

Central London Freight Quality Partnership



Kerbside Discussion Meeting Minutes City of London Corporation

Date/Time: 6th April 2022 10.00 to 12.00

Venue: Guildhall North Wing & Teams

Present at meeting

David Kaner	West End Partnership (Chair)
John Crosk	CLFQP Manager
Jolyon Drury	CILT
Bruce McVean	Corporation of City of London
Mick Dearle	Martin Brower
James Adcroft	Tesco
Jerry Ward	John Lewis Partnership
Jo Breare	New Covent Garden
Eleanor Marshall	Cross River Partnership
Oliver Parsons-Baker	Deloitte
Ellie Hill	Lorry Route
Richard Stone	Scala
Isaac Taylor	Corporation of City of London

Present on online meeting

Huw Brennon	Westminster City Council
Julian Allen	University of Westminster (UoW)
Linda White	RHA
Tom Cornwall	RHA
Andy Neather	TfL
Kathrine Howatson	TfL
Alasdair Forrest	DfT
Jason Smallwood	WSP

Apologies

Jacqueline Saunders	Camden Council
Sam Margolis	Camden Council
Antoneta Horbury	RBKC
Natalie Chapman	Logistics UK
Emily Shovlar	Ealing Council
Chris Sturman	Food Hub Developments
Matt Cobham	Deloitte
Amanda Zambon	DHL

Item 1: Welcome, introduction and apologies

David Kaner welcomed everyone, introductions were made, housekeeping info and the group was reminded of competition law agreement.

Item 2: Background to meeting

David Kaner gave a summary of the CLFQP discussions from 02/11/21 & 22/02/22, and noted that essentially there are many uses of the kerbside, and we need to find a way from the freight industry's point of view of balancing demand and capacity of the kerbside and to have a focused discussion for those people who are interested, David noted that there were a lot of people who turned up, which indicated that there is great interest in this topic.

Item 3: Issue for Freight Industry of Kerbside Access

Summary of discussion points:

- Available space or lack of space means operators often reduce the size of vehicle used, which in turn creates the need for additional vehicles to be used, hence more vehicle movements which does nothing to reduce emissions.
- Operators are competing with street furniture such as planters, pavements have been extended, which makes the street easier on the eye but harder to service.
- Operators believe that there is no, or little thought given to how businesses get serviced.
- Dwell times and congestion have increased significantly with the result being a drop in productivity for some operators, 20% in some cases which requires more vehicles to deliver the same volumes.
- Cycle lanes can add up to 50% to the delivery time when operators need to cross them to make deliveries.
- The impacts are that some adopted road schemes create more vehicles movements, congestion, increased emissions. Some operators are forced to abandon trying to make their deliveries due to health and safety concerns, effectively taking goods for a ride when the delivery has failed, considerably adding to and in some cases doubling operating costs likely to adversely reflect on the “cost of doing business in London”.
- Smaller transport operators cannot afford to service London both in the cost of vehicle type compliance and as a result of cumulative effects of reduced journey cycles because of kerbside congestion and drivers’ hours and handling constraints,
- Although operators understand the need for boroughs to adopt Active Travel schemes, these can result in operators employing more vehicles which drives up their costs, which in turn makes London an unattractive proposition when considering taking on additional work.

- The point was made that operators are serving communities and reacting to their requirements, this could be home delivery for food or parcels etc.
- Concerns were raised around the availability of kerbside space that makes vehicles drive around until a space becomes available, double parking is common as is enforcement for illegal parking.
- Lost productivity in London post Covid for some industries was confirmed to be around 20% and is driving the need for additional vehicles, however this is not applied to all freight operations.
- It was suggested that everyone at the meeting at the same ultimate goal, which was to reduce vehicle movements regardless of them being from a borough or freight background, operators want to reduce the cost of doing business in London as well as reducing emissions.
- The higher costs of servicing London are in most cases being passed on to Londoners.
- PCNs are a factor for operators who are at the kerbside for longer periods and increase the cost of operating in London.
- Inventive methods of delivery are being adopted which gives concerns to health & safety, tramping pallets of goods that could weigh up to a tonne 300 meters to its destination has become more common.
- Double parking in some areas is an issue, especially where there is a concentration of eateries, Old Compton St was used as an example.
- Loading bays are being used for all manner of things other than their intended use, mainly parking, private hire vehicles often use the loading bays on the Red Route which in turn causes some operators to park illegally to make their deliveries.
- And vehicles using the loading bays are expected to off load inside 20mins, which is impracticable when unloading an Artic full of food for example.
- Journey time reliability in London is poor and has a knock-on effect when using timed loading bays, often poor availability can impact the operator's ability to complete their planned deliveries, example given was due to delays encountered 2nd turn deliveries are often delayed or abandoned.
- The example of one operator retiming deliveries was given whereby undertaking a review of operations and retiming their deliveries they were able to reduce vehicle movements by 18 vehicles by adopting night-time deliveries, some of these gains were lost mainly due to noise complaints.
- Out of hours deliveries can be problematic, no one wants to cause residents issues, but some types of delivery are noisy.
- Attracting drivers is becoming an issue, the stresses of delivering in London are increasing, often drivers leave their role to find something easier. Hence the turnover of drivers is increasing and attracting drivers to a business that is becoming more difficult by the day is not an easy task.
- Boroughs have issues with balancing the needs of businesses, residents, visitors, and delivery needs, it is thought that there are around 42 different uses for the kerbside.

