3 - Jct with Mount Pleasant | Alperton | Alperton | Footway |
| Pellatt Road | East Lane Business Park | Preston | Carriageway |
| Manor Farm Road | Alperton Industrial Estate | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Uxendon Crescent | Preston Road Station | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Chalkhill Road | Wembley Park Station | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Station Approach 3 | Sudbury Town Station | Sudbury | Carriageway |
| Carlton Avenue West | Northwick Park | Northwick Park | Carriageway |
| Rushout Avenue | Northwick Park Station | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Beresford Avenue | Grand Union Housing Development | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Burns Road | Alperton | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Oakington Avenue | Wembley Park | Wembley Hill | Carriageway |
| Heather Park Drive | Alperton | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Carlyon Road | Alperton | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Lancelot Crescent | North Wembley | Wembley Central | Carriageway |
| Park Chase | Wembley Park | Wembley Hill | Carriageway |
| Stanley Avenue | Alperton | Alperton | Carriageway |
| Sudbury Court Road | Elmwood Park | Northwick Park | Carriageway |
| The Link | South Kenton Station | Northwick Park | Carriageway |
| Tring Avenue | Tokyngton | Tokyngton | Carriageway |
| Old North Circular Road | Stonebridge Park Station | Stonebridge | Footway |
| London Road | Tokyngton | Wembley Hill | Carriageway |
| Hirst Crescent | North Wembley | Preston | Carriageway |
| Forty Avenue | Wembley Park | Preston | Footway |
| East Lane | Sudbury Court Sports Club | Northwick Park | Carriageway |
| St John's Road | Wembley Central Station | Wembley Hill | Carriageway |
| Uxendon Crescent | Preston Road Station | Kenton | Footway |
| Preston Road | Preston Road Station | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Northwick Avenue | Northwick Park Station | Kenton | Carriageway |

| Street | Priority Location | Ward | Carriageway/ Footway |
|---|---|---|---|
| Churchill Avenue | Kenton Station | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Kingsbury Road 1 - South Side | Kingsbury Station/Town Centre | Queensbury | Footway |
| Kingsbury Road 2 - North Side | Kingsbury Station/Town Centre | Queensbury | Footway |
| Beverley Drive | Queensbury Station | Queensbury | Footway |
| Queensbury Station Parade | Queensbury Station | Queensbury | Footway |
| Airco Close | Colindale | Kingsbury | Carriageway |
| Edgeware Road | Colindale | Kingsbury | Carriageway |
| Kingsbury Road 3 - Southside | Kingsbury Station/Town Centre | Queensbury | Carriageway |
| Limesdale Gardens | Burnt Oak | Queensbury | Carriageway |
| Westmorland Road | Queensbury Station | Queensbury | Carriageway |
| Kinloch Drive | Welsh Harp Open Space | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Kenton Road | Kenton | Kenton | Footway |
| Aboyne Road | Neasden Recreation Ground | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Buck Lane | Kingsbury | Kingsbury | Carriageway |
| Upton Gardens | Kenton Station | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Church Lane | Kingsbury | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Mount Drive | Wembley Park | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Winslow Close | Neasden Town Centre | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Greenhill Way | Wembley Park | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Mayfields | Wembley Park | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Capitol Way | Capitol Industrial Park | Kingsbury | Carriageway |
| Glenwood Grove | Fryent | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Barnhill Road | Chalkhill Park | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Old Church Lane | Neasden | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |
| Wellspring Crescent | Wembley Park | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| Brampton Grove | Barn Hill | Barnhill | Carriageway |
| North Way | Roe Green | Queensbury | Carriageway |
| Robin Grove | Fryent Country Park | Kenton | Carriageway |
| Harp Island Close | Brent Reservoir | Welsh Harp | Carriageway |

## 3.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

### Consultation Process

3.1 A public consultation exercise was carried out between 30 June and 20 July 2025. Consultation letters were posted to 3481 households and businesses located within 50 metres of all the proposed cycle parking bays; and detailed plans and a questionnaire were published on the Council's consultation portal. Information on the proposals was also sent to Ward Councillors, community groups and statutory bodies, including the emergency services. An example of the consultation document can be found in Appendix C.

