

Edinburgh Tram Project Tram Lines 1 and 2

Meeting of the Council

11 December 2003

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 The proposed Edinburgh Tram Project is ranked fourth among the top ten Scottish transport projects as detailed by the Transport Minister in an announcement made on 21 March 2002. The project is a key element of the Councils Integrated Transport Initiative and will radically improve transport in the City.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to address issues which were outstanding when Council considered this matter on 13 November 2003, and also to address those issues which were raised by Council itself at that meeting. The report then seeks approval by the Council for Tram Lines 1 and 2 prior to lodging separate Bills for Tram Lines 1 and 2 to the Scottish Parliament.
- 1.3 If Council chooses to approve lodging the Bills with the Scottish Parliament, this does not commit the Council in any way to actually proceeding to construct a tramway. Neither does it commit the Council financially, other than to continuing development costs that are fully funded through grant from Scottish Executive for tram lines 1 and 2 up to the point of securing parliamentary powers.
- 1.4 To note that a motion to formally approve the lodging of the Bills and supporting documentation for tram lines 1 and 2 will be presented to a special meeting of the Council on 22 December 2003.

2 Summary

- 2.1 A corner stone of the Council's Integrated Transport Initiative is the introduction of a modern integrated tram system. This will complement and build on the existing high quality bus network.
- 2.2 Edinburgh has a thriving and growing economy, with growth forecast to continue and to ensure continued success and investment there is a need for a high quality public transport system to match our British and European competitors.
- 2.3 The number of private cars and light goods vehicles registered to Lothian residents increased from 280,000 in 1996 to 308,000 in 2000 (10% increase in four years)

- 2.4 In 2000 there were more new vehicle registrations in Edinburgh than in any other Scottish local authority and daily commuting in Edinburgh has grown from 51,000 trips in 1981 to an estimated 88,000 in 2001 (72% growth in 20 years).
- 2.5 To address these and other concerns the Council is proposing a vision for transport in Edinburgh through an Integrated Transport Initiative, and the tram scheme is one of the key elements. The tram will offer a first class alternative to the car for many urban trips. Without the Initiative and trams, congestion will reach intolerable levels throughout the city and both the economy and quality of life will suffer.
- 2.6 Trams can carry in excess of 300 passengers in each vehicle, many more than conventional buses. Furthermore trams encourage new people to use public transport. Recent research from Croydon in London indicates that 18% of tram passengers formerly made the journey by car. In the medium to longer term the effect will be even more marked.
- 2.7 Trams are easily accessible, particularly for elderly and disabled members of the community as level boarding is provided at tram stops. This is also beneficial for parents with young children and pushchairs.
- 2.8 Trams are electrically powered with zero emissions at the point of use and will have a positive impact on air quality. Trams are also less noisy than most forms of public transport

3 Main report

A INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 The Council at its meeting of 13 November 2003 considered a report entitled Edinburgh Tram Project Tram Lines 1 and 2. The minute of the decision of the Council was as follows:

Motion

- 1) To note that the proposed Edinburgh Tram Project was ranked fourth within the top ten national transport projects as detailed by the Scottish Executive in March 2002.
- 2) To note progress to date with the development of proposals for Tram Lines 1 and 2 (paragraphs 3.1-3.11 of the Director of City Development's report) and that further reports would be submitted to the Council meeting on 11 December 2003.
- 3) To note the results of the public consultation exercise (paragraphs 3.12-3.17 of the Director's report).
- 4) To approve the alignment for tram line 1 (paragraph 3.18 of the Director's report) with the exception of the Craighleith option and to note that this would be considered by the Planning Committee on 27 November 2003 and a final decision on the specific route alignment of this option (including the Western General Hospital) would not be taken until further investigations were completed, ie at the Council meeting in December 2003.

- 5) To ask **tie** to further investigate detailed route options for the length of road between Wardie Hotel and Granton Square before the Council made its final decision in December 2003;
- 6) To approve the alignment for tram line 2 (paragraph 3.19 of the Director's report) with the exception of the Roseburn to Carrick Knowe option and to note:
 - a that this would be considered by the Planning Committee on 27 November 2003; and
 - b that the final decision on the specific route alignment of the 'Carrick Knowe Option' (including Baird Drive) would not be taken until further investigations were completed, ie at the Council meeting in December 2003, although Council officials were currently minded to recommend 'option B' (paragraph 3.19 of the Director's report).
- 7) To approve the tram stop locations (paragraph 3.20 of the Director's report).
- 8) To approve depot sites at Constitution Street (line 1) and Gogar Roundabout (line 2) (paragraphs 3.21-3.25 of the Director's report).
- 9) To approve sub-station sites (paragraph 3.26 of the Director's report).
- 10) To note that the locations of temporary construction sites would be reported to the Planning Committee on 27 November 2003.
- 11) To approve the approach whereby the design of the tramway was integrated with the design of the public realm (paragraphs 3.30-3.32 of the Director's report) and to approve the setting up of an officer working group to bring forward proposals (paragraphs 3.33-3.34 of the Director's report).
- 12) To approve the draft Design Manual as a means of ensuring high quality design (paragraphs 3.35-3.38 of the Director's report).
- 13) To note that wide-area and local traffic impacts of the introduction of the tramway proposals, together with appropriate mitigation, would be the subject of future reports.
- 14) To note the progress to date with the Development Partnering and Operating Franchise Agreement (paragraphs 3.47-3.50 of the Director's report).
- 15) To approve the development of a Public Transport Integration Strategy and to note that a Quality Contract might be required.
- 16) To note that the Park and Ride Strategy would be reviewed and would be the subject of a future report.
- 17) To note that Appraisal documents would be presented to the Council in December 2003.
- 18) To note that the capital cost estimates and business case for lines 1 and 2 being developed by **tie** would be reported to Council in December 2003.
- 19) To approve the development of a strategy for securing financial contributions for the tram from developers and to note that this would be the subject of a future report.

