



EDINBURGH TRAM Highlight Report to the Chief Executive's Internal Planning Group 25 November 2009



1



1 Background

This 'highlight report' is an update to the Chief Executive's Internal Planning Group (IPG) on the Edinburgh Tram Project to inform on the progress on this project and any decisions required.

A version of this report (with commercially sensitive and confidential material removed) is also to be circulated within the Council as a means of communicating progress with the Tram project.

2 Executive Summary

2.1 Matters Arising

Evaluation of Financial Contingency Measures, Strategic Options and Financial update

An update is provided on the financial contingency measures, including truncation and the Council's £45m contribution.

Tram Monitoring Officer Update

An update on the Dispute Resolution Process (DRP) including a summary of DRPs is provided along with information about the re-opening of Princes Street on Sunday 29 November.

Communications Update

Information is provided on the communications being undertaken for the re-opening of Princes Street, the joint winter promotion and the recent Councillor visits to the work sites.

Picardy Place Development Opportunity

An update on development opportunities on the Picardy Place gyratory is provided.

Tram Legal Agreement with Forth Ports

The legal agreement between the Council and Forth Ports remains a difficult issue and further meetings are being held to resolve this within the next two weeks.

Statutory Council Approvals and Consents

As the detailed design continues, there are several statutory consents that the Council must provide. These include Planning Prior Approvals, Building Warrants, Roads and Structures Technical Approvals.

Building Fixings

Good progress has been made with the court action for the building fixings. It is likely that only one objector will require a full Court hearing, which will take place on 15 December.

Land Acquisition and Certificate(s) of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD)
Progress has been made to clarify how tram CAAD applications will be dealt with, and a process has been agreed with all those involved.





Constitution Street Wall

A programme for the design, demolition and reconstruction of the South Leith Parish Church is awaited from **tie ltd**. Preparations are underway to seek powers from the Sheriff Court to exhume the graves that are adjacent to the wall.

Planned Future Tram Council Reports

A list of planned future tram related Council reports is provided.

Opportunities for Joint Working

The tram project could benefit from greater joint working between **tie ltd** and the Council to achieve greater use of the one-family resources. Some opportunities exist, but would require senior engagement to convert these.

The Power Supply Contract for the tram system

tie Itd is currently tendering the supply of the tram power. There is a considerable amount of political interest in this and consideration will need to be given on how this is best dealt with.

2.2 Matters to Note or for a Decision

- To note the update on the financial contingency measures.
- To note the Tram Monitoring Officers update on DRP and the programme for completion of the tram works on Princes Street.
- To note the communications update.
- To note the work that is ongoing to minimise the future traffic disruption when the hotel is constructed.
- To note the position with regard to the legal agreement with Forth Ports (FP) and that the Director of City Development is meeting FP to conclude matters within the next two weeks.
- To note the progress with the Statutory Approvals and consents.
- To note the good progress with building fixings.
- To note the position regarding land acquisition and CAAD applications.
- To note the update on the Constitution Street graveyard wall.
- To note the planned future tram related Council reports.
- To note the opportunities for Joint Working between tie ltd and the Council and to decide
 if this should be pursued further.
- To note that tie Itd are currently tendering the supply of the power for the tram system.
 There has been a lot of political interest in using renewable energy the IPG need to decide how best to deal with the reporting of this.





3 Evaluation of Financial Contingency Measures, Strategic Options and Financial Update (Presented by Alan Coyle)

Contingency Planning

As highlighted in previous reports, Finance have now commenced work on identifying and evaluating contingency planning options should the capital cost of Phase 1a exceed the amount of funding currently available.

Transport Scotland has been informed of the initial areas the Council will look to in the event that costs exceed the current funding. The range presented to Transport Scotland was between a 5% and 10% increase in costs over the available funding of £545m.

This scenario would require prudential borrowing of £27m-£55m. The resulting revenue impact would be between £2.3m-£4.6m per annum. These borrowing costs could be funded from future TEL profits or through the Council's revenue budget.

The work on contingency planning will continue into the New Year as the cost range for Phase1a narrows as a result of DRP items being completed and the more positive engagement with BSC yields results. The intervening period will allow time for a robust assessment of TEL profit levels and other potential funding.

