

• EDINBURGH •

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

FAX SHEET

City Development Department
PO Box 12474
1 Cockburn street
Edinburgh
EH1 1ZL

URGENT

Tel: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]

To: *Andrew Callander*

Fax: [REDACTED]

Date: *10/12/03*

Time: *11-00am*

Pages: *3* (including this sheet)

From: *Ewan Kenny*

Tel: [REDACTED]

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

Andrew → as discussed.

Barry Cross

From: "Andrew Burns" <andrew.burns@edinburgh.gov.uk>
To: "Barry Cross" <barry.cross@edinburgh.gov.uk>; "Ian Mathie" <ian.mathie@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 December 2003 10:25
Subject: NOT FOR CIRCULATION Fw: Trams - Line 1 - Craighleith Option
 Barry / Ian

I'm sure you've seen Alison Bourne's earlier e-mail, of last night, asking why we didn't ask about the claimed 'glaring factual inaccuracies'?? She has now sent a second e-mail (see below) to all Councillors. I haven't responded on the content other than to say I've asked for an update on this second e-mail.

I know this is probably the last thing you need but I would like to be able to respond before the Full Council meeting tomorrow - and copy that response around all Councillors so they have an update on her 'claims'. Could you draft a shot suggested reply on each of her points below and send it over and I could then forward it??

PLEASE just shout if you feel responding would be unwise and/or if you will struggle to put such together today?

Andrew

Councillor Andrew Burns
 Executive Member for Transport & Public Realm
 (and Councillor for Moat Ward)
 Tel: [REDACTED]
 Fax: [REDACTED]
 Mob: [REDACTED]

Investing in Travel Improvements
 read how at: www.ititime.com
 Moat Ward and further transport info.
 at: www.andrewburns.labour.co.uk

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED] Bourne
To: [lesley hinds](#); [steve cardownie](#); [donald anderson](#); [ian perry](#); [william fitzpatrick](#); [elizabeth maginnis](#); [trevor davies](#); [dougie kerr](#); [gordon munro](#); [phil attridge](#); [ricky henderson](#); [eric milligan](#); [andrew burns](#); [donald wilson](#); [kingsley thomas](#); [lorna shiels](#); [chris wigglesworth](#); [robert cairns](#); [bill cunningham](#); [shami khan](#); [ewan aitken](#); [lawrence marshall](#); [maureen child](#); [brian fallon](#); [frank russell](#); [andrew scobbie](#); [ian murray](#); [sheila gilmore](#); [kenneth harrold](#); [jack o'donnell](#); [john longstaff](#); [george grubb](#); [jim lowrie](#); [robert aldridge](#); [paul edie](#); [tom ponton](#); [jenny dawe](#); [phil wheeler](#); [marjorie thomas](#); [sue tritton](#); [marilyne maclaren](#); [david walker](#); [fred mackintosh](#); [gordon mackenzie](#); [allan laing](#); [alastair paisley](#); [kate mackenzie](#); [iain whyte](#); [allan jackson](#); [james gilchrist](#); [michael dixon](#); [david quest](#); [george hunter](#); [brian meek](#); [mark mcinnes](#); [elaine aitken](#); [ian berry](#)
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2003 9:51 AM
Subject: Trams - Line 1 - Craighleith Option

Dear Councillor

You may remember that I spoke at the last full Council meeting, on behalf of residents of the Groathill area, regarding the above and, specifically in relation to serving the Western General Hospital.

You may further recall that, during that speech, I detailed a meeting which we had attended with Councillors Burns and Davies on 3 November at which it was elicited that TIE/Mott McDonald, in their "exhaustive" research of 63 route options, had failed to identify Craighleith Road as a route which would serve the hospital - a recognised key destination. This discovery was made entirely due to two local residents who had noticed certain inconsistencies in correspondence with TIE during the consultation.

10/12/03

CEC02082850_0002

We have now had sight of the "Craigleith Report" and, what a surprise, there appear to be factual inaccuracies contained therein! As the Councillors are being asked to decide the Craigleith Option on 11 December, we are anxious that you be aware of these inaccuracies prior to the meeting taking place. We feel that, given the importance and clear public support of the hospital, as detailed in Section 5 of TIE's consultation report, it is essential that the Council have accurate information before them when making this decision.

1. At Section 1.2.3 of the report, TIE/City Development have stated that the width of Craigleith Road is 12.5m and that "land take from adjacent properties may also be required". We have been out with our tape measures and have established that there is, indeed, a "pinch-point" of 12.5m but, for approximately 95% of its length, the correct measurement should be 21.5m. Craigleith Road is, indeed, as we said previously, a wide sweeping boulevard and certainly considerably wider than, say, Starbank Road or Constitution Street (17m max/13m average). Why should there require to be any land take, other than as detailed at Point 3 below? We feel this is just scaremongering on the part of TIE/City Development.

2. In the same section, the report states "Crewe Road South is not sufficiently wide to accommodate segregated running and the tram would therefore have to share with existing traffic". It is worth noting that whilst one side (the WGH) of Crewe Road South is built up, the other is not. Telford College is due to move and its old site will be redeveloped. Fettes College grounds and Police Headquarters grounds take up the majority of the rest of that side of the street. We made the suggestion that the tram could perhaps run offstreet for significant sections of Crewe Road South, but this appears not to have been investigated for the purposes of the report.

3. Section 2.1(i), identifies a possible land take of cemetery ground. This land is not, in fact, a cemetery but is common garden ground to a block of flats at Comely Bank Roundabout.

4. Several other areas, such as traffic management and modelling studies, have not yet been carried out. Only a preliminary assessment of patronage has been carried out. Parking/servicing requires further assessment. *sufficient analysis has been carried out*

It is clear that Option C has been given only a basic assessment at this stage in comparison with the original two options.

We are sure that you will agree that getting the route of Line 1 right is essential to the success of the scheme and it is, therefore, vital that the Council have accurate and complete information before them before dismissing what is, to most local residents, an obvious route to serve the WGH.

Costs We note from the main report to Council (Trams) that, on 11 December, you are to be asked to approve the costs, as detailed in STAG 2 (page 71 for line 1; and page 88 for line 2) and Financial Statement. Are you aware that these documents show a different total cost (£566.7m) than the total being shown in the report to Council (473.4m)?

Yours sincerely

Alison Bourne
On behalf of the residents of Groathill who previously signed Petitions in favour of either Option A or B

Lbours + conting.

219,320

incl. 287,309

27,9400
566.709

sufficient

10/12/03