- 20) To note that separate Bills for tram lines 1 and 2 were being prepared with the Council as tram promoter and that these would be presented to Council for approval in December 2003.
- 21) To approve the regulation of events, marches and demonstrations (paragraphs 3.51-3.52 of the Director's report).
- 22) To note that working arrangements between the Council and **tie** were being reviewed (paragraph 3.83 of the Director's report).
- 23) To approve the creation of a unified Communications Group (paragraphs 3.84-3.85 of the Director's report).
- 24) To agree the above decisions noting that final approval of the Parliamentary Bills for tram lines 1 and 2 would not happen until December 2003 and that such final approval would not take place before publication of 'Appraisal, Costs and Revenue' details for both lines (paragraphs 3.66, 3.71 and 3.72 of the Director's report).
- 25) To approve the recommendations of the Environmental Quality Scrutiny Panel that **tie** be asked:
 - a To reconsider the former rail route as an alternative to the proposed Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent route and to report on the following:
 - i the comparative capital cost and running times of the two options;
 - ii the effect on tram stop positions for the Newhaven development and the practicalities of running a spur/shuttle into part of the development area; and
 - iii the length of time that the road route would be closed should that option be chosen.
 - b To draw the lines of deviation within Craigleith to allow flexibility of stop positions.
- 26) To thank all staff of **tie**, the Council and consultants who had been involved in developing the Edinburgh Tram Project to its current level of detail. To note this very significant achievement and commend all those involved for their commitment and sheer hard work.

Amendment

- 1) To reiterate support for the construction of new tram lines in Edinburgh and welcome the report by the Director of City Development.
- 2) To support:
 - a The Environmental Quality Scrutiny Panel recommendations to investigate use of the railway link bypassing Starbank Road on line 1.
 - b The Planning Committee recommendations for further discussions on the Telford Road and Baird Drive sections.

- 3) To express concern about the following outstanding issues:
- a Difficulties with the consultation with local residents about the route of line 2 to the west of Ingliston.
 - b The impact on the viability of the Newbridge Terminus of the decision only to study a shuttle service to Ingliston from Newbridge as opposed to a direct service from Newbridge to the city centre.
 - c The threat to the Greenbelt for the proposal to run line 2 across country between Gogarburn and the Airport rather than run alongside the A8 and airport approach road and the proposal to locate the line 2 depot in the Greenbelt.
 - d The recommendation to reduce considerably the use of Princes Street for marches, demonstrations and events and the impact this is likely to have on the civic life of the city.
 - e The visual impact of overhead power lines in Princes Street (and other parts of the World Heritage Site) and to call for a detailed report on the use of alternative power supplies.
 - f The need for sufficient flexibility in the location of tram stops to allow further detailed consultation with local residents.
- 4) To approve the recommendations in the Director of City Development's report as a basis for continued design work and to instruct the Director to address the issues raised in paragraphs 2) and 3) above in his report to the Council meeting on 11 December 2003.

- moved by Councillor Mackintosh, seconded by Councillor Dawe.

The amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Burns, as adjusted.

(References – The Executive of the Council 21 October 2003 (Item 2); report no. CEC/97/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development and CEC/101/03-04/EQ by the Environmental Quality Scrutiny Panel, submitted.)

This report now addresses these and all other outstanding issues.

B ISSUES ADDRESSED

3.2 Tram Line 1

3.2.1 Craigleith

Two options were considered in the Craigleith area during the public consultation. In option A the tram would run along the route of the former Haymarket to Granton railway, and in option B the tram would run along Groathill Avenue and Telford Road with a stop outside the Western General Hospital and good links to the bus network.

Response from the public within the zone of influence of the route options favoured the former railway solum along the Roseburn corridor. When taking into account all parties, the majority were in favour of Telford Road, particularly because of the proximity to the Western General Hospital and the responses of cycle groups, who are concerned that there may be an adverse effect on the cycleway if the former railway solum was used for the tram route.

Notwithstanding, there was strong support for the former railway solum as a means of segregating trams from traffic and lessening congestion in the Telford Road area.

tie has recommended to the Council that option A (the former railway solum) should be adopted as the preferred route option.

This recommendation was reported to Planning Committee in October which requested further consultation be undertaken. This took place (11 November), and resulted in a requirement for further information/analysis to be produced on both options, plus an additional option via Craigleith Road and Crewe Road South.

tie has undertaken this work and is reported in a paper, which is a background document to this report. **tie** has recommended again that option A should be adopted as the preferred route option.

In summary **tie** have made this recommendation because option A has:

- lower capital cost;
- greater reliability;
- lower running times; and
- higher overall patronage.

As previously reported to Council it is the view of Council Officials that the case for selecting between options A and B is finely balanced. The third option via Craigleith Road is not considered to be an acceptable or practicable solution. Having considered the recent work undertaken by **tie** it is now the view that Option A should be adopted as the preferred alignment.

Providing good access from the tram to the Western General Hospital is an important consideration. Option A has been slightly modified by moving the tram stop previously located near Telford Road northwards close to Telford Drive and Easter Drylaw Drive. This will provide good access to the hospital via Telford Gardens.

It is proposed that **tie** are instructed to establish a community liaison group with the residents most affected by option A. The purpose of this group would be to liaise with local residents about the emerging detailed design, and to inform and update residents on a regular and frequent basis about the development and progress of the project.

This matter was reported to Planning Committee on 27 November which agreed to support the recommended alignment. It was noted that the former railway line is safeguarded for such a purpose in the North West Edinburgh Local Plan.

3.2.2 Lower Granton Road between the Wardie Hotel and Granton Square

Responses were received during the public consultation concerning existing traffic problems and the plan for road realignment. Meetings have taken place with the local residents to discuss potential mitigation measures.

tie following consultation with local residents have recommended segregated tram operation adjacent to the sea wall. The road is moved further away from the houses and the footway adjacent to the houses is widened and dedicated parking spaces are provided. A footpath/cycleway will run adjacent to the sea wall.

This does not totally satisfy the demands of local residents who wish to see shared operation at this location with the road moved to the proposed tram route. It is **tie**'s opinion that shared operation at this location would have an unacceptable impact on the efficient operation of the tram and would work against the objective of keeping the project affordable and viable. This view is shared by Council officers.

This route was considered by Planning Committee on 27 November which agreed to support the recommended alignment. A background paper has been provided.

3.2.3 Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent

Concerns were raised during the public consultation about width of carriageway, conflict with traffic and loss of parking. **tie** has recommended shared tram operation at this location and made an allowance within the limits of deviation for widening to cater for parking and servicing requirements.

Planning Committee requested further design work and **tie** have produced a paper (Background Paper) presenting 9 possible options for introducing a footway/cycleway on the seaward side of the sea wall. This would free up some space on the landward side to provide additional formalised parking and servicing, thereby addressing some local concerns. Of these 9 options, 5 were discounted due to the unknown condition of the sea wall. Out of the four remaining options, **tie** have given thought to the impact on visual amenity and wildlife and made a recommendation that the option comprising an Ekki hardwood platform resting on reinforced concrete columns should be discussed further with officers in City Development Department. As this structure would be within limits of deviation, it would not require planning permission, but would require prior approval. This has been considered and approved by Planning Committee as a way forward.