Truncation

The report to the IPG on the 28 October detailed information provided by **tie Itd** on a range of strategic options relating to scope truncation. In the intervening period since the last IPG some work has been done to further assess the financial impact of these savings. The revised potential savings highlighted under each of the truncation options are;

A) Truncation at Ocean Terminal - Estimated Gross capex savings £12.5m

These gross savings would be offset by loss of profits and additional alteration costs of £3.4m yielding estimated Net savings of £9.1m.

B) Truncation at Bernard Street – Estimated Gross capex savings £33.8m

These gross savings would be offset by loss of profits and additional alteration costs of £7.4m yielding estimated Net savings of £26.4m.

C) Truncation at Picardy Place – Estimates Gross capex savings £66m

These gross savings would be offset by loss of profits and additional alteration costs of £17m yielding estimated Net savings of £49m.

It should be noted that these truncation options would impact the TEL Business Plan to varying degrees with catastrophic impacts should the line be truncated at Picardy Place.





Finance Update

The latest cost estimate put forward by **tie ltd** for Phase 1a is £524m plus a range of risk items, pending the outcome of a commercially agreed programme and the outcome of negotiations on disputed items. Detail of the individual items relating to the £524m + "X "are highlighted in Appendix 3 of this report.

The £524m does not take account of sunk costs relating to the decision to postpone Phase 1b. These sunk costs total £6.2m, therefore the estimated base cost is £530.2m. The items relating to "X" total £65.1m. A range of potential opportunities have been identified that would reduce the total estimated cost by £23.6m. Taking all these numbers into account would suggest a base case estimate of £595.8m falling to £572.2m should the range of opportunities be crystallised.

Council's £45m Contribution

There has been further progress in the period on the Council's £45m contribution. £570k has now been received from Scottish Widows for their development at Fountainbridge/Semple Street. This takes the Council's achieved contribution to £15.7m.

The Council's financial strategy means the Council have to fund its contribution in advance of recovering the funding from developers and capital receipts. Therefore, the Council have now contributed a total of £29.6m to the project – the difference of £13.9m is currently being funded through the Council cash flow management.

4 Tram Monitoring Officer (TMO) Update (Presented by Marshall Poulton) The table below provides a summary of the Dispute Resolution Process (DRP).

The approximate value of each DRP is noted below (though it should be noted that the value of a DRP principle may significantly differ from the value of the DRP dispute itself). There has been an improvement in engagement between tie Itd and BSC, principally due to the relationship developing between Richard Jeffrey and David Darcy (BB). As a result some items previously programmed for adjudication have now been agreed and other items have been put on hold. The main commercial issues outstanding are agreement on Extension of Time 2 and agreement on the commercial programme. tie Itd and BSC have also agreed that there will be no further items relating to Base Date Design/Issued for Construction Drawing items referred to DRP as a result of more constructive engagement between the parties. Issues currently awaiting the adjudicators result should be allowed to run their course. In addition, tie Itd and BSC have agreed a timetable through to the end of February to produce a revised commercially agreed programme. The dispute put forward by BSC on MUDFA delay has also been put on hold to use the time more constructively to discuss programme related issues.

In the period BSC have supplied tie Itd with a series of start dates for work on both on and off street sections.





