

On-street micromobility rental framework

Introduction

Thank you for responding our survey on the regulating of on-street micromobility (OSM) schemes.

Closing date is 28 January 2025.

Print or save a copy of your response

At the end of this questionnaire, you have the chance to either print or save a copy of your response for your records. This option appears after you press 'Submit your response'.

Save and continue option

You have an option to 'save and continue' your response at any time. If you do that you will be sent a link via email to allow you to continue your response where you left off.

It's very important that you enter your correct email address if you choose to save and continue. If you make a mistake in the email address you won't receive the link you need to complete your response.

Accessibility statement

Read our [accessibility statement for SmartSurvey forms \[opens in a new window\]](#).

Confidentiality and data protection

The Department for Transport (DfT) is carrying out this survey to seek views on the regulation of on-street micromobility (OSM) schemes.

View our [DfT online form and survey privacy notice \[opens in a new window\]](#) for more information on how your personal data is processed in relation to this survey.

Table of Contents

Personal details	3
Organisation details	4
Proposals	5
Micromobility	8
The opportunity for on-street micromobility.....	10
The risks of on-street micromobility schemes.....	11
Licensing: the preferred approach	12
Bespoke local condition reasoning.....	15
Appeals	16
Managing and allocating parking for OSM schemes.....	17

Personal details

1. What is your name?

Matilda Fisher

2. What is your email?

technical@ciht.org.uk

3. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes

No (Go to 'Proposal')

Organisation details

4. Your organisation's name is?

Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation

5. Your organisation is best described as:

- micromobility scheme operator (Go to 'Micromobility scheme operators')
- a local authority
- a representative organisation for disabled people (Go to 'Proposals')
- another type of organisation: (Go to 'Proposals' after answering)

Membership body representing over 10,000 people who work in the highways and transportation sector

Proposals

We plan to empower elected local leaders regulate On-Street Micromobility (OSM) schemes to maximise their benefits and limit their negative impacts. The proposed scope of the types of schemes to be regulated are those whose vehicles are parked on public land and/or are particularly impacting pedestrians in shared street space. Initially, this regulatory framework would cover shared cycles and e-cycles. It is designed to be expanded to cover other vehicle types and operations in the future as necessary, particularly those which similarly impact upon pedestrian space.

It is our view that there are problems with how these schemes currently operate, including insufficient local influence over schemes, an imbalance of access to information, market uncertainty, and geographic inequity.

In our view, there are potential benefits to shared micromobility, including reducing inactivity, greener transport, and better integrated transport systems. There are also potential disbenefits such as obstructive parking and antisocial behaviour. We are looking to strike a balance in its regulatory approach to allow local areas to maximise these potential benefits and minimise disbenefits, helping this emerging market to flourish in a way which works for whole communities.

The underlying principles for the proposed regulatory intervention to ensure its functionality and effectiveness are: consistency, adaptability, proportionality, enforceability, and accountability. In its assessment of how best to maximise benefits, minimise disbenefits, and align with these principles, we have settled upon licensing for OSM schemes as its preferred option.

The proposed licensing approach would require a licence to operate an OSM scheme, and to operate a scheme without a licence would be a criminal offence. Local authorities would be designated as 'licensing authorities' and be responsible for issuing licences in their area. As part of this proposed approach, the Secretary of State for Transport would set some minimum standard conditions common to all licences to ensure all schemes operate under a baseline level of safety and effectiveness. Licensing authorities could then add their own bespoke conditions to best align OSM schemes with local needs and priorities. An area in which we recognise a particular need to balance differing local interests is in the provision of parking for OSM schemes, especially where responsibilities belong to different tiers of local government. The proposed solution for ensuring adequate parking provision for licensed schemes is a legal duty for local highway authorities to cooperate with licensed schemes and licensing authorities.

We are also interested in views at this point on the necessity of a bespoke appeals process in relation to OSM licensing decisions.

At this stage, we are seeking to consult only on key aspects and broad principles of this overall approach. The finer detail, such as how a licensing framework would operate on a practical level, would be set out in secondary legislation following the provision of powers to do so by parliament in primary legislation. Further

consultation on such details will be carried out before regulations are made to enact this regulatory framework.

Where open text responses are asked, unless stated differently, the response textbox will be limited to 75 words.

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the types of operations we expect to be covered by a new framework is appropriate?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to 'Micromobility')

Operations reasoning

7. Why?

The anti-social behaviour problems associated with micromobility apply mainly to large operators, operating from an on-street environment and do not tend to apply to cycle hire shops, e.g. near off-road cycle paths.

Micromobility

Initially, this framework would cover shared cycles and e-cycles. It is designed to be expanded to cover other vehicle types and operations in the future as necessary, particularly those which similarly impact upon pedestrian space.

