## transport planning practice

## New City Court (Ref: 21/AP/1361) <br> Response to Transport Objection

1. This Note provides a response to transport points raised by RPS on behalf of their client - the owners of the Shard Quarter in their objection letter dated 20 September 2021. The comments are re-provided below in italics and a response to each of the points raised provided directly below in blue.
'Whilst the servicing strategy is based on a consolidation approach, this equates to a vehicle entering, unloading/loading, and leaving in 20 minutes, which is very tight and leaves little room for delays. For a central London location, mindful of the highly congested nature of all surrounding roads, it seems very unlikely that however well managed, the strategy will be able to accommodate the predicted demand, even the consolidated demand.'
2. Response: The proposed number of daily deliveries is 38 of which 8 would be by a motorcycle. Therefore, a total of 30 vehicles would be expected to use the service yard per day. As part of the vehicle consolidation strategy, all deliveries will be pre-booked and spread out across the whole day avoiding the morning and evening peak periods and the lunchtime peak. This ensures that there will be no delivery vehicles during time periods when the surrounding roads could be most congested.
3. Taking in account the delivery restrictions, there are 16 hours in which vehicles can deliver. This equates on average to $2-3$ vehicles an hour being present in the service yard with 6 deliveries an hour during a busiest hour.
4. The 20 minute dwell time was discussed with the consolidation team and it was agreed that this would be achievable as all the goods are already logged and sorted and it is expected that the deliveries could arrive in specialised containers which will allow for the speedy unloading of the vehicles and minimal paperwork. Notwithstanding this, there is additional space adjacent to the turntable where a vehicle could wait should a delivery take longer, thus not impacting on the public highway.
5. Therefore, the proposed servicing provision can adequately accommodate the predicted demand and is in line with the methodology adopted in the TAs for nearby developments in the London Bridge area.
'The swept path analysis only shows vehicles turning right in and right out, of the service yard. A similar set of diagrams should be provided for vehicles turning left in and left out (i.e. access from the east, egress to the west), as this is the current situation;
6. Response: The tracking drawings were undertaken on one of the expected future layout of St Thomas Street proposed by TfL at the time of preparing the planning submission. However, the vehicles would also be able to turn left in/left out as shown on attached Drawing 30848/AC/084.

The vehicle swept paths show that the means of vehicular access is very tight, with no margin for error particularly for the larger vehicles. The vehicle swept paths should include at least a 0.5 m buffer / safety zone along their entire lengths;
7. Response: There is sufficient clearance between the vehicles and any structure taking into account low vehicle speeds and the private nature of the service yard.
'RPS understands that LBS use a 10.7 m refuse vehicle and this vehicle should be subject to a vehicle swept path analysis.'
8. Response: The proposed development is a commercial scheme and is therefore not obligated to use LBS's refuse vehicle, rather can select a private contractor to suit their requirements. Incidentally, this has also been the approach adopted by a number of nearby developments.

There are a number of refuse vehicle options with regard to the waste collection and the chosen vehicle represents a reasonable and robust assessment.
'The driver forward visibility to the service yard from St Thomas Street is very limited, and it's unclear what would happen if a vehicle arrived when one was leaving, which mindful of the 20 minute turnaround is very likely, regardless of any advance communication.'
9. Response: As mentioned above, the 20 minute turnaround is the expected maximum dwell time for most deliveries, however, there is in fact much greater flexibility within the service yard as vehicles could also wait on the turntable. With the managed system, the chances of two vehicles meeting at the entrance is low, however, should it happen vehicles can pass one another within the service yard around the turntable area where the service yard is at its widest.
'It is unclear how a LGV can access and egress the site if there is a $10 \mathrm{~m} / 10.2 \mathrm{~m}$ vehicle parked on the turntable. Likewise if cars are parked in the disabled bays;
10. Response: Whilst it is not envisaged that there will be many deliveries by HGV, with the developer striving to undertake the deliveries by LGV, there is adequate space to allow the vans to pass a stationary HGV if required.
'There is a gate shown opening in from King's Head Yard with no stated use.'
11. Response: A gate in this location was shown to facilitate the flexible use of this area. It can be confirmed that the gate will not provide vehicle access from Kings Head Yard.
'There is no stated contingency during turntable maintenance periods.'
12. Response: This will be scheduled during quieter periods when no deliveries are scheduled e.g. weekends or at the end of the peak periods. This would be pre-planned and managed and not an everyday occurrence.
'There is no information with respect to fire tender access in case of an incident occurring within the service yard, or a tender having to gain access to the building through an occupied service yard.'
13. Response: A Fire Statement was prepared for the scheme and submitted with the planning application. The document shows the proposed fire tender access indicating where the fire tender would need to stop (see image below). This shows that access by fire tender is not expected to be required into the service yard.