BSC Dispute Summary

Case Number	DRP Item	Stat us	Summary Description	tie view	BSC View	Delta	Outcome/ Financial Impact	Notes
				£k	£k	£k	£k	
4	3	С	Hilton Car Park	S.A.	48.7	48.7	2	Adjudication was completed on this dispute on 13th October 2009 in favour of tie
5	4	S	Extension of Time 1 - True and proper valuation of tie change order 1 in connection with change from v26 to v31 of the programme	1,823.1	6,987.6	5,164.5	3,500.0	tie had made a provision of £2.5m in their latest cost estimates for EOT1. This was eventually settled without the need to go to adjudication at £3.5m
6a	5а	С	Gogarburn Bridge		313.1	313.1	313.1	The adjudicator found in favour of BSC on this issue and rejected tie's argument on the principle of Design development on this issue. The final amount of the settlement is yet to be agreed.
6b	5b	С	Carrickknowe Bridge	71.8	339.0	267.3	267.3	The adjudicator found in favour of BSC on this issue and rejected tie's argument on the principle of Design development on this issue. The final amount of the settlement is yet to be agreed.
6c	5c	1	Russell Road retaining wall	701.5	4,597.8	3,896.4	5	BSC view, Temp works £1.156m, Perm works £1.565, Perm work (contaminated material) £1.876m – Adjudicators decision expected 17 th December 2009.
21	A	ı	Delays arising from MUDFA programme Rev 8					This item has been put on hold. Tie have acknowledged to BSC that MUDFA has caused delay. This item is wrapped up in the EOT2 discussion. Tie have made an interim proposal to BSC on EOT2 granting BSC 9 months of damages and 6 months on cost. This remains within the assessment tie have made for EOT2.
	5f	S	Haymarket Viaduct	25.3	399.7	374.4	185.0	The true and proper entitlement to additional payment as a consequence of the matters particularised in Infraco notification of tie change number 112 dated 16 September 2008. This item was settled at £180k.
23	13	S	Depot Drainage	436.9	1,318.2	881.3	130.0	This dispute concerns the works associated with the external drainage at the deport. Infraco seeks to be reimbursed for all the works identified as differences between BDDI drawings and the IFC drawings on a measured basis. This item was settled at £130k
				23,217.5	44,948.7	21,731.2		

O=Outgoing P=Proposed I=Incoming C=Complete S=Settled





Princes Street Works

Several meetings have taken place with **tie ltd** regarding the re-opening of Princes Street to buses taxis and cycles on Sunday 29 November at 5am. There remains a significant amount of construction work to be undertaken by BSC and **tie ltd** have prepared plans to ensure that the works are complete on time. Localised contingency measures have been developed, however it is also worth noting that there is no float in their programme for severe weather.

To ensure Princes Street is opened on time, it will be necessary to re-programme some minor works until the New Year, but these works should not require buses to be diverted and will be able to be carried out under localised lane closures.

A series of 4-hourly progress meeting are being planned over the weekend of 28/29 November with **tie ltd**, BSC, Lothian Buses, Police and the Council to ensure that progress can be monitored and co-ordinated remedial action undertaken as quickly as possible. This mimics the successful operational procedure that was used when buses were removed from Princes Street in February.

Transport staff will also be deployed as traffic monitors on Monday 30 November and Tuesday 1 December to monitor the traffic and take swift remedial action as appropriate.

The table below notes the progress made on Princes Street as of 23 November.

Location	Road Construction	Blacktop	Setts	Lining	Footpath Paving
Sth Charlotte	60%	40%	25%	0%	NB 75%
Street to Lothian Road					SB 0%
Charlotte Street	100%	100%	95%	95%	NB 80%
to Castle Street					SB 70%
Castle Street to	100%	100%	95%	95%	NB 100%
Frederick Street					SB 80%
Frederick Street	60%	60%	Centr/reserve west	0%	NB 100%
to the Mound			100%		SB 20%
			Centr/reserve east 0%		
			Track 60%		
Mound to South	100%	SB 100%	97%	30%	NB 80%
St David Street		binder			SB 80%
		NB 75% wearing			
South St David	95%	80% base	85%	0%	NB 75%
Street to Waverley Bridge		30% binder			SB 50%





5 Communications Update (Presented by Isabell Reid)

Re-opening of Princes Street

Come into Town

This campaign is focussed on alerting local residents, businesses, commuters and visitors to Edinburgh that buses are returning to Princes Street and telling people where they can catch their buses from the end of November. The campaign is also promoting the Council's annual parking promotion as detailed above. The target audiences are within Edinburgh and the surrounding areas. Activity around this campaign includes:

City Gateways: Posters alerting people to the revised traffic management on Princes Street and the winter parking promotion are being erected at the airport, bus station and Haymarket and Waverley Stations this week.

Press Advertising: There will be press advertising starting Thursday 19 November in the Edinburgh Evening News, West Lothian Courier, Metro, Midlothian Advertiser, Lothian Times, Midlothian Times, Peebles, Musselburgh News, East Lothian News and Lothian Times East Edition. This will run weekly for the next four weeks.