Examples of schemes that are not envisaged to fall within the scope of this framework might include a group of residents wishing to share a cycle, a shop that rents out a small fleet of cycles stored on private property, or a business that leases vehicles on a longer-term basis to be used in a similar way to a private vehicle.

There is no intention to include motor vehicle hire in the scope of this policy. There are existing regulations around parking, insurance and fleet maintenance for motor vehicles.

8. What, if any, additional micromobility scheme types do you think should be exempted from in the scope of this policy (limited to 75 words)?

Motability scooters for people with mobility impairments which are often rented in large spaces such as shopping centres. Inclusion of these in the scheme would add to the cost of running the scheme and the users of these schemes have fewer choices than users of other micro mobility schemes regarding where vehicles can be left etc.

9. What, if any, additional micromobility scheme types do you think should be included from in the scope of this policy (limited to 75 words)?

Shared e-scooters should be included within the scope of this policy as they cause similar issues if left at inappropriate places as shared cycles. Due to e-scooters being smaller, can represent a greater trip hazard to visually impaired pedestrians.

10. What, if any, additional micromobility vehicle types do you think should be excluded from in the scope of this policy (limited to 75 words)?

Motability scooters for people with walking impairments which are often rented in large spaces such as shopping centres. Inclusion of these in the scheme would add to the cost of running the scheme and the users of these schemes have fewer choices than users of other micro mobility schemes regarding where vehicles can be left etc.

11. What, if any, additional micromobility vehicle types do you think should be included from in the scope of this policy (limited to 75 words)?

Shared e-scooters should be included within the scope of this policy as they cause similar issues if left at inappropriate places as shared cycles. Due to e-scooters being smaller, can represent a greater trip hazard to visually impaired pedestrians.

The opportunity for on-street micromobility

Shared micromobility is a relatively new transport mode, offering people a quick and convenient way of travelling and we have identified key opportunities of the mode if managed effectively.

We consider that this form of transport can offer three key opportunities:

- 1. Reducing inactivity – shared micromobility allows users to access public transport more conveniently and potentially replace short distance car journeys. These micromobility journeys can be more active than car journeys.*
- 2. Greener transport – micromobility vehicles have zero emissions at the point of use, offering a more environmentally friendly transport option than private cars.*
- 3. Creating an integrated transport system – shared micromobility schemes can make public transport offerings more accessible to users if located to serve less well-connected areas.*

Any regulatory intervention should, where possible, seek to encourage usage that maximises these opportunities.

[The following 2 questions should be answered using one of the following options: 'Strongly agree', 'Agree', 'Neither agree nor disagree', 'Disagree', 'Strongly disagree' and 'Don't know'. For each box, please choose one of these options.]

12. To what extent do you agree or disagree that:

	reduce inactivity	create an integrated transport system	create a greener transport network
shared cycles present an opportunity to:	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
shared e-cycles present an opportunity to:	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
shared e-scooters present an opportunity to:	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree

The risks of on-street micromobility schemes

Safety is the government’s priority. Any proposed regulations must also account for the potential risks from on-street micromobility (OSM) schemes and aim to mitigate them to the greatest extent while promoting the opportunities. We consider that the two main risks are:

1. Obstructive (and potentially dangerous) parking.
2. Anti-social behaviour.

For this question, as with question 12, please choose an option from: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree for each box.

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree that:

	obstructive parking	anti-social use
shared cycles present a risk of:	Agree	Agree
shared e-cycles present a risk of:	Agree	Agree
shared e-scooters present a risk of:	Agree	Agree

We set vehicle standards in distinct separate regulations following a robust process of evidence gathering, vehicle testing, and consultation. The inherent safety aspects of any future vehicles will be considered fully separately from the proposed intervention to manage OSM schemes. Therefore, we are seeking views here on the risks of shared micromobility operations as a model, rather than risks of specific vehicle types.

14. What, if any, other significant risks do you believe are presented by on-street micromobility schemes (limited to 75 words)?

Users of shared micromobility schemes may be infrequent users and less confident/ aware of say cycling in busy traffic. Many schemes do not provide safety equipment, e.g. helmets and hi-vis clothing. Lack of confidence can cause some users to ride on the pavement instead of the road, endangering pedestrians, particularly those who cannot get out of the way due. Some users travel at inappropriate

speeds for the environments they are in and can cause collisions.

Licensing: the preferred approach

Currently, there is no legal requirement to seek permission from local authorities to operate an OSM scheme.

The proposed approach of licensing would provide the legal mechanism needed to ensure local authorities have the power to shape shared micromobility schemes and ensure they work for local people, and also to intervene promptly and decisively to tackle any issues which arise.

Under this approach, the Secretary of State for Transport would set minimum standards to be included in all licences which are largely expected to relate to the objective of ensuring the safe and effective operation of all schemes. These minimum standards would ensure that less experienced and/or smaller licensing authorities can be confident when issuing licences that the schemes will be operating safely and effectively.