3.2.4 Options using the disused Railway alignment as an alternative to Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent.

tie were requested by Council to reconsider the former rail route as an alternative to the proposed Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent route and to report on;

comparative capital cost and running times;

the effect on tram stop positions for the Newhaven development and the practicalities of running a spur/shuttle into part of the development area; and

the length of time that the route would be closed should that option be chosen.

tie's advisors have undertaken an analysis of 5 route options, 4 in detail and the results including the above are reported in a background paper to this report.

tie have recommended to the Council that the preferred alignment that should be adopted at this location continues to be a shared route on Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent with widening on a structure founded in the foreshore to provide a northern footway. The key issues that are highlighted from the STAG2 appraisal in coming to this decision are:

- a Accessibility to the western Harbour development area whilst allowing the continuity of the loop to be maintained;
- b Comparable impacts to the railway corridor routes on reducing social exclusion;
- c Quicker journey times with a positive impact on patronage;
- d Lower cost solution than other options; and
- e Addressing local issues of parking and frontager access.

This route was considered by Planning Committee on 27 November which agreed to support the recommended alignment.

3.2.5 Overhead power lines in Princes Street and alternative power supply systems

In coming to the decision to recommend a tram system for Edinburgh a range of technologies were considered from bus based systems (including quality bus and guided bus), rail based systems and through to more specialist guideway systems (such as monorail or cable based systems).

Following an analysis it was concluded that the most appropriate technology solution to meet the transport needs and topography of Edinburgh is the tram. Opportunities for an electric powered tram not utilising overhead wire equipment (similar to the trial system in Bordeaux) are being kept under review and consideration of this technology will be maintained as the project evolves. The Bills seeking powers to construct the tram are drafted such that a Bordeaux type power supply system could be adopted without further legislation. A further report will be made once technical issues are resolved.

3.3 Tram Line 2

3.3.1 Roseburn to Carrick Knowe (including Baird Drive)

During public consultation views were sought on three options:

Option A - the tram line would pass under the existing railway on Russell Road, pass alongside the existing City of Edinburgh Council cleansing depot and continue west to Saughton, parallel to and south of the railway line. This option would impact on properties in Whitson Road and Stenhouse Avenue West.

Option B - the tram line would bridge over Russell Road, skirt round the ScotRail depot site, bridge over Roseburn Street, then continue parallel to and north of the railway line past Murrayfield Stadium and Carrick Knowe Golf Course. East of Carrick Knowe Avenue the track would cross back over the railway via a new bridge. This option would have an affect on properties at Roseburn near Murrayfield Stadium and at Baird Drive.

Option C is a hybrid of A and B. The tram would follow option A, route under the railway on Russell Road and run parallel to and south of the railway as far as Balgreen Road. The line would pass back under the railway and follow the route option outline in option B past Carrick Knowe Golf Course. This option would minimise the impact on properties under options A and B but the complications of the route layout would mean slower tram travelling speeds.

Option B that runs north of the existing railway carried most support in the consultation. Whilst this route utilises property owned by Network Rail, in recognition that it will run close to some properties in Baird Drive further consultation with local residents was carried out by **tie** to discuss a design mitigation the effects of a tram in the area

Following the consultation **tie** recommend that option B be adopted as the preferred alignment.

The route options at this location were considered by Planning Committee in October who requested that further consultation be undertaken by **tie** and also agreed to perform a site visit.

tie produced a paper on this that was circulated to members at the site visit (Background paper). This sets out a rigorous appraisal of the three options for routing the tram between Roseburn and Carrick Knowe and recommends again that Option B is the preferred alignment.

In summary the paper indicated that:

Option A would result in the loss of gardens from properties on Whitson Road and Stenhouse Avenue West plus the demolition of part of a block of flats at Stenhouse Avenue West. The horizontal and vertical alignment of this option precludes an all-ways junction with line 1 at Haymarket and restricts east/west movement. This option would also require three railway crossing which present significant technical and cost implications and is an important factor in route selection.

Option B would impact on the residents of Baird Drive most significantly during construction but to a much lesser extent after completion. The number of properties affected is less than in option A with no requirement for the purchase of residential land. In this option an all-ways junction can be constructed at Haymarket and permits unrestricted tram operation at the interface of line 2 with line 1. This option requires only one railway crossing and would be the cheapest to construct.

At the site visit by members of the Planning Committee it was demonstrated that it would be possible to accommodate the tramway without impinging on gardens of houses in Baird Drive. The frequency of trains on the mainline tracks was also noted. There is enough room within the limits of deviation to accommodate the tramway and mitigation measures without impinging on the gardens of local residents.

Option C which is a hybrid of A and B would avoid impact on residential properties in Whitson Road, Stenhouse Avenue West and Baird Drive but would impact on Jenners Depository. As with Option A this option precludes an all-ways junction with line 1 at Haymarket and restricts east/west movement.

This means that trams heading west into town on line 2 could not turn left at Haymarket onto the western leg of line 1. Likewise trams travelling south on the western leg of line 1 could not turn right to travel west on line 2. Instead trams could only travel to and from the north via the city centre. This is a severe operational limitation and places a considerable burden on access to and from key existing and developing economic centres in north and west Edinburgh.

Option C would require five railway crossings and would be the most expensive to construct. The alignment of option C is poor and this would mean that trams would travel slower than on the other two making the system less attractive to the travelling public.

Following this further appraisal process, **tie** has recommended again option B as the preferred route. Key factors in this decision include:

- a a single railway crossing;
- b minimises impact on Network Rail infrastructure, resulting in significant capital cost savings;
- c avoidance of poorly aligned on street running;
- d quicker journey times
- e the ability to construct an all-ways junction at Haymarket and improve accessibility.

It is the view of Council Officials that the case for selecting between options A, B and C is clear cut and that **tie**'s recommendation to adopt option B as the preferred alignment should be accepted.

Further consultation has been undertaken with the residents of Baird Drive with the aim of developing a design that minimises the impact on the residents. Three options have been developed which aim to minimise visual intrusion and noise after construction.

- a the tramway at mainline railway level between the Water of Leith and Balgreen Road.
- b the tramway entering a false cutting west of the Water of Leith to run at low level before rising again to bridge over Balgreen Road
- c the tramway entering a false cutting west of the Water of Leith to run at low level and cross Balgreen Road at-grade via a signalised junction.