Radio Advertising: Three adverts are being produced, one on the buses return to Princes Street which will run prior to 29 November and one encouraging shoppers to park in town for free after 5.30pm weekdays and 1pm on Saturdays, before and after New Year until the end of the promotion on January 10. Coverage will be on Forth, Galaxy and Borders radio stations.

Leaflet: Will include a map of where to catch your bus on Princes Street and details of the parking promotion. This will be handed out by a street team, primarily at bus stops along George Street and the surrounding area in the week prior to the buses returning to Princes Street. 100,000 copies are being distributed by a team of ten concentrating on those exiting buses on George Street from Monday 23 November.

Websites: A dedicated page on the Council's website has been created to provide information on bus routes and the full list of streets included within the parking promotion. This address is www.edinburgh.gov.uk/comeintotown. There is also web advertising on scotsman.com and times online starting today.

Ancillary advertising: Consideration is being given to installing vinyl wraps in empty shop units at the West End.

Media: Edinburgh Trams and the Council are working on a joint media schedule for the reopening of Princes Street. Edinburgh Trams will lead on the pre-activity including the 'countdown' and there will be a joint media release on the handover. The Council will assume responsibility for post-handover communications including any arising traffic management issues.





Funding: The Council's transport section are funding £16,000 of the loss in parking revenue. Essential Edinburgh are giving £20,000 to fund the rest of the shortfall. Economic Development are contributing £20,000 towards the marketing and advertising costs with **tie Itd** funding £14,000 primarily for the radio campaign and on-street distribution of the leaflet.

Open for Business marketing

A two week Real Radio promotion commenced on Monday 16 November to promote shopping in Edinburgh, this includes competition prizes from retailers and will include *Come into Town* messaging.

A special Christmas edition of the lifestyle/shopping magazine EH Living has been produced. Again this includes *Come into Town* messaging.

Joint winter promotion

There has been an intrinsic link between the Princes Street tram works and the start of Edinburgh's Christmas programme. In light of this the marketing effort to ensure shoppers and visitors make the most of the festive offering has been undertaken in a more coordinated way across all the agencies involved in winter promotion. For example both Essential Edinburgh and Edinburgh Trams have given direct funding to Edinburgh's Christmas for additional on-street activity over the opening weekend of Edinburgh's Christmas.

While this co-ordination has been valuable, it has had drawbacks with the number of people involved. If this is replicated in future years then pre-planning will be vital to ensure best value form the agencies involved.

Tram mock-up public display

The tram mock-up has been situated outside the Rutland bar at the West End. It will soon move to the Gyle Shopping Centre.

Councillor Visits

Councillors Dawe, Lowrie, Dundas, Morris, McKay, Hawkins and Thomas were all taken on tours of the Princes Street tram site in recent weeks. Feedback has been very positive with comments including: "It was great to see real progress being made with the tram works; useful to see first hand the scale of the challenges which the engineers are faced with; and thrilling to see the final vision taking shape. I am confident that the pace of observable progress will pick up in the coming months and early next year and trigger a fresh enthusiasm amongst the public for the finished product." From Councillor Dundas.

Future planning

Discussions have commenced between **tie Itd** and the Council on communicating future works to stakeholders, the wider public and the media. When a firm schedule has been produced more detailed planning will be undertaken.





6 Picardy Place - Development Opportunity (Presented by Andy Conway)

Following the direction last month, further discussions with Henderson Global International (HGI) has been undertaken and HGI are prepared to confirm the hotel servicing requirements and have agreed to liaise with **tie ltd** and the Council on minimising any traffic management impact. It may be possible to implement some works before the next phase of the tram works, but that will not be known until the scope of the hotel utility diversions are confirmed.

7 Tram Legal Agreement with Forth Ports (Presented by Dave Anderson)

Further meetings have taken place with Forth Ports (FP) to conclude the tram legal agreement. FP are reluctant to sign the agreement until there is a formal conclusion with the overall Section 75 agreement for the whole of redevelopment of Leith Docks. Discussions are underway with a view to concluding the agreement with FP and the Director of City Development is meeting with Charles Hammond later this week to pursue this. It is planned that the tram agreements will be concluded within the next two weeks.