### Consultation Responses

3.2 A total of 214 responses were received to the online consultation, of which 178 were objections and 35 expressing support (see Table 2, below). Email responses were also received from the Metropolitan Police and the Brent Cycling Campaign. A residents' petition was also submitted objecting to the proposed bay in Lancelot Crescent. While the overall response rate is low (6%), it is also acknowledged that the proposed interventions are relatively small scale in nature and in many cases, it is considered they would have limited negative impact. All comments and objections received have been carefully reviewed and

are detailed in Appendix D. A summary of the key findings and recommendations is set out in Table 3, below:

*Table 2: Consultation response rate*

| Question 1 | **Yes** | **No** | **No opinion** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Do you agree with the proposed Cycle hire Bay?** | 35 | 178 | 1 |
| Percentage | **16%** | **83%** | **1%** |

*Table 3: Overview of key findings and recommendations*

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ealing Road 1 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Harrow Road - For S&HR Station | 82 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | • Loss of parking at busy shopping parade<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Windermere Avenue | 63 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Road Safety and Traffic Concerns<br>• Antisocial Behaviour & Misuse of Lime Hire Bikes<br>• Negative Environmental Impact<br>• Consider Alternative Location | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Ealing Road 2 - Jct with Chaplin Road | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Ealing Road 3 - Jct with Mount Pleasant | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Pellatt Road | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | • No specific issues raised | N/A | Progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Manor Farm Road | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Uxendon Crescent | 63 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | • Loss of parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Chalkhill Road | 49 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Station Approach 3 | 58 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | • No specific issues raised | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Carlton Avenue West | 16 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | • No specific issues raised – respondents were supportive of the location and suggested sites for other bays. | • Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Progress to implementation |
| Rushout Avenue | 29 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | • Traffic & Congestion Risks<br>• Nuisance and Anti-social Behaviour<br>• Abandoned bikes on the footway<br>• Demographic Suitability<br>• Parking and Access Issues<br>• Lack of Consultation or Understanding<br>• Consider alternative location | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Beresford Avenue | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Burns Road | 48 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Street use and Suitability<br>• Consider alternative Location<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Oakington Avenue | 42 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | • Traffic Flow and Road Capacity | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Heather Park Drive | 65 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | • Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Loss of Parking<br>• Abandoned bikes on Footway<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Carlyon Road | 43 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | • Consider Alternative Locations | • Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Other locations will be considered in future phases. | Considerable benefits to this location - progress to implementation |
| Lancelot Crescent | 31 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | • Loss of parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned bikes on footway<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consider alternative locations | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • Objection letter and petition against proposal submitted | • Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Park Chase | 38 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | • Loss of parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned bikes on footway<br>• Consider alternative locations | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Stanley Avenue | 69 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | • Loss of parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety<br>• Abandoned bikes on footway<br>• Consider alternative locations | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Sudbury Court Road | 33 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | • Accessibility Concerns<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| The Link | 26 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned bikes on footway | • Negligible loss of parking. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Tring Avenue | 36 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Old North Circular Road | 448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| London Road | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Hirst Crescent | 143 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | • Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Forty Avenue | 64 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | • Abandoned bikes on footway<br>• Anti-social behaviour<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Consultation Process<br>• Consider Alternative Locations<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Consultation undertaken appropriate for a project of this size/nature.<br>• Bays are being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| East Lane | 16 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 0 | • Impact on Elderly Residents<br>• Antisocial Behaviour and Noise<br>• Overflow and Obstruction<br>• Loss of Parking<br>• Negative Impact on Community Maintenance Efforts<br>• Traffic and Road Safety<br>• Consultation Process<br>• Consider Alternative Locations<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Some loss of parking.<br>• Consultation undertaken appropriate for a project of this size/nature.<br>• Bays being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| St John's Road | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Uxendon Crescent | 64 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | • Loss of parking<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Preston Road | 116 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 0 | • Consultation Process<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Detailed consultation exercise undertaken commensurate for a project of this nature.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Northwick Avenue | 39 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Traffic and Congestion<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Consultation Process<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Consultation undertaken appropriate for a project of this size/nature.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Churchill Avenue | 37 | 26 | 2 | 24 | 0 | • Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Loss of Parking<br>• Inappropriate Location<br>• Antisocial Behaviour and Security<br>• Lack of Consultation and Transparency<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Some loss of parking.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Consultation undertaken appropriate for a project of this size/nature.<br>• Bays being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Kingsbury Road 1 - South Side | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Kingsbury Road 2 - North Side | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received from residents for this location<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Beverley Drive | 44 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | • No specific issues raised by residents.<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Queensbury Station Parade | 29 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | • Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Inappropriate Location<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Airco Close | 53 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns | • Negligible loss of parking. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Edgeware Road | 52 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Kingsbury Road | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Limesdale Gardens | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Westmorland Road | 196 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Kinloch Drive | 16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | • Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns | • Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kenton Road | 54 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | • Safety Concerns<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with pedestrians due to footway location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Footway considered wide enough in this location to safely accommodate a cycle hire bay. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Aboyne Road | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Buck Lane | 28 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | • Traffic Safety and Road Suitability<br>• Loss of Parking<br>• Antisocial Behaviour | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Upton Gardens | 23 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | • Traffic Congestion and Road Narrowing<br>• Loss of Parking Space<br>• Litter, Clutter, and Safety Risk<br>• MPS concerns over potential conflict with other road users due to location. | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Bay management and monitoring regime to be put in place. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Church Lane | 75 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | • Loss of Parking Space<br>• Road Safety<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Some loss of parking<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Mount Drive | 40 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Safety & Traffic Issues<br>• Antisocial Behaviour & Crime<br>• Community Character<br>• Consultation & Communication Issues | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Consultation undertaken appropriate for a project of this size/nature. | |
| Winslow Close | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Greenhill Way | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Mayfields | 29 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | • No specific comments provided | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Capitol Way | 89 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | • Accessibility and Parking Availability<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Glenwood Grove | 23 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | • Antisocial Behaviour<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Consider Alternative Locations | • Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| Barnhill Road | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Old Church Lane | 29 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | • Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • Antisocial/Criminal Behaviour<br>• Heritage and Conservation Area Impact<br>• Consideration of Alternative Location | • Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. However, following further review, concerns around the suitability of this location have been raised by officers and alternative sites are currently being explored. | benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Wellspring Crescent | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | • No response received for this location | N/A | Progress to implementation |
| Brampton Grove | 14 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | • Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Consideration of Alternative Locations | • Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes.<br>• Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |
| North Way | 12 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | • Loss of Parking<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Abandoned Bikes on Footway<br>• Wider concerns raised by Cllrs following local Ward meeting | • Some loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Geofencing of bays will prevent badly parked/abandoned bikes. | Nature and level of concerns outweigh benefits - review site and reconsult |
| Robin Grove | 14 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | • Loss of Parking Space<br>• Accessibility and Safety Concerns<br>• Antisocial Behaviour<br>• Consideration of Alternative Location | • Negligible loss of parking.<br>• Design Risk Assessment and Road Safety Audit did not raise any significant issues.<br>• Bay location not expected to lead to increase in antisocial behaviour. Lime also working to prevent misuse of bikes. | Benefits outweigh concerns - progress to implementation |