The second option has been discounted due to the limited benefits it provided. The parliamentary submission documents prepared by **tie** are based on option 3, however provision has been made in the Bill and the limits of deviation have been set to allow the construction of a range of vertical options.

It is proposed that **tie** are instructed to establish a community liaison group with the residents of Baird Drive. The purpose of this group would be to liaise with local residents about the emerging detailed design, and to inform and update residents on a regular and frequent basis about the development and progress of the project.

This matter was reported to Planning Committee on 27 November which agreed to support the recommended alignment. The Committee also agreed that the detailed design be brought back to Planning Committee at prior approval stage to ensure that the detailing addresses the concerns of local residents, including noise, impact on privacy and amenity, and loss of trees.

3.3.2 Shuttle Service between Newbridge and Ingliston

Two options were considered between Ingliston and Newbridge during the public consultation. Uncertainty regarding long-term expansion proposals for Edinburgh Airport have not been finalised and are a key consideration for the alignment of the tram past the Royal Highland Showground.

In option A the tram would run from the airport to the Royal Highland Showground and stop directly outside the north gate, before continuing across the A8 and on to Newbridge.

In option B the tram would run directly south from the airport, travelling through the fields to the east of the Showground, with a stop near the A8. The tram would then cross over the A8 and continue to Newbridge.

The public consultation showed that option on these two options was equal. A strong consultation submission from BAA, which operates Edinburgh Airport prompted further discussion to ensure that passengers are served in the best possible way while the options for further expansion of the airport remain open.

A service to the Airport can best be provided with an alignment running adjacent to Eastfield Road terminating at the Airport Terminal Building then returning on the same line. This presents operational difficulties if the full tram service continues from there to Newbridge.

The operational problems involved in serving Newbridge can best be resolved by terminating the main service at the Airport and providing a shuttle tram service to and from Newbridge. **tie** currently proposes that this shuttle would operate between Newbridge and the Ingliston Park and Ride site. However the tram infrastructure required for the shuttle would be exactly the same as if the full service terminated at Newbridge.

The plans recommended by **tie** now show line 2 running roughly parallel with Eastfield Road from the proposed park and ride site at Ingliston to the airport. The plan also show a spur to Newbridge from the park and ride site running westerly along the northern boundary of the existing park and fly facility. At the eastern end of the Royal Highland Showground the alignment crosses the eastbound carriageway of the A8 to run in the central reservation then at Hallyards Road the tram line would cross to the south of the A8 then onto Ratho Station and then to Newbridge. The Newbridge spur would be operated by a shuttle service.

As already mentioned, there is uncertainty over the airport expansion plans and this alignment has been developed to minimise the risk of conflicting with those aspirations while maintaining an acceptable tram alignment and service west of the airport. The alignment runs close to roads and established landscape features and should be able to accommodate future development plans should they emerge.

This route was considered by Planning Committee on 27 November which agreed to support the recommended alignment.

One of the purposes of this report is to seek approval of council to lodge Bills with the Scottish Parliament to gain powers to construct tram lines 1 and 2. The powers being sought in the Bill for line 2 are to deliver a tramway from Newbridge to Haymarket and this is not influenced by the decision to operate a shuttle service between Ingliston and Newbridge.

3.3.3 Greenbelt Issues west of Gogar

The proposed alignment of Line 2 between Gogarburn and the airport is similar to the alignment previously approved for CERT up to the park and ride site at Eastfield Road. From there it turns north, running parallel to Eastfield Road as far as the airport - this is a new stretch.

For the stretch, which has the previous approval, there is no objection in principle to loss of Green Belt. Exploration of a new alignment close to the A8 was explored fully with **tie**, but was found to be unviable due to engineering complications at the Royal Bank of Scotland access ramps. The principle of a route providing a stop to serve RBS then reverting to CERT was therefore accepted. The key issues with the former CERT alignment are impact on visibility, landscape features, natural heritage and field boundaries. These are matters being addressed in the Environmental Statement, and mitigation measures similar to those secured through the CERT proposals are being sought, along with additional requirements to address the greater visual impacts of poles.

At Gogarburn itself, where the route turns north from the RBS stop to join the former CERT alignment, the routing seeks to minimise impact on visual amenity and the setting of Gogar Church and graveyard by remaining as far away as possible. The route also seeks to avoid areas of archaeological interest, but if this is not possible, mitigation measures will allow for any remains to be undisturbed. Appropriate mitigation measures are to be included within the Environmental Statement.

For the stretch beyond the park and ride site, the strategic principle of a connection with the airport was sought by and endorsed in the first planning committee report. Indeed, the extension of the tramway out to Newbridge is an important element of the finalised structure plan, currently linked to the release of housing development land in the area. Concerns over detailed routing shown in consultation plans were expressed at that time because of the uncertainty over the future of the airport - to be addressed in the impending government White Paper. The route to the airport now proposed runs in an alignment mirroring Eastfield Road, and is generally in keeping with the landscape structure of the area. It would also allow for possible expansion of the park and ride site should this be justified at a later stage. Providing adequate mitigation measures are delivered as part of the Tram Project - with reference to visibility, landscape features, natural heritage and field boundaries - and that the limits of deviation make sufficient provision for these measures, it is considered that the impact on the green belt will be minimised.

3.3.4 Gogar Depot

In a report to Planning Committee in October it was noted that **tie** had identified a possible depot site at Gogar Roundabout. It was pointed out that the proposed location is highly sensitive in visual terms, being at a major gateway to the City. In addition, the West Edinburgh Planning Framework recognises that land in the A8 Corridor has potential for nationally significant economic development in the period post 2020. In this context, such a prominent Green Belt depot location could only be supported, if all other urban depot options are clearly unfeasible and its visual impact can be significantly ameliorated through an appropriate design solution. Such a solution might require an innovative approach and comprise, for example, a building with a "green roof", combined with extensive landscaping. A report by **tie** - Line 2 Depot Report (Background Paper) – applies STAG guidelines to three potential Line 2 sites and explains the operational reasons why the Gogar site has emerged as the preferred option. In Gogar's favour is its position on the tram mainline and the absence of any nearby housing means there will be no residential amenity problems.

tie's conclusions are accepted and the depot can be supported at Gogar as a justified exception to Green Belt policy, other non-Green Belt options having been effectively ruled out as impracticable. However, to mitigate the development's visual impact, an exceptional package of landscape measures needs to be secured. This is vitally important with this gateway site on a key route close to many centres of economic activity. A well-designed depot in this location will address these concerns and could become an asset to the city. The existing bunds provide very effective screening and there should be a presumption in favour of their retention. This may reduce the amount of operational land available; to compensate, additional land immediately to the west of the site will be included in the Limits of Deviation. The depot configuration and uses shown are based on the requirements of a main depot serving the entire tram network, in the event that other lines do not go ahead for whatever reason. If both Lines obtain approval a review of depot requirements should be carried out. On this basis, providing the Environmental Statement and Bill address these issues fully, there is no objection. In addition, it has been requested that the Design Manual include a chapter on Depot Design.