8 Statutory Council Approvals and Consents (Presented by Andy Conway)

The table below provides an updated summary position on all the necessary approvals required from the Council for the tram project. A further detailed breakdown is attached as Appendix 1.

CEC Statutory Council Approvals and Consents	Total Number of Submissions	Total number of Approvals	% Complete
Prior Approval	64	61	95%
Full Planning Permission	10	8	80%
Listed Building Consent	11	11	100%
Scheduled Monument Consent	1	1	100%
Building Warrant	18	15	83%
Technical Approvals (including Structures, Roads and Drainage)	126	106	84%
Total	230	202	88%

9 Building Fixings (Presented by Colin Mackenzie)

Good progress continues to be made with the building fixings consents following the initial hearing with the Sheriff Court. Preparations are underway to present the Council's case at the evidentiary hearing on 15 December with Mr & Mrs Webster (the owners of 4-6 Athol Place.

The only other likely Court appearance will be from Mr Di Resta from 8-12 Shandwick Place and papers were lodged with the Sheriff Court on 2 November, however there are indications that Mr Di Resta will withdraw his objection without the need for further Court action. The remaining outstanding consents are likely to be resolved by negotiation.





10 Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD) (Presented by Andy Conway)

Since the last report meetings have been held between valuers in Corporate Property and the District Valuers to review the likely CPO compensation where property has development potential. The Tram Acts contain useful clarity on 'betterment' in the CPO compensation clauses. It is anticipated this work stream will confirm that most claims based on future development potential will be fully offset by betterment on adjacent land retained by the claimant. This particularly applies at the Airport.

Legal Services are continuing to consider the validity of the application by CALA for a CAAD on the site at Ocean Drive in Forth Ports.

Following the receipt of a second CAAD application, from BAM for a site at Haymarket Yards, further efforts to improve the processing of CAAD applications is proposed, and the Director of City Development has planned an internal meeting to ensure appropriate action is taken.

Appendix 4 details the plots which are expected to be subject to CAAD applications aimed at confirming development value.

11 Constitution Street Wall (Presented by Andy Conway)

A programme is awaited from **tie ltd** on the design, demolition and reconstruction of the South Leith Parish church graveyard wall. Preparations are underway developing an application to the Sheriff Court for powers to exhume the graves that are adjacent to the wall should this be required.

The Council has written to the church informing them of the proposed works and are currently setting up a meeting to provide them with further detailed information and to seek their views on the final design of the new wall.

Once the final design of the new wall is complete, the impact on the Council's budget or the tram budget will be reviewed and possible funding options confirmed. Phased construction will also be considered at that stage to minimise any cash flow implications.





12 Planned Future Tram Council Reports (Presented by Andy Conway)

The table below identifies the planned tram related Council reports. There needs to be some consideration to the future of the Tram Sub-Committee as very few meetings have been called and tram reports have been considered at other Committees e.g. Policy and Strategy.

		20	09						20	10						
		Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
1	Update on governance - conclusion of Stage 1															
2	DRP progress, including costs and programme implications															
3	Lothian Buses transfer proposals															
4	Lothian Buses transfer - approval of final arrangements															
5	Remuneration Strategy (for all Council companies) - does this include TEL and tie Itd															
6	Tram Traffic Regulation Orders															
7	Magdala area traffic calming															
8	Consultation on the future pedestrianisation of Princes Street, plus update on the success of winter festivals embargo.			15												

Key

Full Council
Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee
Policy and Strategy
Tram Sub Committee

13 Opportunities for Joint Working

This area was subject of a report to Council senior management highlighting a number of opportunities where the tram project could benefit from greater joint working between the Council and **tie ltd** or where Council staff could have a greater involvement working on the project to achieve greater use of one-family resources and provide the opportunity for cost savings. The following areas were examined;





Engineering - Discussions have taken place between the Tram Project Director and the Head of Transport regarding synergies in the Engineering area. As a result of these discussions some possibilities have been identified that will provide the opportunity to make cost savings and ensure that staff from the Council will have greater visibility of the issues on site. While this is positive, it is thought that there may be greater opportunities for one family working in this area.

Communications and Stakeholder Management/Finance and IT – There have been no discussions on the potential of one-family working in these areas with tie Itd. Opportunities do exist, though would require senior engagement to convert these opportunities.

