
From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: 16 August 2007 10:08
To: Walter McQueen
Cc: David Crawley
Subject: FW:

Hi Walter,

I shall be away for the next two and a half weeks. Thought you should see this in case rework of figures is embarked upon!!

All the very best,

Tony

From: Walker, Colin [mailto:WalkerCC@Halcrow.com]
Sent: 15 August 2007 11:04
To: Tony Glazebrook
Cc: McQuade, Paul
Subject: RE:

Tony

Looking at my structures, I would revise the figures to:

Crewe Rd gardens bridge £0 - no opportunity to provide a walkway under this structure anyway.
Russell Rd bridge £40k - 25.5m² at £1500 per m²
Russell Rd Retaining Walls £75k - due to loss of retained fill required

These figures do not included for the redesign costs.

Roseburn St Bridge - ask PMcQ
Murrayfield Stadium retaining wall - ask PMcQ
Murrayfield Training pitches retaining wall - ask PMcQ
Water of Leith Bridge - ask PMcQ
Baird Drive retaining wall - ask PMcQ

From: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 14 August 2007 15:30
To: Walker, Colin
Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Gavin Murray; Andy Steel - TSS; Walter McQueen; Ennion, Bruce; David Crawley
Subject: RE:

Hi Colin,

'Twas very crude and quick because of a remarkably short timescale that was imposed upon me by TPB requirement.

Cost of structures – per average Bidders figs:

Crewe Rd gardens bridge £2M2
Russell Rd bridge £1M2
Russell Rd Retaining Walls £2M5
Roseburn St Bridge £3M
Murrayfield Stadium retaining wall £1M5
Murrayfield Training pitches retaining wall £0M7
Water of Leith Bridge £1M5
Baird Drive retaining wall £1M

Total cost of these 8 structures that could be narrowed not previously (separately) accounted for in this respect £13M6 – say £200k saving per structure gives £1M6 overall VE possible saving.

Any improvement on this very quick and crude assumption please do suggest!

All the best,

TIE00040756_0001

Tony

<hr size=2 width="100%" align=center tabIndex=-1>

From: Walker, Colin [mailto:WalkerCC@Halcrow.com]

Sent: 14 August 2007 13:56

To: Tony Glazebrook; David Crawley

Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Gavin Murray; Andy Steel - TSS; Walter McQueen; Ennion, Bruce

Subject: RE:

Tony

I note the figure of £1.6M against the walkways, how have you calculated this?

From: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]

Sent: 14 August 2007 13:47

To: David Crawley

Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Gavin Murray; Andy Steel - TSS; Walter McQueen; Walker, Colin; Ennion, Bruce

Subject:

Herewith my notes of last two VE meetings (i.e. includes today's one) – Note that "VE-unproductive" structures have not been included:

Structure	Proposal	Requires	Possible saving (Max)
Edinburgh Park Viaduct	Cor-Ten, no walkways, side OLE, simple parapet	Agreement of NR/CEC/NEL (New Edinburgh Ltd)/TEL/Transdev/NR/ICP (HMRI) to principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none">low mtce, lighter, leaner, structure (steel) and its appearance and need, or otherwise, for NR possessions for maintenanceevacuation via 4' or adjacent track after other line trams stopped via control centre; maintenance effect likely to be nil in practice (i.e. meaningful mtce will expect trams to be stopped)OLE change not to "look like a forest of poles" – Halcrow preparing a visualisation for CEC to peruse. Centre poles need wider structure 'cos its on a curve and cant/DKE effect worsens the width requirementParapet to be what's functionally needed rather than world-class showpiece that no-one will actually see – expectation is that this structure will be a "Landmark Structure" – fine if someone's prepared to pay extra for the consequences of doing so	£1M
A8 retaining wall – adjacent Depot	Simplify/abolish by Northwards depot move	Depot move feasibility to be confirmed (ongoing)	£2M
Tower Place Bridge (docks)	No walkways - Walkers and cyclists to use existing adjacent bridge!!!!	Agreement of CEC/Forth Ports/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI) to this remarkably obvious solution	£2M
Victoria Dock Bridge (docks)	No walkways - Walkers and cyclists not anticipated until future nearby development materialises – developer then to pay	Agreement of CEC/Forth Ports/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI)	£0.5M
Eight other structures	No walkways	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI) – logic as above	£1.6M
Depot Access bridge	Simplify as a result of Northwards depot move	Depot move feasibility to be confirmed (ongoing)	£0.3M
Lindsay Rd retaining wall	Simplify/abolish through FP agreement to area works	Agreement of CEC/Forth Ports/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI)	£1M
Carrick Knowe bridge	Simple parapet	Agreement of NR/CEC/Forth Ports/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI) – logic as above	£0.085M

A8 underpass	Reduce headroom from 5m to 4.4m	Already covered by means of April info. Drop to bidders – JMcE asked Michael Terrance (TSS) to identify cost saving to be booked to VE	£2M
Haymarket Viaduct	Reduce deck length from 5 spans to 2 and replace those 3 spans with retaining wall	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev	£0.25M
Russell Rd. Bridge	Adopt "Roley" suggestion for piling changes	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev	£0.1M
Crewe Rd Gardens Bridge	Move Tram alignment Eastwards and adopt shared running over approx 1km. Allows deletion of bridge and reduction of adjacent retaining walls	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI)	£3M
Coltbridge Viaduct	Interlace tracks over viaduct to eliminate need for structural change	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI)	£0.8M
Gogar Burn Bridge, South Gyle Access Road Bridge, Roseburn Terrace Bridge	5% of cost of structures to reduce their cost through VE – details yet to be specified	Agreement of CEC/TEL/Transdev/ICP (HMRI)	£0.12M
TOTAL			£14.755M

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

<HRsize=2 width="100%" align=center>

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.