3.4 C RECOMMENDED ROUTES AND FACILITIES

3.4.1 Recommended Routes

The Council at its meeting of 13 November approved the recommended tram routes for line 1 with the exception of alignments at Craigleith, Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent and Lower Granton Road between the Wardie Hotel and Granton Square. The Council also approved the alignment for line 2 with the exception of the section between Roseburn and Carrick Knowe.

Craigleith – **tie** have investigated three options in this vicinity and have recommended that Option A should be adopted as the preferred alignment. This recommendation is endorsed by council officials and has the support of Planning Committee.

Lower Granton Road – **tie** have investigate several options at this location and recommend that the preferred option is to adopt a segregated tramway running adjacent to the sea wall, locating the existing road further away from the houses, widening the footway adjacent to the houses and provide dedicated parking spaces. This recommendation is endorsed by council officials and has the support of Planning Committee.

Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent – **tie** have investigated several options at this location including utilising the former railway solum as an alternative to the coastal road route. **tie** have recommended that the preferred option is to adopt a shared tramway along Starbank Road and Trinity Crescent, and to make allowance within the limits of deviation to permit local widening for parking and servicing. This recommendation is endorsed by council officials and has the support of Planning Committee.

Roseburn to Carrick Knowe – **tie** have investigated three options in this vicinity and recommended option B, that runs north of the railway and to the rear of properties on Baird Drive. This recommendation has been endorsed by council officials and has the support of Planning Committee.

3.4.2 Location of Tram Stops

The Council on 13 November 2003 approved tram stop locations but at the same time expressed concern that there needs to be sufficient flexibility to allow further detailed consultation with local residents.

There will be some scope to vary tram stop locations within the limits of deviation subject to Council approval and meeting technical, operational and safety standards. Ultimately however this scope will be curtailed by the extent of powers that are vested in the Council. This does not preclude minor adjustments to locations and improvement of access as the design develops.

3.4.3 Temporary Construction Compounds

During the construction period of the tram, temporary compounds will be required by the contractors to store plant and materials. It is a requirement to identify locations for these and assess their impact in the Environmental Statement. The Council has now completed this work and a list of sites is contained within the ES for both lines 1 and 2.

3.5 F TRAM SYSTEM OPERATION

3.5.1 Events Marches and Demonstrations

The Council has approved that powers be sought through the Bill to limit the number of events, which would have a direct effect on the operation of the tram. These would be limited to the Festival Cavalcade, the Festival Firework display and the Hogmanay Celebrations. There is a potential public safety issue with the overhead electrical power cables and a procedure to manage this will need to be developed in consultation with the Chief Constable and Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate. (HMRI).

The Council has also approved that powers be sought through the Bill to regulate those marches and demonstrations that would have a direct effect on the operation of the tram. Currently, between thirty and forty marches and demonstrations take place on Princes Street each year. It is possible that sufficient space will remain on Princes Street for marches involving lesser numbers of people.

The Council at the same time as approving that powers should be sought to regulate events, marches and demonstrations along the route of the trams also expressed concern about the possible impact that this may have on the civic life of the city.

Provision is being made in the Bill for the Council to retain powers to allow additional events to those in the schedule. This would be enacted by following procedures aimed at providing the Council with relevant information. This would include representation from the tram operator.

3.5.2 STAG and Financial Appraisal

Tram proposals, in common with all major transport projects, require to be assessed using the Scottish Executive's guidance document Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG). This is a holistic process which begins from issues and objectives and traces the development of project proposals from these through a process of option appraisal. There is therefore a requirement to provide a rationale for the selection of particular project proposals, and the rationale should be traceable back to the issues to be addressed and the planning objectives determined by the promoter of the project.

In summary, the appraisal process requires that proposals be tested against three sets of objectives:

- a The planning objectives.
- b The governments five objectives (environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility); and
- c any other relevant external objectives relating to transport, land use or wider policies.

A STAG 1 appraisal for trams was prepared in January 2003, which identified a viable tram network for the city produced outline capital, revenue and operating costs for tramlines.

STAG 2 appraisals for tramlines 1 and 2 are complete and are background documents to this report and these will be presented to Scottish Executive for approval.

The STAG2 economic appraisal is augmented by a financial appraisal, which focuses on funding and affordability parameters, and is described later in this report. A Preliminary Financial Case for tram lines 1 and 2 (background papers) has been prepared which in due course will form the core of a formal application for funding to the Scottish Executive within a comprehensive business case. This preliminary financial case has been produced by **tie**, reflecting advice from its consultants. Prior to submission to the Council for approval of the final business case, the Director of Finance shall undertake a rigorous evaluation. Obviously given timescales such a review of the preliminary submission from **tie** has not been possible. This review is not expected to raise any further issues that have not already been identified.

Estimates of Expense and Funding Statement have been prepared for tram lines 1 and 2 and are background papers to the report. These are submitted to the Parliament with the Bills.

3.5.3 Environmental Appraisal

The *Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999* set out projects for which EIA may be required. Proposals for the construction of tram systems fall within Schedule 2 of the Regulations which lists development which may require EIA if it is likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. The Regulations include applicable thresholds and criteria for the purposes of classifying development as Schedule 2 development. In the case of trams, the appropriate threshold is that the *area of the works exceeds 1 hectare*. Lines 1 and 2 will both be above this threshold and so **tie** has decided to undertake an EIA for each. As there will be separate Bills for lines 1 and 2, separate EIAs are being conducted.

The outcome of the EIA process has to be reported in an Environmental Statement (ES). A separate ES is being produced for each line and will be lodged with the relevant Bill.

The Environmental Statements for both lines are complete and are background papers to this report.