- Westminster have over 247k residents and around 55k individual businesses all with differing needs and attract all type of servicing vehicles 7days a week 24/7. 1.1 million people step into the borough, which is only 8.3 miles square, hence balancing economic, residential and business activity is an immense task.
- The point was made that for Westminster the single and double lines with 20 & 40 mins stay can often satisfy most delivery needs that freight operators are concerned about but noted that these yellow lines sometimes get lost to other schemes, and this is something Westminster are keen to preserve.
- Westminster is to carry out two projects involving video surveys of 140 or so loading bays, further information will be given in the near future.
- Other issues discussed included the rise in hospitality alfresco dining areas, these make it difficult in terms of access and often reduce the time operators have to access an area, often the tables and chairs start to appear on street around 10:00 and at that point deliveries can no longer take place.
- Urban freight studies show that 80 to 90% of all deliveries and collections take place at the kerbside, and that drivers find it difficult finding space to stop, with the effect of operators employing more vehicles, increased emissions and increased risk to the public where goods are moved greater distances.
Street furniture was found to be an issue for drivers, bollards, pocket parks etc all take up space and reduce the kerbside which makes it more difficult for operators to unload
Lack of space has the effect of generating more parking contraventions and is often compounded by the fact that other vehicle types have illegally used space reserved for goods vehicles.
It has become more stressful for drivers, and we now see drivers leaving the industry to peruse other careers, hence their knowledge is lost and has to be learnt by new drivers coming into the industry.
There is also huge growth in on-line shopping, which is having a massive impact on trip generation, areas where the biggest growth is seen is in the delivery of foods and groceries
- There are innovations in the commercial sector that operators need help to expand, things like micro distribution where there is a lack of property, and EV availability is still an issue.
- Concern was also raised around the placement of rental bike bays, rental scooters and the potential issue of electric charging points which all reduce access to the kerbside further.
- It was noted that pressure from the rise in on-line deliveries was impacting kerbside access with more and more vans competing for space, this is thought to continue to grow in areas such as food home deliveries and parcels.
- The biggest impact for deliveries that are off the high street was around access issues, one day operators can deliver the next access is restricted, things like LTNs. We then get a financial penalty in the form of a PCN for servicing the community who have requested a delivery, this approach that we are there without good reason is unreasonable , there needs to be some recognition that we are there to serve one of

the community not because we are using the street as access or as a short cut.

- LTNs are thought to cause some issues with congestion where traffic is being forced to use the major road network with a knock-on effect to vehicles being able to stop without causing more congestion.
- A question was raised around if data was available to identify the growth in the growth in LGVs, is it a direct result of on-line shopping, or is it service vehicles? this data is not currently available.
- The cost of delivering in London was raised and an example from the brewery logistics sector was shared where it costs £150 per tonne of beer to deliver inside the M25, as apposed to £74 per tonne in the rest of the country, some cities such as Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool are closing in on the London figure. Commercial decisions around the tendering and servicing of London customers have now become part of the conversation.

The smaller freight operators are also struggling to meet the costs of delivering to the capital, they cant replace their vehicles with DVS compliant vehicles, and cant tender for work if they don't own a 3 star DVS vehicle, they are also concerned with the risks of moving goods greater distances on the kerbside, and we are now hearing more and more that the small operators wont take contracts if it involves delivering in London.

It was thought that the accumulation of the various schemes such as London Lorry Control Scheme, DVS, Congestion Charge, ULEZ, LTNs etc that is discouraging some operators from wanting to provide services into the capital.

