

COUNCIL MEETING - DEPUTATION/PETITION REQUEST FORM

NAME OF DEPUTATION/PETITION LEADER: Ben Pearson	
ADDRESS: Flat Bakersfield, N7	
TEL:	E-MAIL:
Name and contact details of other proposed attendees (maximum of 6 plus deputation leader): Albert (resident of Camden): Darren (resident of Camden): Rose (worker in Camden) Rachel (motorcyclist representative)	
Does any member of the deputation have access requirements? If so, please tell us what they are: NO	
Have you submitted a deputation request to the Council before? If so, please give details: YES.	
Deputation on the topic of anti-motorcycle bias scrutiny committee on 14/12/2023. However, the subject of that deputation.	
Petition on the topic of motorcycle parking char 29/01/2024 while proposals were in draft form a	
Deputation on the topic of the review of the CTS to the meeting of the culture and environment scrutiny committee on 06/02/2024	

Please summarise below the key points you wish to make at the Council meeting (continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

We wish to submit a deputation to the meeting of Cabinet on 28th February about the revised proposed charges for motorcycles. Since this is the decision meeting for this policy, we think it is essential that we are given the opportunity to speak and the views of Camden residents who rely on their motorcycle are able to be heard.

We are aware that we have previously submitted a deputation on this topic, however since then the final details of the policy have been published, and there have been minor changes to the policy.

In response to our previous deputation Cllrs and officers said that consultation responses were being considered and that they hoped riders' concerns would be addressed by the final shape of the proposals. Categorically this has not happened, and therefore their views on this matter should be heard at the decision meeting.

The consultation report underpinning this vote has numerous factual errors relating to motorcycles, and has failed to address or even accurately represent the concerns of many riders. It is clear therefore that Cllrs have not been presented with the full facts of the charges

The Cabinet needs to be well informed as to the impact of their potential votes on this matter, and the context in which the Council has failed to address the serious and fundamental flaws with the proposed policy.

It is very clear that the Council has not yet properly engaged with the issues, and we are aware that several Councillors have even referred to emails from residents and workers concerned about the plans as "spam", clearly showing a deliberate unwillingness to engage with and understand their constituents.

In this deputation we will set out the key concerns of riders, and how the Council has failed to address them. For example;

Motorcyclists in car-free housing will have to pay £950/year to use the parking they currently use for free. The Council's report suggests they get an electric motorcycle to reduce their costs to £485/year and apply for a cost of living support package, clearly recognising that the charges themselves are unaffordable.

Residents with a car and a motorcycle will be forced to sell one, meaning some will end up doing more car journeys. The report does not dispute this fact, saying only that the Council will monitor whether it entrenches car use.

Other resident motorcyclists will pay the same as those with hybrid SUVs, further entrenching car usage in Camden. The report answers that motorcycles can park parallel to the kerb and take up as much space as they want, which runs contrary to the stated aim of reducing kerb space usage, as well as the obvious real world behaviour of riders.

No 'block booking' discounts will be available for solo motorcycle bays, as is the norm in other Boroughs who charge. 'Car-free' housing residents will have to book a new daily parking session every single day before 8am, and commuters will pay 6 times more than Westminster or Islington. Many riders who commute into the Borough including key workers have told us this is far too much. The report does not answer this concern.