3.5.4 Risk Management

Risk is a significant factor in all major capital projects and a key element of the Preliminary Financial Case for both tram lines 1 and 2 has been to examine the risks inherent in the projects and identify how to mitigate these. Experience of public sector procurement of major projects has illustrated that project promoters can be exposed to significant risks when developing and procuring projects. As a consequence of this the HM Treasury has identified Optimism Bias as the systematic tendency for appraisers to be over-optimistic about key project parameters. Evidence from other tram projects in the UK has confirmed this to be a major issue. The Optimism Bias analysis effectively adds a level of contingency to project costs to compensate for the stage of development reached. The adjustment should reduce over time as project definition progresses. A full time Risk Manager has been appointed to develop and apply a framework of risk analysis.

tie's risk management has identified a comprehensive package of risks surrounding the development of tram lines 1 and 2 and has initiated a related mitigation strategy, which is kept under regular review.

HM Treasury methodology for STAG2 appraisals requires that an Optimism Bias factor be applied to underlying capital cost estimates. In the case of tram lines 1 and 2 a factor of 31% has been applied to capital cost estimates and 14% to the anticipated construction period. For the purposes of the STAG2 appraisal this has resulted in an increase in base capital costs of £67.7million for tram line 1, and £79.6million for tram line 2 and a 5 month increase in the 36 month construction period for each line.

3.5.5 Economic Impact and Cost to Government

The cost to sets out the net cost of a proposal from the public sector's point of view, which can be compared with the overall benefits of the scheme covering all five of the main STAG objectives (environment, safety, economy, integration, and accessibility). The economic impact of the tram project compares the monetised benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and economy and then compares with the cost to Government.

Tram Line 1

For tram line 1 the present value of costs (PVC) to Government is £218.6million and this compares with a present value of benefits (PVB) of £329.2million, producing a positive net present value (NPV) of £110.6million and a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of 1.51. On this basis tram line 1 represents good value for money.

Tram Line 2

For tram line 2 the present value of costs (PVC) to Government is £199.0 million and this compares with a present value of benefits (PVB) of £275.0 million, producing a positive net present value (NPV) of £76.0 million and a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of 1.38. On this basis tram line 2 represents good value for money.

3.5.6 Financial Assessment

Costs

The capital costs for tram lines 1 and 2 include the infrastructure, vehicles and the start up costs associated with the projects. The costs are based on the outturn costs for other systems in the UK. Note that all costs quoted in this section are in 2nd Quarter 2003 prices.

Base costs are estimates of the actual costs of the work calculated on the analysis undertaken to date. To these a contingency is added as there is the potential for cost overruns. The overall contingencies in the final figures are 10.8% for tram line 1 and 8.5% for tram line 2. The contingency costs included above have been advised to **tie** by their professional consultants, based on their detailed evaluation of the underlying costs and the remaining project risk. **tie** operates a rigorous risk management procedures, which have supported the development of the project scope and costs. For the purposes of the financial assessment, the costs do not include the element captured within the optimism bias concept which is designed to accommodate more general contingent risk based on non-project specific factors.

The Council and **tie** regard the two tram Bills as representing two parts of a linked network of tram routes and certain aspects of the two projects are coincident, primarily a shared section of the route from Roseburn to St Andrew Square. An independent evaluation of the costs and funding for each line has been performed for the purposes of the STAG submissions, but to avoid double-counting within the financial case of the costs related to the joint-running section, these costs have been included in the costings for line 1 in the Statement supporting the line 1 Bill but have been excluded from the costings included for line 2.

On this basis, the capital cost for tram line 1 is £243.0 million and for tram line 2 £230.4 million, stated in Quarter 2 2003 prices. Construction cost risk will be addressed in the tender process and subsequent negotiations for the infrastructure contract. The objective will be to pass this risk to the private sector.

Operating Revenue

The professional advice is that private sector will not accept substantial revenue risk at a reasonable price. Therefore, as reported to Council on 13 November this risk must be borne by the public sector and the impact of this risk will be scrutinised carefully as the financial case develops, including means of mitigating or sharing the risk. The draft operator agreement allows for partial transfer of the risk on a gain/pain sharing basis and the negotiation of this aspect will commence once the tender process is completed, anticipated to be in early March 2004. This process will also provide third party operator insight into the current revenue projections and since the operator will be taking some of the risk, it would be logical to conclude that the projections which emerge from that process will have been prudently compiled. Experience from other UK schemes will also continue to be factored in. The operator contract will not commit the Council to commence operation; hence, if the debate during 2004 highlights unacceptable risk of lower revenues or operating losses, the Council is fully empowered to terminate the project in the absence of mitigation.

The operating costs (including operator profit) are those associated with the day-to-day running of the tram system and are forecast at the commencement of operation to be for tram line 1 £6.52 million per year and for tram line 2 £6.42 million per year.

Lifecycle maintenance represents the costs that are not included within the operating maintenance costs above and include refitting vehicles, replacement of track and other infrastructure elements. These have been developed using the estimated life of the system and are forecast to be for tram line 1 £20.0 million and for tram line 2 £23.4 million. These costs will be incurred over the life of the system, deemed to be 30 years, and have been arrived at by applying standard HM Treasury Net Present Value methodology.

The capital and life-cycle costs will be market-tested when the infrastructure contract is tendered, probably late next year. Should capital costs emerge from that process at an unacceptable level, the Council will be under no obligation to proceed.

3.5.7 Funding

The principal source of funding is the commitment (subject to STAG and Business Case approval) of £375 million from the Scottish Executive. Presently, there is no commitment to indexation of this sum. The total funding for the project encompassing both trams will be developed during 2004 as the procurement process evolves. The Executive commitment is to cover the network, rather than made conditional on a particular configuration, and it has been allocated between the two routes to avoid any double counting. This allocation though not the aggregate) may be refined as project costings and funding requirements are finalised through formal procurement. The form of public sector grant (lump sum capital or annual revenue support) is also subject to revision in the light of decisions on procurement strategy.

At present the outline projections disclose a funding requirement beyond the current estimates of grant award of £33 million for line 1 and £72 million for line 2, assuming both routes were built to full extent of the powers being sought in the Bills. This requirement is on the basis of 2003 prices, assuming up-front grant award from the Scottish Executive and excludes optimism bias. It is hoped that this requirement will be met by operational surpluses in excess of lifecycle costs, commercial income and property development gains related to the project together with funding from other public sector and private sector sources to be developed in due course. It is the Councils intention to build both lines but the Council would retain control over the scope of the network to be constructed and would be in a position to curtail activity in advance of any unfunded contractual commitment.

