

CITY DEVELOPMENT

TRANSPORT

Willie Gallagher

Chief Executive

tie Limited Citypoint

65 Haymarket Terrace

EDINBURGH

EH12 5HD

Date

03 April 2008

Our Ref

SS/1.1/HAB

Your Ref.

Corr No.

Dear Willie

EDINBURGH TRAM TECHNICAL APPROVALS AND QUALITY CONTROL ISSUES

Further to the letter of 28 March 2008 to you from David Leslie in CEC Planning raising concerns about the Prior Approval (PA) process I am writing to raise similar concerns about the Technical Approval (TA) process. I won't reiterate everything said in that letter, as the concerns are fundamentally the same, but I would like to highlight some specific issues.

The TA submission for the part-1C Section (South St David Street) generated seventeen (17) pages of issues, and CEC's timeous approval was given on the understanding that these be addressed. Many of the issues raised had been noted previously, some as far back as the Preliminary Design approval stage and many more came to light during the reviews which the conducted with SDS, and which were attended by CEC, TEL, Transdev, TSS, etc. So a good many of them are not new issues and my concern is not only that they have not been addressed previously but I conclude that they will not or indeed cannot now be addressed prior to issue of IFC drawings, given the timescales involved. I would welcome your thoughts on that.

CEC are currently drafting a similarly long list prompted by the TA submission for Section 1B (Leith Walk), but that submission has also brought to light more fundamental concerns. In particular there is a conflict between proposed OLE pole and traffic signal installations and this is particularly worrying as the submission purports to be a design which has undergone SDS's interdisciplinary design check (IDC) process, the very process which is meant to address such conflicts. Not only that but the Road Safety Audit (RSA) is an interim audit, so we have yet to receive the Stage 2 Audit. The upshot is that 1B is to be resubmitted with a revised design which addresses these conflicts and that resubmission should be accompanied by an associated RSA.

I also have to say/

DAVE ANDERSON

DIRECTOR

City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh EH1 1YJ





I also have to say that in the absence of a detailed specification for such things as traffic signal and lighting installations any approval at this stage can only ever be an approval in principle. My point being that as things stand at the moment it seems that these details will only surface after the construction contract is awarded, and that places CEC in a very difficult position. One way that *might* be resolved is if CEC issue a specification but as I understand it the contractual arrangements with BBS are such that they would not be bound to accept or adhere to that. Please correct me if that's not the case.

This is not to forget that SDS note that the design submissions are "based on geometric layouts that have been previously tested" but that the final traffic modelling is "on-going". So it has to be understood that the modelling which has yet to be undertaken may identify modifications which are required to be made and it has always been recognised that this could and probably will impact on the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) design. And of course any changes to those may well require the Stage 2 Audit to be revisited.

Finally I should note that not least of CEC's problems are that there are conflicts between the Prior Approval and the Technical Approval submissions. So while we are all doing what we can to achieve the delivery programme, as my colleague in Planning stated, I would hope that the above examples explain the predicament CEC find themselves in. And as Planning noted we clearly need to resolve this as a matter of some urgency.

Yours sincerely



c.c Dave Anderson, Director of City Development
Marshall Poulton, Head of Transport, City Development
David Leslie, Development Management Manager, Planning, City Development