Item 4: Possible Approaches to balancing demand and supply of kerbside

Summary of discussion points:

- The area-based delivery and servicing planning was discussed, and what we want the kerbside to look like in terms of supply and demand, there was acknowledgement that we need to look at reducing delivery movements without reducing the amount of goods being delivered. And how do we decide how much demand there is and how much capacity at the kerbside we need and where is the optimal location for the delivery bay and then how we share the use of the bay.
- Retiming deliveries was discussed and can play a part in reducing vehicle movements and understanding the needs of residents was thought to be vital, however residents should have an expectation that deliveries being made at 07:00 is not unreasonable and that debate needs to be had.
- Retiming some deliveries to overnight should be pursued as this would take pressure off kerbside activity, this would require boroughs and

operators to work together to identify types of deliveries that could be considered.

Vehicles and equipment are much quieter now, cages have rubber tyres, fridges some are electric, tail lifts are also less of a problem. technology improvements should be part of the conversation for consideration.

Operators are willing to invest further to investigate ways to make it quieter to allow retiming, but Councils must help with this.

- Street based DSPs should be considered when designing and planning street space and understanding the requirements by business and delivery type should be the norm at the outset, understanding what a street needs in terms of how many, what type, what time of delivery etc would be a major step forward in understanding how a DSP should work.
- When public realm schemes are being considered we don't think about trucks and servicing, example of a dual use loading bay where EVs could be charged whilst delivering was put to some councils but there was no interest, more interest was around placing planters and making the street look good than thinking about servicing solutions.
- Street management and street design that is currently being undertaken does not seem to take into consideration freight at all, the DfT and other guidance to planners and street designers hardly mentions servicing, the main focus is on active travel and freight is not being built into the plans. Delivery and servicing need to be part of the kerbside management plans from the very outset and seen as a function sitting alongside all other uses of the kerb.
- In other parts of the world, especially in America designers are thinking about the different land use in the city and the kerb requirements in those land uses and then prioritise by the functions required in a particular location.
Typically, in the UK no authority has that level of understanding.
- The point was made that current solutions being considered were based around consolidation centres, cargo bikes and retiming, which all have a role to play. Although consolidation is already practiced for major retail operations the idea of urban re-consolidation centres that are often being promoted as the only viable solution have not demonstrated promised last mile improvements, retiming has been talked about for 30 years and we have not made progress with its delivery.
- It was thought that a much more detailed understanding of what happens at the kerbside is required, so in order to facilitate any change, and that local authorities have to have a much better understanding of what is going on with that kerbside space in London, currently no local authorities have the level of understanding that's necessary and to capture this information to understand how the kerbside is being used by freight at different types of time of day and by different types of users. That knowledge is completely lacking due to the lack of urban freight surveys in recent years, once we have all that knowledge then it could be possible to define a strategy where we can

think about all those different potentials and needs at the kerbside and the priorities.

- One option considered was to pick a very small area in London or a street where a local authority are interested in understanding what's currently going on there in terms of freight, understanding how the space is being used by all functions and then thinking about all of the potential requirements at the kerbside and how to better make use of the kerbside space.
- The point was made that the new kerbside uses are here to stay and that there will only become less space available due to active travel and LTNs plans. There was an understanding that there is a need for improved strategies and that smart city technology, things like virtual loading bays need to be explored further, because the space is not coming back. It was commented that booking a bay in advance could be problematic due to journey time reliability being so poor.
- The use of bookable and virtual loading bays was discussed as one option for having greater control over loading bay activity, and in terms of virtual loading bays being trialed for distance critical activities to see if they could be an option.
- It was determined that some trials of bookable bays have been trialed in Dublin and Newcastle using technology provided by Grid Smarter Cities, there is some data available.
- Paris make the loading bays sized to the type of vehicle, but not to a timed slot. Paris also makes available some zones especially in the clothing area and are used by the larger vehicles, data relating to this is available.
- Retiming deliveries in mixed residential areas could be a problem between 18:30 – 08:30 where the lines provide parking for residents. Using EVs when they become more widely available could help, idling vehicles outside bedroom windows will always cause an issue and complaint.

Alfresco dining was brought in to help businesses that were hit by the pandemic and helped them become more attractive to the public, loading bays stretched out along the kerbside would not be so attractive.