3.6 J POWERS

3.6.1 Proposed Bill to the Scottish Parliament

Two private Bills have been prepared for lodging with the Scottish Parliament in December 2003 and are background papers to this report. These will seek the necessary powers, which if granted will be vested solely in the Council to enable the construction of tramlines 1 and 2. The Bills have been drafted with the Council as sole promoter of the schemes. It is anticipated that this will result in a parliamentary inquiry during 2004.

3.6.2 Limits of Deviation

Limits of Deviation, define the lateral extent from the centre line over which powers are being sought in the Bill. The limits of deviation will be shown on plans that accompany the Bill when it is lodged at Parliament. The plans, which are background papers to this report, indicate the limits of deviation.

3.6.3 System of Prior Approvals

The Bills will describe, both in words and by reference to plans and sections, the development and the land upon which it is to be carried out. Such development when authorised by the Act will obtain permitted development rights under Class 29 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 (the GPDO).

The permitted development powers are constrained in the GPDO, and the following is not permitted *unless* the local planning authority has given "prior approval"

- a the erection, construction, alteration or extension of certain types of structure such as buildings, bridges, aqueducts, piers or dams, or
- b the formation, laying out or alteration of a means of access to any road used by vehicular traffic,

In other words, these particular works will remain under the control of the planning authority. The difference between prior approvals and planning permission is that the planning authority shall not refuse prior approval nor make approval subject to conditions unless they are satisfied that

- a the development ought to be and could reasonably be carried out elsewhere on the land designated in the Act,
- b or - in relation to buildings and structures - the design and appearance would cause harm to the amenity of the neighborhood and such harm could be avoided through reasonable modifications.

Focusing on planning related powers, the Bills will seek powers for

- a the Council to carry out and maintain works which are necessary to construct the two tramways within the limits of deviation specified on the plans;
- b the Council to make fixings to buildings outwith the limits of deviation; and
- c the Council to acquire land within the limits of deviation, or to obtain new rights in such land.

With regard to works within the limits of deviation, these should include all the powers necessary to construct the tramways, and will be specified as relating to

- a stopping places
- b control of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the tramway
- c strengthening, improvement, repair or reconstruction of any road
- d strengthening, alteration or demolition of any building or structure
- e altering the position of road furniture, lights, or underground services
- f altering or interfering with watercourses, rivers or streams
- g landscaping and other works to mitigate any adverse effects of construction, maintenance or operation of the tramways
- h facilities and works to benefit or protect land or premises affected by proposed tramways, and
- i such other works as may be necessary or expedient in connection with or as a consequence of the construction of the tramways.

With regard to fixings to buildings outwith the limits of deviation, these include fixings of brackets, cables, wires, insulators and other apparatus required in connection with the tramways. Such power is sought over all buildings, if necessary, including listed buildings (the Bills seek powers to be exempt from any Listed Building enforcement procedures). The details of such fixings will be addressed in the Design Manual and will be subject to 'Prior Approval' by the Planning Authority. It is limited by a schedule in the Bill, which lists certain key buildings as exceptions.

Certain other works to listed buildings will be specified in the Bill for Line 1. These are at Haymarket - where authorisation will be sought to demolish the Caley Alehouse (Haymarket Inn, Haymarket Terrace) and to remove, alter or demolish the listed steps and lamp associated with the station, if necessary. The station building itself will remain. It is accepted that these works are necessary to achieve the high quality transport interchange, which is sought here. The other listed building to be specified is the Roseburn Terrace former Railway Bridge where widening or other alterations are proposed.

Although all these works would obtain authorisation through the Bills, they will be subject to detailed control under the "Prior approval" mechanism, providing they relate to certain types of structure – buildings, bridges, and aqueducts. Discussions have taken place about the legal definitions of buildings and structures and hence the degree of planning control over detailed design matters. A balance is to be struck between the planning authority retaining sufficient control over detailed design of poles, streetscape and street furniture (particularly within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Site), and ensuring design and procurement processes are not held up. For the avoidance of doubt, the Bills will specify the works for which further approval will be required. These must include poles, street furniture, substations and fixings to buildings with frontages to the tram route.

In order to give guidance to all parties about how the Planning Authority will handle the design details, a Design Manual is being prepared, and this will be supported by a Procedure Note. The approach involves the following steps

- a the Bills, once approved will grant baseline powers and also define clearly the works which will require further detailed approval of the planning authority.
- b the Design Manual, once finalised, sets detailed design standards, compliance with which will allow fast tracking of design details to approval by the planning authority.
- c The Environmental Statements, will detail clearly the mitigation measures required to be delivered as part of the tram project – no further planning approval is likely to be required for these.
- d A Procedure Note to confirm the processes to be followed both for designs which comply and those, which do not comply with the Design Manual.

3.6.4 Programme

Assuming approval, by the Council, of the draft parliamentary submission documentation for both lines 1 and 2 in December, it is intended to submit these to the Private Bills Unit of the Parliament by the end of the year. Once agreed with the Private Bills Unit the two Bills and supporting documents can be formally lodged with the Parliament, triggering 60 day objection periods.

In parallel with the above the STAG 2 appraisals and Outline Business cases will be submitted to the Scottish Executive for approval.

The next stage in the Scottish Parliamentary process will be the Preliminary Stage when Private Bill Committee(s) will be appointed to consider, amongst other matters, whether to approve the principle of there being trams. At this stage the Promoter will be required to prove the case of need for the trams.

After the Preliminary Stage there follows the Consideration Stage when the Committee will hear representations from Objectors and from the Promoter. At the present time it is not possible to advise when this stage is likely to take place since this is a matter subject to the control of the Parliamentary Bureau.

At the Final Stage of the Private Bill process the whole Scottish Parliament meets to consider the Bill. MSPs consider any further amendments and then decide whether or not the Bill should be passed. Any Member of the Scottish Parliament may propose an amendment. Provided the Bill is not subject to any legal challenge, it will be presented to the Queen for Royal Assent, thereafter becoming an Act of the Scottish Parliament. Assuming Statutory Powers and funding are secured in 2005 its anticipated that the first trams could be operational in 2009.

4 Financial Implications

- 4.1 The costs for developing Tramlines 1 and 2 to the point of attaining Parliamentary powers are committed from the Scottish Executive Integrated Transport Fund.
- 4.2 Further reports regarding funding for the construction and operation of the tram project to the effect of refining this outline business case, will be presented to the council in due course.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The proposed Edinburgh tram project ranks fourth in the top ten national transport projects as set out by the Scottish Executive.
- 5.2 The tram forms a key component of the Councils Integrated transport Initiative and will radically improve transport in Edinburgh.
- 5.3 It is proposed to lodge two private bills with the Scottish Executive seeking necessary powers to construct tram lines 1 and 2.

