
From: Andie Harper
Sent: 13 December 2006 17:26
To: Trudi Craggs; Ailsa McGregor; Geoff Gilbert; Susan Clark
Subject: FW: Structural Charette Draft outline
Attachments: Tram Structures Charette.pdf

Importance: High

FYI
Andie

From: Andie Harper
Sent: 13 December 2006 17:23
To: 'Andrew Holmes'
Cc: 'duncan.fraser@edinburgh.gov.uk'
Subject: FW: Structural Charette Draft outline
Importance: High

Andrew

Further to our discussions last week on the above I have now read the report in detail and would question it's value and whether it warrants a discussion at a Planning Summit?

Below are some of my comments followed by my conclusions, and while I acknowledge I am not an expert in these matters I do feel in this case the process has offered little to help inform the ongoing design or the consideration of options.

Comments

1. The stated brief seems to be inconsistent with the stated pre-charette brief and seems to have suffered from scope creep some of which would be outwith parameters established for the project at the outset and laid down in the standards/ manuals.
2. We must consider the value achieved from this compared to the time and cost expending on getting this report.
Structure charette first raised 01/09
RM circulates draft outline 06/10
Charette 13/11
Report due 17/11
Report received 8/12
Frankly I would have expected more substance after 14 weeks of consideration, particularly in the context of the time demands all other areas of the project are being asked to achieve and the considerable costs involved.
3. Report contains only basic sketches and photographs but rarely prompts any real conclusions other than some laudable aspirations.
4. Coltbridge recommendation to employ a nationally or internationally reputed Architect or Engineer- is it being suggested that PB and Halcrow do not fit that criteria, particularly after they brought over the PB Placemakers Group?
Meat of this seems to conclude that the issue is in detailing and this will be picked up by SDS in Detail Design phase.
Mention of St. George's Bridge- this was not in scope and we must draw a line on revisiting decisions.
5. Edinburgh Park Viaduct- seems to ignore the constraint imposed through the side agreement with NEL and in Design Approval Panel.
Solution doesn't seem to align with stated/desired outcome of holistic proposal aimed at avoiding environmental blight, nor for that matter does it seem to fit with the concept of slender and elegant.
Item 4a will be picked up in Detail Design stage
Item 4b not sure if this is driven by buildability or aesthetic considerations.
Item 4c This is not a cost effective design solution and the current design allows for light penetration.
6. Carrick Knowe-These are again mainly Detailed Design considerations.
Item 1. Bridge can be skewed more within LOD but beyond that it will need a retaining wall which will require planning approval and is not currently on the design and approvals programme.
Item 2. Detailed Design issue

- Item 3. Is it CEC's view we should have pedestrian access? This is outwith design standards.
7. Conclusion- I am not convinced this has provided practical and immediate solutions and maybe has achieved the opposite.
Saying Standard solutions should be resisted is contrary to Project Requirements and Functional Specification recently concluded and included in the DFBC.
 8. If we adopt some of these ideas we will need to follow Change Control process, would you as Change Owner be confident we can secure TS agreement for change and its cost and time impacts?

Conclusions/ Recommendations

- a. We cover some of the points above in the due Detail Design process as indicated.
- b. Coltbridge- Continue with SDS as designers, and exclude St George's Bridge from any change process.
- c. Edinburgh Park- continue with existing design and seek to get detailing right through Detailed Design process.
- d. Carrick Knowe- skew bridge to limits of LOD. Andrew Holmes/CEC to confirm opinion on pedestrian walkway requirement.
- e. Prepare Change Orders for your submission to DPD and TPB if appropriate.
- f. Draw a line under Charette and Planning Summit process as complete, and revert to existing approval protocols and processes.
- g. Further debate will seriously impact programme and costs.

Finally one item not included in the report but needing resolution is the issue of side poles or centre poles on the Edinburgh Park viaduct. The design currently assumes side poles as centre poles will require a wider deck(approx. 500mm) with it's subsequent extra expense (c.£200k). I would appreciate your views on this.

I am looking for your earliest response as I seek to tie these issues and requirements down with SDS and take away any arguments about scope and delivery timescales.

Regards Andie

From: Riccardo Marini [mailto:riccardo.marini@edinburgh.gov.uk]
Sent: 06 October 2006 16:42
To: Frances Hamilton; Aileen Grant; Andrew Holmes; chandlerj@pbworld.com; hutchisond@pbworld.com; david_mackay@ [redacted] duncan fraser; keith.rimmer@edinburgh.gov.uk; Willie Gallagher; wwcampbell@lothianbuses.co.uk; ney@pbworld.com; nrenilson@lothianbuses.co.uk
Cc: Andie Harper
Subject: Structural Charette Draft outline
Importance: High

Dear all
please find attached a draft outline for the proposed Structural Charette, yesterday I had a meeting with Sir Terry and he is comfortable with it but obviously your input will be important.
Possibly it could be discussed at the next available opportunity.
regards
riccardo

This Email and files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended for the sole use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this Email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without using, copying, storing, forwarding or disclosing its contents to any other person. The Council has endeavoured to scan this Email message and attachments for computer viruses and will not be liable for any losses incurred by the recipient.