The IPG need to decide if this should be pursued further.

14 The power supply contract for the tram system

tie Itd are currently preparing the competitive tender process for the commissioning and supply of the power source for the Tram project. There has been a considerable amount of political interest in this issue, particularly around the use of renewable sources. The Council Leader has previously stated in Council meetings that the source of the tram power will be decided by the Council. tie Itd take the view that it will be the Tram Project Board who will have the final decision because of the commercial impact it will have on TEL and there is a need to reconcile this position.

The tender process will evaluate all suitable sources and it will be undertaken competitively. Once the tendering process is complete, it is recommended that an update on that process is provided to full Council at an appropriate time.

The IPG need to decide how best to deal with the reporting of this issue.

List of Appendices:

- 1 Statutory Council Approvals Tables 1 and 2
- 2 Statutory Council Approvals Tracker
- 3 Breakdown of Latest Cost Estimate
- 4 Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD)



Statutory Council Approvals

Summary Table

CEC Statutory Council Approvals and Consents	Total Number of Submissions	Total number of Approvals	% Complete
Prior Approval	64	61	95%
Full Planning Permission	10	8	80%
Listed Building Consent	11	11	100%
Scheduled Monument Consent	1	1	100%
Building Warrant	18	15	83%
Technical Approvals (including Structures, Roads and Drainage)	126	106	84%
Total	230	202	88%

Table 1 - Planning and Building Warrant Approvals

CURRENT STATUS	Sub Totals	Prior Approval	Full Planning Permission	Listed Building Consent	Scheduled Monument Consent	Building Warrant
Informal consultation not started	5	3	1	o	0	1
Informal consultation started	1	0	0	0	0	1
Application submitted	2	0	1	0	0	1
Approval granted	96	61	8	11	1	15
GRAND TOTAL and Sub Totals	104	64	10	11	1	18
% Complete	92%	95%	80%	100%	100%	83%

Table 2 - Roads & Structures Technical Approvals

CURRENT STATUS	Sub Totals	CEC Technical Approval	*Network Rail Form A	*SW Drainage Outfall Consent	*SNH	*BAA Approval	Roads Construction Consent
TA delayed due to recent change	0	.0	0	0	0	0	0
Issued for informal consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Issued for Technical Approval	16	10	1	4		0	1
Technical Approval Granted	106	84	11	10	1		
Not Yet Due	4	3	0	0	0	1	1
Delay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL and Sub Totals	126	97	12	14	1	1	1
% Complete	84%	86%	92%	71%	100%	0%	0%

^{*} These consents are not CEC's responsibility, but for completeness they have been included as they are required to allow construction to commence.



APPENDIX 2

Prior A	Approvals	Status	3		Approved by CEC	IFC	
Section	Batch	CEC Delay	SDS/ TIE/ BSC Delay	Activity ID	Current forecast (live)	v31	Notes
1	1/02a			Ocean Terminal Bypass Road	TBC		Forth Port require the design to be changed to accommodate their floorplan of a proposed future building. Agreed with Director of City Development on 13/10/09.
5A	5/05c			29 Roseburn Street – JB McLean (Building Warrant)			Pending Consideration. BSC to provide information to SDS. Target date TBC
	5/23			Redesign of Retaining Wall/Roseb urn Street Bridge			Application on hold. tie to provide 'as built' details
5C	5/30			Tram Stop Gogarburn	11/09/2008	11/09/2008	Awaiting concept design comments from tie.
7	7/29a			Airport Kiosk – Full PP			Following meeting 15/08 change is on hold. tie to confirm final scope of works
	7/29b			Airport Kiosk – Building Warrant			SDS to confirm with CEC scope of Building Warrant

Technical Approvals Status - Structures

				Approved by CEC	IFC	
Section	CEC Delay	SDS/ TIE/ BSC Delay	Activity ID	Current forecast (live)	v31	Notes
			S22B Balgreen			SDS has responded to NR concerns. NR is re-evaluating its points following clarification and will provide a response. Potential meeting required
5A			Road NR Access Bridge	?	16/01/2009	dependent on NR response.