6 Recommendations

6.1 Issues Addressed

Line 1

- 6.1.1 To note that on 13 November 2003 the Council approved the alignment of line 1 with the exception of the Craighleith option.
- 6.1.2 To note that **tie** have undertaken further investigation of options A and B at Craighleith and have developed a third alignment, option C.
- 6.1.3 To note that as a result of this work **tie** have recommended that option A, which follows the alignment of the disused railway corridor, should be adopted as the preferred alignment, and that this is endorsed by Council Officials.

- 6.1.4 To approve that option A should be adopted as the preferred alignment at Craighleith.
- 6.1.5 To note that **tie** has undertaken further investigations into the alignment of tram line 1 on Lower Granton Road between Wardie Hotel and Granton Square.
- 6.1.6 To note that **tie** continue to recommend a segregated tram alignment adjacent to the seawall and that this is endorsed by Council Officials.
- 6.1.7 To approve that the alignment for tram line 1 on Lower Granton Road should follow a segregated line adjacent to the sea wall.
- 6.1.8 To note that **tie** has undertaken further investigations, which consider using the former rail route as an alternative to the proposed Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent route.
- 6.1.9 To note that **tie** continue to recommend that the alignment for tram line 1 should be routed along Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent on a shared basis with other traffic and that allowances are made within the limits of deviation in the Bill for widening to cater for parking and servicing requirements. This is supported by Council Officials.
- 6.1.10 To approve the alignment for tram line 1 on Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent.
- 6.1.11 To note that the alignment of line 1 including the recommended options at Craighleith, Lower Granton Road, Starbank Road/Trinity Crescent was considered and supported by Planning Committee on 27 November.

Line 2

- 6.1.12 To note that Council approved the alignment of line 2 with the exception of the Roseburn to Carrick Knowe option.
- 6.1.13 To note that **tie** has undertaken further investigations, which have considered routing options between Roseburn and Carrick Knowe.
- 6.1.14 To note that **tie** continue to recommend that option B, which runs to the north of the railway and passes to the rear of Baird Drive should be adopted as the preferred alignment, and that this is supported by Council Officials.
- 6.1.15 To approve that option B should adopted as the preferred alignment on tram line 2 between Roseburn and Carrick Knowe.
- 6.1.16 To note that the alignment of line 2 including the recommended option B between Roseburn and Carrick Knowe was considered and supported by Planning Committee on 27 November.
- 6.1.17 To note that the concern expressed by Council under the amendment (No3) regarding various tram line 1 and 2 issues has been addressed within the main report.

Community Involvement

- 6.1.18 To approve that **tie** is instructed to create were appropriate community liaison groups and in the first instance groups should be established at Craighleith and Baird Drive.

6.2 Appraisal

- 6.2.1 To approve STAG2 appraisal for tram line 1 and that this should be submitted to Scottish Executive.
- 6.2.2 To approve STAG2 appraisal for tram line 2 and that this should be submitted to Scottish Executive.
- 6.2.3 To note that both tram lines 1 and 2 show a positive Net Present Value, and that the Benefit to Cost ratios are 1.51 for tram line 1 and 1.3 for tram line 2 which demonstrate that both lines are good value for money.
- 6.2.4 To approve the Environmental Statement for tram line 1 and to note that this is an accompanying document, which will be submitted with the Bill for line 1 to the Scottish Parliament.
- 6.2.5 To approve the Environmental Statement for tram line 1 and to note that this is an accompanying document, which will be submitted with the Bill for line 1 to the Scottish Parliament.
- 6.2.6 To approve the Preliminary Financial Case for tram line 1.
- 6.2.7 To approve the Preliminary Financial Case for tram line 2.

6.3 Risk Management

- 6.3.1 To note that **tie** has put in place a rigorous risk management system to address what can be a significant factor in such major capital projects.

6.4 Financial Assessment

- 6.4.1 To note that current estimates of capital cost for tram lines 1 and 2 are £243.0 million and £230.4 million respectively.
- 6.4.2 To note that capital and life-cycle costs will be market-tested next year and that the Council is under no obligation to proceed.
- 6.4.3 To note that the Scottish Executive have given a funding commitment of £375 million for the tram network subject to STAG and Business Case approval.
- 6.4.4 To note that present projections disclose a funding requirement beyond the current estimates of grant of £33 million for line 1 and £72 million for line 2 and it is hoped that this will be met by operational surpluses, commercial income, and property development gains and other public and private sector sources.
- 6.4.5 To note that in the event that funding was not ultimately sufficient the Council would retain control over the scope of the network to be constructed.
- 6.5.6 To approve the Estimate of Expense and Financial Statement for tram Lines 1 and 2.
- 6.4.7 To note that a final business case will be submitted to the Council in due course, following refinements to project costings and funding availability.

6.5 Powers

- 6.5.1 To approve the draft Bills for tram lines 1 and 2.

6.5.2 To note that a motion to formally approve the lodging of the Bills and supporting documentation for tram lines 1 and 2 will be presented to a special meeting of the Council on 22 December 2003.

6.5.3 To approve the system of Planning Prior Approvals.

Andrew Holmes
Director of City Development

Appendices	None	
Contact/tel	Ewan Kennedy – 0131-469-3575	
Wards affected	All	
Background Papers	Edinburgh Tram Line 1	
	Lower Granton Road Paper	Nov 03
	Craighleith Paper	Dec 03
	Starbank Options Paper	Dec 03
	Parliamentary Bill for Tram Line 1	Dec 03
	Preliminary Financial Case	Dec 03
	Estimate of Expense and Funding Statement	Dec 03
	Environmental Statement: Line 1	
	STAG 2 Appraisal: Line One	Nov 03
	STAG 2 Drawings: Line One	Nov 03
	Edinburgh Tram Line 2	
	Baird Drive Paper	
	Baird Drive – Residents letter	Nov 03
	Depot Report	Dec 03
	Station Road, Ratho Station – Letter to Residents	Nov 03
	Gogarburn Alignment Options	
	Parliamentary Bill for Tram Line 2	Dec 03
	Preliminary Financial Case	Dec 03
	Estimate of Expense and Funding Statement	Dec 03
	Environmental Statement: Line Two	
	STAG 2 Appraisal: Line Two	Dec 03
	STAG 2 Drawings: Line Two	Dec 03