A question was asked if the New London Architecture group ever discuss the kerbside and its use when they meet. Transport infrastructure, kerbside and competition for space is discussed where freight and servicing are defined as essential traffic because there cannot be a city without freight. The discussions help the next Mayor understand the asks; however, a lot of the discussions are around logistics space and logistics land rather than the management of logistics given the role of the NLA

- The City of London informed the meeting that they are currently looking at raised the issue around service vans which take up a lot of kerbside space, its early stages but COL are looking at applying some of the things that they would normally look at when dealing with freight and applying them the service vans, things like consolidation, retiming and remodelling should be applied to them to free up space so they can use

the space for things like parklets etc where they are not competing with unloading/loading

- The City of London are looking at area-based traffic management and planning and suggested that the area of Fleet St/Temple could be a trial area given that it has a lot of businesses and kerbside activity. It also has some big new developments as well as a host of businesses that require kerbside management. The new developments will incorporate some consolidation within the building.

Fleet St is a particular challenge, every business is a priority, it is a bus route, a cycling corridor and needs wider pavements, its got lots of unloading/loading and the mayor route into the city. The city is interested in exploring area-based consolidation in other parts of the city and understand that this might need some subsidy but believe there are some opportunities.

For any trial getting money is difficult and surveys are expensive, but you can get money for projects, so there are some opportunities to get some trial projects and then prove their value and make the case for securing funding to get a really good understanding of how this works in central London.

Its also right that we look at freight and servicing from a central point perspective to ensure we take advantage of things like the last mile deliveries, even if they can't provide everything, COL can't provide all the hubs required but central London can, and this is a role for the GLA and TfL to come up with a central London plan for freight and servicing.

- There was a comment on road user charging, one it will make it cheaper to deliver at night by making it more expensive to deliver during the day, and the other thing it will do is focus on reducing the number of vehicles in congested areas at peak times, and also make freight consolidation look better.
- COL are looking at Tech that would allow identification of legitimate uses of LTNs, example of a disabled person in a car or taxi that can reduce their travel time by using the LTN, if the tech were available perhaps it could be used for a home delivery for instance, this should be investigated. Noted that one home delivery vehicle removes four vehicles from the road that would have driven to the supermarket. It was noted that some of the Tech is already available via various platforms and comes to a smartphone.
- The meeting was informed that CRP commissioned guidance a report on Highway and Footway Accessibility, the group were urged to read the report.

Climate resilience is very important when looking to the future, example floods in 5 to 15 years could make delivering to flooded street impossible so it's important to understanding of all the different uses.

- Continuing with Tech, virtual loading bays could be an answer to critical distance deliveries like brewery logistics, because they are required to park adjacent to the delivery point and don't make use of loading bays and often park on restricted and are at times in conflict with parking regs, being able to book a virtual loading bay could be the answer to their problem and are keen to trial the technology to test if it could work.

- Retiming where a delivery company makes noise over a period of a month as an example that is unacceptable to a resident, the good companies will take action but other won't, and then the council can't stop them when it's been allowed, and it needs a council officer to witness the incident, so until the councils have the power to stop the delivery residents will continue to push back against night time deliveries.

There are plenty of deliveries that are made at 03:00 in the morning and nobody notices because they are in boxes, no cages are used etc. If a council could revoke the licence of a company that causes nuisance, then perhaps residents will believe it could work.

The blue-chip companies attending this meeting will be able to control their delivery drivers if they received complaints from residents, however that cannot be said for the white vans where there will be no control.

- The virtual loading bays, it would be difficult to enforce, say if a company pays £50 for an hour's slot and then a white van parks in the bay, councils will find it difficult without camera enforcement, and the reality is councils would not be able to enforce the bays.
- Area based DSPs, a question was raised as to what is stopping this from happening? the issue is data, we do not know what the real demand is.

You can't ask businesses on street because they don't know how their deliveries get to them and won't be able to tell you, TfL did some work on this and when they asked businesses about their deliveries the figures, they were given were 50% below the actual amount when TfL checked it against information collected via a camera survey.

Getting the data is really difficult, also the data collected today is going to be different to what's going to happen in say 2 years' time, and with class E change where any shop can become a restaurant/food outlet where we know this type of business attracts more vehicles than retail, hence we only know what's happening at a given time, but not what is going to happen in the future, say 2/3 years' time.

Because of this you cannot plan your kerbside design on the basis that it will change every 2/3 years, it's fixed, and then outlets change from retail to food that will drive up deliveries.

It's not about how much kerbside is available, it's also about how many deliveries you need, and how do you reduce that number.