Licensing authorities would be able to add further bespoke conditions to allow them the flexibility to ensure shared micromobility schemes work as well as possible for local communities and help them to meet their local transport objectives and priorities. Schemes would need to comply with the conditions set out in their licence or risk having that licence revoked. Operating a scheme without a licence would be a criminal offence.

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree that a licensing framework is an essential part of effectively controlling OSMR schemes?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Per current proposals, the highest tier of devolved local government would grant licences for their jurisdiction. This would be for the purpose of allowing on-street micromobility schemes to be able to operate on a more region-wide basis to create a consistent, integrated transport system which reflects the nature of user journeys. Where one exists, this will be the Strategic Authority (such as Transport for London or Liverpool City Region Authority) and in other cases where there is no Strategic Authority, this might be the city council (for example Leicester City Council).

16. Assuming a licensing framework is implemented, to what extent do you agree or disagree that the 'licensing authority' should sit at the highest level of local government?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Licences would contain a number of minimum standard conditions that would be non-negotiable and common to all licences.

This is designed to ensure minimum acceptable standards of safety and operability are met in all schemes, regardless of the experience or capability of the licensing authority, whilst also providing consistency to operators.

The nature of minimum standards set by the Secretary of State have yet to be decided but could include enforcement measures as well as safety and accountability mechanisms.

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree that it would be beneficial to have minimum standard conditions that would be common to all licences for a given vehicle type (for example e-cycles)?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Licensing authorities would also have the ability to add in bespoke conditions to suit local needs and priorities. For example, the number of vehicles allowed may need to vary across cities and areas of different sizes.

These conditions could include caps on:

- *vehicle fleet size*
- *precise operating area*
- *limiting operations at certain times of day*

18. To what extent do you agree or disagree that licensing authorities should be able to set their own bespoke conditions in addition to minimum requirements set centrally?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

19. To what extent do you agree or disagree that licensing authorities ability to add bespoke local conditions should be limited to specific aspects of shared scheme operation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to 'Appeals')

Bespoke local condition reasoning

20. Why (limited to 75 words)?

Whilst there is a need for some uniformity, each local area is different and so there needs to be some flexibility at the most local level, e.g. in the number of units on-street.

Appeals

We are considering whether a dedicated appeals process is needed for licensing decisions. This would mean some decisions could be appealed without resorting to the courts, which could be more accessible and less costly than court proceedings. This could reduce the burden on the judicial system but could also mean appeals of licensing decisions would be more readily made. More appeals could increase the process burden on licensing authorities.

The detail of how an appeals process could work would be decided at the secondary legislative stage if we decide such a process is necessary. At this stage, we are only seeking views on whether such an appeals process is necessary in principle.

21. To what extent do you agree or disagree that a dedicated appeals process for on-street micromobility schemes is necessary?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Managing and allocating parking for OSM schemes

One area in which we recognise a particular need to balance differing local interests is in the provision of parking for OSM schemes, especially where responsibilities for licensing and managing street space respectively would belong to different tiers of local government.

The proposed solution to ensuring adequate parking provision for licensed schemes is a duty for local highway authorities to cooperate with licensed schemes and licensing authorities to provide adequate parking.

22. To what extent do you agree or disagree that a legal duty on local highway authorities with parking powers, would be sufficient to ensure adequate parking for on-street micromobility schemes?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

For the remaining textual response questions answers will be limited to 150 words.

23. What in your view, if any, are the current barriers to providing adequate parking for on-street micromobility schemes (limited to 150 words)?

There can be regional disparities between authorities who approach such schemes proactively versus those who take a more reactive approach. Financial constraints, consideration needed for the character of the area and lack of space in the streetscape also create barriers. Many residents do not wish to see shared schemes operate outside their property and will oppose any efforts to do so which result in patchy coverage of parking across an area.

24. What, if any, other essential aspects do you think we will need to consider at the primary legislation stage to ensure a licensing framework will function effectively (limited to 150 words)?

Licensing bodies must have due regard to integrating transport modes and prioritise the placement of parking in the vicinity of transport hubs. There must be regulatory control on where micromobility vehicles are parked and used in public places and insurance binding the renter of the micromobility vehicle to have full liability when the vehicle is in use or when parked. Licencing schemes must include the safe maintenance of all vehicles and maintain a balance between local autonomy and central direction. For example, local authorities should be granted some control over OSM operators in relation to the allocation of on carriageway parking space to facilitate schemes. There must be a robust enforcement regime which enables the public, especially those with disabilities who can be badly affected by breaches in licences, to easily report misbehaviour. The process for revoking licences or applying penalties should not be onerous on cash strapped local authorities.