| Location | Letters Sent | Responses Received | Yes | No | No Opinion | Key Issues Raised | Officer View | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | • Operator data suggests a demand for hire bike parking in this location. Bays also being proposed at several nearby locations to meet user demand. | |
| Harp Island Close | 43 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | • No specific comments provided | N/A | Progress to implementation |

3.3 Appendix D considers responses in detail and provides officers responses to the concerns raised.

3.4 Officers have taken all the comments into consideration and are recommending implementing dockless bike parking bays at 50 locations (highlighted in green in Table 3) and reviewing/reconsulting on the siting of parking bays at 11 locations (highlighted in red in Table 3).

## 4.0 EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 A very small number of respondents completed the equality monitoring questions. As such, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions as to how representative of Brent's population the consultation was.

4.2 A high-level equality analysis of the proposals has been undertaken. This suggests that the proposals will have a positive impact on the following protected groups:

- Age
- Disability
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Sex

No groups are likely to be adversely affected by the proposals.

*Table 4: Equality Analysis*

| Protected Characteristic | Positive | Neutral | Negative | Comments | Mitigation if required |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | X | | | Dedicated cycle parking provision will result in a reduction in street clutter and improvements to the wider public realm which will be beneficial to older people. | N/A |
| **Disability** | X | | | Dedicated cycle parking provision will result in a reduction in street clutter and improvements to the wider public realm which will be beneficial to those with certain disabilities. | N/A |
| **Gender reassignment** | | X | | No reason to believe this group will be disproportionally affected. | N/A |
| **Marriage and civil partnership** | | X | | No reason to believe this group will be disproportionally affected. | N/A |
| **Pregnancy and maternity** | X | | | Improving physical access to the public realm is expected to have a positive impact for this group as it will improve accessibility and create more welcoming places. | N/A |
| **Race** | | X | | No reason to believe this group will be disproportionally affected. | N/A |
| **Religion or belief** | | X | | No reason to believe this group will be disproportionally affected. | N/A |
| **Sex** | X | | | The provision of safe, accessible, cycling infrastructure will benefit all groups, but particularly women. | N/A |
| **Sexual orientation** | | X | | No reason to believe this group will be disproportionally affected. | N/A |

## 5.0 POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 In line with the Brent Long-Term Transport Strategy and Active Travel Implementation Plan, the Council is actively working to improve cycling facilities to encourage people to take up travel by active and sustainable modes. The overarching aim is to create conditions where cycling becomes a viable choice for more people in Brent. By promoting cycling, the Council aims to enhance public health, reduce traffic congestion, and improve air quality throughout the borough.