No freight operator puts more vehicles on the road than they need, it's customer demand that drives the requirement of vehicles.

The way to move this forward is to find an area, look at what is happening currently on the street and what is going to happen in the future, and then look at the space we need and then how we design it to meet the needs of the street.

And although this has been talked about a lot nobody has sat down and done it, we need to see if we can make it work and to see if we can balance the needs of the kerbside.

COLs idea about using Fleet St/Temple to look at these issues could address some of these issues.

- What gets started in London migrates to other cities hence it would be a really good topic for DfT funding, to pick an area thorough this group and provide funding and then trust us to get it right.
There have been some trials previously, but they fell short on the size and shape of the zone examined.
And unless we really do analyse the video input you will be able to see the branded vehicles but not the white vans, who will be doing a lot of work especially in the food and parcel sector, and the depth of the analysis takes money and time.
- In terms of understanding what is happening at the kerbside the methodology already exists for doing that and has been there for a good while,
TfL commissioned and conducted four high st surveys, Atkins put together a methodology that involved auditing the kerbside space and how it was currently used, and the restrictions and timings associated with it, and then they monitored all the activity that took place at the kerbside, they interviewed drivers and shopkeepers, hence the methodologies are there.
So, we know how to do it, we know it is expensive and it is a question about picking an area, start with a survey and we need to define the area so we can move on with a trial.

Item 5: Does it make sense to test the approach, and where?

- We know that there are a lot of solutions being worked on by people to reduce the number of deliveries, road user charges will help with this.
So, we should focus on what we do at the kerbside, and one solution is to pick an area, identify the cost, find the funding and then get on and do it.
City of London have offered Fleet St and Temple and Westminster City Council are willing to tag on to the trial, if we can do area-based work in that area and then have the discussion to ensure that it all makes sense, along with the definition of the area that would be a start.
City of London will provide details of the Fleet St and Temple area to check if can define an area that makes sense to check for possibilities.
- We need to have another look at the retiming issues with EVs, quieter vehicle and silent delivery techniques to see what is possible.
We will also need to look at what happens when there is a problem and how we monitor it and react.
It is worth exploring as this is an area where the kerbside is used less, even in the West End, therefore it provides more options.
EVs, silent delivery techniques and the guidance from TfL can be used, but we will still need a mechanism so that if there are issues it can be stopped, not after six months or via a court case but immediately.

- The subject of kerbside hierarchy was discussed in terms of what is considered more critical to the street, who sits where in the 42 users, how could this be used when discussing kerbside strategy.
Is it more important to have a loading bay or a dock less bike bay, which is more critical for the use of the street? perhaps this is one for the DfT
Southwark Council have a kerbside user hierarchy, is there a need for all boroughs to have a similar approach?
In America cities are more advanced in terms hierarchy and kerbside management and are now also building freight into the kerbside considerations.
- It was asked if the group could share best practice, Paris comes up a lot particularly when discussing freight movements, but if there are other places that are doing something that could be explored that would be beneficial in terms of adopting best practice, Barcelona with their Super Blocks was given as examples, as was Holland.
It was suggested that the NLA could get involved with looking at best practice in terms of design and DSPs
- Westminster City Council are open to discuss retiming and the possibility of a trial, EVs could be a game changer and the catalyst for some form of roll out.
- Loading bays where they have 20/40mins unloading time, perhaps we can look at a more pragmatic approach, which can reduce vehicle movements by allowing the larger vehicles more time to unload, evidence of unloading/loading would need to be visible at all times, but this area should be explored.

Suggested Actions

- Look for data on servicing vs deliveries in terms of kerbside demand for LGV's
- Look at possibility of re-energising retiming using EV's and quiet/silent delivery techniques
- Research on Best Practice from International Cities (NY, Paris, Barcelona were mentioned)
- Discuss with NLA their involvement/interest in this area
- Look at using Fleet Street/Temple Area as an area DSP Trial
- Review CRP Report on Highway and Footway Accessibility
- Review possibility of harmonising/revising loading bay timings

Item 6: Any Other Business

- Julian Allen mentioned the risk of electric vehicle charging points being positioned kerbside, it is worth having it in our minds when planning where to place them to avoid creating another issue at the kerbside.
- John Crosk mentioned, testing the technology that out there, he would be keen to trial virtual loading bays to see if the technology works and the potential benefit to distance critical operations like brewery logistics, and he would be happy if one of the boroughs wanted him to run a trial to supply some suitable sites to consider

Item 7: Date of next meeting

Next meeting: TBC