

Central London Freight Quality Partnership



CLFQP discussion on the LLCS Review. Meeting notes

Date/Time: 18th February 2020 09.45 to 11:15

Venue: Meeting Meeting: Room L195
University of Westminster
35 Marylebone Road
London
NW1 5LS

Notes of meeting held on 18th February 2020

Present

Mike Browne	CLFQP/ University of Gothenburg (Chair)
Dennis Lynch	CLFQP
Jacqueline Saunders	London Borough Camden
Jolyon Drury	CILT
Julian Allen	University of Westminster (UoW)
Tom Linton-Smith	Cross River Partnership
Sarah King	Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)
Antoneta Horbury	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Chris Eales	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Carl Quilliam	DHL
Keith Coomber	Martin Brower
Freddie Talberg	EMSOL
Jerry Ward	JLP
John Crosk	BLG
Malcolm Smith	L B Hackney
Tom Parker	City of London
Matthew Bennett	West End Partnership Board
Denise Beedell	FTA
Andy Wilson	TNT
Linda White	RHA
David Kaner	West End Partnership
Andrew Luck	London Coucils
Chris Gwyn	Hermes Parcelnet

Item 1

Mike Browne welcomed everyone and introductions were made.

Item 2

Mike Browne outlined the reason for this LLCS discussion, confirming the importance of the scheme and the ongoing interest CLFQP members had in the final outcome and recommendations of the review.

Mike Browne thanked Andrew Luck for his attendance.

Item 3

Andrew Luck gave a brief outline and progress to date of the LLCS review confirming:

- 1 There were changes to the paper issued on the 15th October 2019 and update would be issued shortly.
- 2 This was the first review of the scheme
- 3 There was no recommendation to scrap the scheme
- 4 Awareness that the scheme was not always popular
- 5 The "Project Centre" are now appointed as Project Managers
- 6 There are reasons for the perceived time it has taken to complete the work.
- 7 They were still considering, ERN, hours of the scheme and method of control/enforcement
- 8 No changes to the weight limit (18tons)
- 9 Report (Final) expected early next year

Item 4

A general discussion took place covering the following main issues:

- a. The ERN route needs to be carefully considered both in size and road allocation.
- b. Unloading/delivery noise was considered far more important than vehicle driving noise.
- c. Better sharing of data both in the review planning and during the operation of the revised scheme.
- d. Trials should set to evaluate the planned changes
- e. Enforcement methods should be reviewed which should consider a better and more modern tracking system.
- f. Operational time window for the scheme needs to be changed, as London is a 24hr/7 days a week City. Making better use of the "shoulder" time is essential.
- g. The scheme should not reduce larger vehicles by replacing them with many smaller vehicles.
- h. Ensure the scheme is easy for logistics/operators/drivers to understand.
- i. A slicker scheme is needed in the back office support.
- j. Each Borough has differing needs and requirements.
- k. Current scheme can produce detours up to 20miles+
- l. The data used to recommend changes in the review should be shared, therefore making any changes (or lack of changes) more transparent.

- m. This revised scheme needs to be “fit for propose” covering an extended life which must embrace the likely changes in Logistics and vehicles.
- n. Consider ways to avoid the costly operation of providing “Signs” with the new scheme.

Item 5

Mike Browne summarized the discussions and suggested that in addition to the points noted in Item 5 above the following “Actions” should be addressed:

- 1) Some boroughs may have specific reasons why they find the LLCS does not provide benefits. Where this issue exists then there should be a process for the borough to raise this with London Councils (having involved the necessary neighbouring boroughs) with the aim of finding variations to the LLCS that meet their needs in terms of the time and route allowed for vehicles that make deliveries or collections in the borough. London Councils were asked to develop such a process together with input from boroughs.
- 2) Industry representatives raised the question of journeys made by their members that involved lengthy detours as a result of the LLCS rules. It was agreed that this information should be collected in order to understand the scale of the problem and that if it was agreed that there were problems then these routes should be examined by London Councils, boroughs, industry and the associations representing industry in order to identify potential solutions.
- 3) The moving vehicle question needs to be considered in combination with the point of delivery in terms of noise and disturbance. London Councils were asked to consider how this could be addressed by gathering views from boroughs, industry and the associations representing industry.
- 4) Actions by all concerned with the LLCS to share data should be a priority. At present some of the information remains at an anecdotal level. There needs to be a clear way in which data of problems and the potential solutions can be shared between all those involved in the scheme. This would also help with the question of limited resources available for both the public and private sectors when considering the LLCS.