5.2 Micromobility provides an important and growing transport option in London allowing people to travel more sustainably through easy access to shared e-bikes and e-scooters. Between 2019 and 2024, around 2 million trips were made using Lime's e-bike service in Brent and there is significant potential to increase this further with two thirds of car trips in the borough that could be made by bike in 20 minutes or less.

## 6.0 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 It is proposed to replace a mix of on-street permit and pay and display parking with dockless bike parking bays in the following locations which could result in a small loss of parking revenue for the Council:

| Location | Parking Changes |
|---|---|
| Harrow Road - For S&HR Station | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Uxendon Crescent | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Chalkhill Road | Loss of one dual use permit/pay and display parking space |
| Station Approach 3 | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Beresford Avenue | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Heather Park Drive | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Lancelot Crescent | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Stanley Avenue | Loss of one dual use permit/pay and display parking space |
| London Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| St John's Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Preston Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Airco Close | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Edgeware Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Kingsbury Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Limesdale Gardens | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Westmorland Road | Loss of one pay and display parking space |
| Mount Drive | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Winslow Close | Loss of one dual use permit/pay and display parking space |
| Greenhill Way | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Glenwood Grove | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Barnhill Road | Loss of one permit parking space |
| Harp Island Close | Loss of one permit parking space |

6.2 The costs of implementing the dockless cycle parking bay programme will be met by Lime, with some funding also provided by TfL. The Council secured c.£120,000 through TfL's Micromobility Parking Programme in 2024/25 and has been allocated an additional c.£94,000 for 2025/26.

6.3 The cost of implementing all Phases 4 and 5 cycle parking bays and associated infrastructure is estimated at c.£100,000 Installation works are to be undertaken by the Council's term contractors.

## 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 That the Head of Healthy Streets and Parking gives approval to:

(i) Progress with the installation of dockless cycle parking bays at the following 50 locations:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ealing Road 1 | Oakington Avenue | Kingsbury Road 2 - North Side | Winslow Close |
| Harrow Road | Heather Park Drive | Beverley Drive | Greenhill Way |
| Windermere Avenue | Carlyon Road | Queensbury Station Parade | Mayfields |
| Ealing Road 2 - Jct with Chaplin Road | St John's Road | Airco Close | Capitol Way |
| Ealing Road 3 - Jct with Mount Pleasant | Park Chase | Edgeware Road | Glenwood Grove |
| Pellatt Road | Sudbury Court Road | Kingsbury Road | Barnhill Road |
| Manor Farm Road | The Link | Limesdale Gardens | Wellspring Crescent |
| Uxendon Crescent | Old North Circular Road | Westmorland Road | Brampton Grove |
| Chalkhill Road | London Road | Kinloch Drive | Robin Grove |
| Station Approach 3 | Hirst Crescent | Kenton Road | Harp Island Close |
| Carlton Avenue West | Preston Road | Aboyne Road | |
| Rushout Avenue | Northwick Avenue | Buck Lane | |
| Beresford Avenue | Kingsbury Road 1 - South Side | Upton Gardens | |

(ii) That locations where concerns have been or are raised will be subject to monitoring and review, to address any emerging issues.

(iii) Review/re-consult on the siting of parking bays at the following 11 locations:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Burns Road | Forty Avenue | Church Lane | North Way |
| Lancelot Crescent | East Lane | Mount Drive | Tring Avenue |
| Stanley Avenue | Churchill Avenue | Old Church Lane | |

**AGREED** / ~~**REJECTED**~~

Signed:

Date: 3 September 2025

**Sandor Fazekas**
**Head of Healthy Streets and Parking**

## APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Map of Proposed Dockless Bike Parking Locations – Phase 4 & 5
Appendix B: Design Risk Assessment – Dockless Bike Parking Bays
Appendix C: Consultation Letter Example
Appendix D: Summary of Consultation Responses – Phases 4 & 5