Technical Approvals Status - Roads & Drainage

	**	24	å SS		Approved by CEC	IFC	
Section		CEC Delay	SDS/ TIE/ BSC Delay	Activity ID	Current forecast (live)	v31	Notes
1A3	Roads & Drainage				28/08/2009	21/01/2009	TA ongoing
101	Roads & Drainage						On hold awaiting drainage design/revised RSA
3A	Roads & Drainage				31/10/09	?	Progressing application in accordance with priority list
3B	Roads & Drainage				31/10/09	?	Progressing application in accordance with priority list
3C	Roads & Drainage				31/10/09	?	Progressing application in accordance with priority list

Breakdown of Latest Cost Estimate

Edinburgh Tram Project

Source; tie P3 0910 Consolidation

599.5

June 09 Base	£m
tie PM	44.0
Other Resources	29.7
SDS	27.0
Infraco (BB & S)	248.7
Tramco	58.2
MUDFA	53.3
All else (incl land)	36.1
Base Costs	497.0
Burned Risk/Unrealised savings;	
Picardy Place	3.0
MUDFA	6.8
SDS & Approvals	4.4
	511.2
Delay - EOT2 and future	5.0
Ground Related	2.0
Road Reconstruction	1.0
Deliverability of VE	2.0
Other risks/contingency	3.3
	524.5
Sunk 1b Related costs	
Design	3.0
Loss of economies of scale	3.2
Assumed Base	530.7

x = Basket of Potential Risks/unapproved increases as at	
04/11/09	£m
Delay - EOT1	3.5
Delay - EOT2 and future	17.5
Design (Incl BDDI to IFC)	20.8
Ground Related	6.6
Road Reconstruction	6.7
Client inst / other changes	3.0
Burnside Road	1.8
Deliverability of VE	4.3
Other risks/contingency (net of cell C28)	0.9
MUDFA Valuation of Change	3.7
// -	68.8

£524m + X current view

Upside Opportunities	£m
Delay - EOT2 and future	(4.3)
Design (Incl BDDI to IFC)	(10.0)
Ground Related	(3.0)
Road Reconstruction	(1.5)
Other risks/contingency Picardy Place Provisional	(1.8)
Sum Opportunity	(3.0)
	(23.6
£524m + X current view less	

Trends/Impacts and Risks

APPENDIX 3

Risk Forensic review to be undertaken in next 4-6 weeks

MUDFA Betterment/Deferment not yet secured of £4.225m included in MUDFA numbers. Further risk identified in relation to Valuation of Change.

EOT 2 £17.5m allowed for is for a full years delay to tie's account

BDDI to IFC tie optimistic that around half of the allowance will be required

Road Reconstruction This number could trend up. V/E opportunities in Princes St have not been captured due to Supplemental Agreement.

Client Instructed Changes Figure reduced due to double counts in BDDI to IFC item and reducing estimates.

Infraco Defeased leasing opportunity built into Infraco number - unlikely to be realised.

APPENDIX 4

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION

RISKS TO LAND BUDGET FROM PLANNING ISSUES

LOCATION	PLOT NO	AREA (m2)	DV VALUE	PLANNING BASIS	PLANNING/ CAAD RISK	RISK VALUE	COST RISK	ADDITION AL FEES	ADDITIONAL INTEREST	TOTAL AT RISK	BUDGET RISK
FORTH	47										
PORTS	47	500	040,000	Taran Danier I consider	202120401	04 500 000	0050 000	000 000	0400.050	04.040.050	04 000 050
	48	566	£10,000	Trans Reserv/ amenity	residential	£1,500,000 incl in	£250,000	£30,000	£130,356	£1,910,356	£1,900,356
u u	49	310		Trans Reserv/ amenity	residential	above					
HAYMARKET						y			-1		
YARDS	516	206	357505547	Trans Reserv/ amenity	office/business	£0		po trantegratura		y Systematical Art Statement	9400090 2000
"	517	1056	£28,750	Trans Reserv/ amenity	office/business	£250,000	£75,000	£5,000	£21,726	£351,726	£322,976
л	518	1000	£50,000	Trans Reserv/ amenity	office/business	£250,000	£75,000	£5,000	£21,726	£351,726	£301,726
u	523	1245	£45,104	Trans Reserv/ amenity	office/business	£250,000	£75,000	£5,000	£21,726	£351,726	£306,622
GYLE	478	1966	£57,500	Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£1,000,000	£50,000	£20,000	£86,904	£1,156,904	£1,099,404
ii ii	479	111	£1,150	Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£60,000	£50,000	£1,200	£5,214	£116,414	£115,264
ж	480	69		Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£35,000	£50,000	£700	£3,041	£88,742	£88,742
	481	5619	£33,580	Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£3,000,000	£50,000	£60,000	£260,712	£3,370,712	£3,337,132
u	482	1196		Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£600,000	£50,000	£12,000	£52,142	£714,142	£714,142
н	483	3152	£14,407	Trans Reserv/ amenity	retail	£1,600,000	£50,000	£32,000	£139,046	£1,821,046	£1,806,639
AIRPORT/A8	495	505	£7,266	hope value	hope value	£100,000	£50,000	£2,000	£8,690	£160,690	£153,424
31.	496	10724	£153,841	hope value	hope value	£450,000	£50,000	£9,000	£39,106	£548,107	£394,266
ii ii	497	25817	£213,645	hope value	hope value	£1,100,000	£50,000	£22,000	£95,594	£1,267,594	£1,053,949
ж.	259	14551	£86,430	hope value	hope value	£600,000	£50,000	£12,000	£52,142	£714,142	£627,712
ii ii	499	41805	£779,174	hope value	hope value	£2,100,000	£50,000	£42,000	£182,498	£2,374,498	£1,595,324
ж	498	16016	-	hope value BAA?	hope value	£650,000	£50,000	£13,000	£56,487	£769,488	£769,488
	273	4418	£115,000	hope value	hope value	£250,000	£50,000	£5,000	£21,726	£326,726	£211,726
Э.Н.	289	1188	£69,000	hope value	hope value	£120,000	£50,000	£2,400.00	£10,428.48	£182,828	£113,828
SH .	291	8046	£175,000	hope value	hope value	£850,000	£50,000	£17,000.00	£73,868.40	£990,868	£815,868
ii .	303	10064	£150,000	hope value	hope value	£1,100,000	£50,000	£22,000.00	£95,594.40	£1,267,594	£1,117,594
ж	312	17728	£180,000	hope value	hope value	£1,800,000	£50,000	£36,000.00	£156,427.20	£2,042,427	£1,862,427
W.	318	5616	£100,000	hope value	hope value	£600,000	£50,000	£12,000.00	£52,142.40	£714,142	£614,142
	322	29477	£550,000	hope value	hope value	£3,000,000	£50,000	£60,000.00	£260,712.00	£3,370,712	£2,820,712
iii	327	3360	£75,000	hope value	hope value	£450,000	£50,000	£9,000.00	£39,106.80	£548,107	£473,107
	TOTALS		£2,894,847			£21,715,000	£1,475,000	£434,300	£1,887,120	£25,511,420	£22,616,573

Notes

1 No allowances for Injurious Affection

2 No allowances for severance

3 No offset for betterment

4 No allowance for change of Planning

CALA

FORTH RISK OF ADVERSE CAAD REQUIRING REVISED BASIS OF CAAD being considered HAYMARKET RISK OF ADVERSE CAAD REQUIRING REVISED BASIS OF BAM CAAD being

YARDS VALUATION considered

RISK FROM CHANGING PLANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR SHOPPING CENTRES PERMITTING ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT THEREFORE INCREASED

GYLE VALUATION

ONGOING PLANNING DISCUSSIONS INCREASING HOPE VALUE PLUS CHANGE OF PLANNING CONSENT WITHIN 10 YEAR PERIOD ALLOWS

AIRPORT/A8 CLAIMANT TO REVISIT CLAIM

GENERAL CONSIDERABLE EXPOSURE TO COSTS FOR CAADS, LANDS TRIBUNAL AND COURT REFERRALS

ADDITIONAL SETTLEMENTS ALSO RESULT IN ADDITIONAL FEES AND INTEREST PAYMENTS

CLAIMS WEST

LODGED CRAIGS £8,500,000

NIL £11,500,000

BAM £2,000,000

CALA £1,500,000