

---

**From:** Chandler, Jason [ChandlerJ@pbworld.com]  
**Sent:** 12 October 2006 18:58  
**To:** Trudi Craggs; Ailsa McGregor  
**Cc:** Andie Harper; Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram); aileen.grant@dundas-wilson.com;  
Finc, Richard; Hutchison, David  
**Subject:** CEC Meeting

Ailsa and Trudi,

We had a very good meeting with CEC earlier today. Attendees were David Cooper, Duncan Fraser, Andy Conway (part time), Laurie Mentaplay, Rick Finc, Kim Dorrington and myself.

We took them through the attached presentation informally. The main aim was to discuss the status of the programme and help them to understand the logic and process for taking the design forwards through to completion and gaining approvals. They had several key concerns which we talked through. These were as follows

- 1) Traffic Modelling - They were concerned that we would be undertaking significant amounts of design prior to finalisation of the roads design and completion of the associated modelling. We already had a warning from Trudy that this would be the case further to a meeting that she had already with Duncan yesterday. Using extracts of the plan we confirmed with Duncan that by Jan he would be in receipt of an updated model output that included the Charette options. Using an extract of the plan we demonstrated where the first submissions were being made for section 1 which allows a reasonable period of time for review of the modelling and amendment if required. This is not to say that it will be an easy ride, just the opposite and I think that by the end of the discussion, Duncan could recognise that we had structured the plan and deliver such that we could minimise the risk of putting submissions through for prior approval that subsequently change and have to be re submitted. I think that we also managed to demonstrate that for a significant amount of the design the traffic modelling should not impact the detailed content of the drawings and it is only when there is significant shift in the p way that this occurred. We also pointed out that roads design is one of the latter designs to be completed so the risk of abortive submissions should be reduced.
- 2) Review of the designs by tie prior to submission to CEC - Duncan is concerned that they are going to be receiving designs for review prior to tie having commented upon them and the drawings having been updated. I showed him an extract of the plan indicating the logic of design - submit to tie - tie issues comments - SDS update drawings - SDS issue documents formally to CEC.
- 3) Content and Quality - Due to the number of submissions for detailed design there is a common understanding that what is formal submitted to CEC needs to be robust and what they are expecting. We discussed the eight week informal consultation period prior to submission of the design and the approach that would be take of regular meetings, meetings on site to discuss designs, prior to formal submission. We agreed to prepare a flow chart to demonstrate practically how this process would work. We also confirmed that a set of exemplar detailed formal submissions would be presented at the end of October to agree the style, content and level of detail of the submissions aswell as the design statements.
- 4) Volume of Submissions requiring review - CEC are obviously concerned at the number of submissions that are to be made and the timescales. We showed them a filter from the programme indicating the number of submissions that were to be made and the distribution of these between Jan and Dec. This had two effects, first it did demonstrate that they were not all being issued on the same day at the end of August, but it also indicated just how many there are which is obviously a worry. This prompted a discussion about resources. I indicated to CEC that an suitable sized team of around seven people would be required full time. Duncan did not seem phased by this. He did, however, say that they are going to have to recruit. We also discussed the issue of (partial) co-location at the Citytpoint. There are obviously procedural reasons why this would have to be done with care for the planning personnel and it may not be possible to do this at all, but it was not dismissed and Duncan took this away to be considered. Certainly for the technical team it seemed like a strong possibility.
- 5) Timescales - Duncan was very sceptical that this could be achieved in the timescales, by beginning of September. We talked through the programme. It is obviously tight but possible with the right coordinated approach. The informal consultation period is key.

One thing that I was very worried about was that Duncan started talking about a two phase detailed design - detailed design 1 and detailed design 2, similar to that of PD1 and PD2. This is a detailed design first pass where we do the design and then another round of modelling, followed by a further refinement of the detailed design. This is not how we have programmed the work, or the prior approvals submissions. We explained our philosophy but all indications are that there could be a long haul with modelling.

We talked through the Tram Design Working Group briefly and the decision was made for Rick and the approvals team to finalise the batching of designs for submission for Prior approval and then produce a programme for the TDWG to suit this, such that they can be briefed on the design as it progresses. We also agreed to present a watered down version of the programme presentation to the TDWG next week. We obviously need to discuss this, I will prepare a draft.

I hope that this is a useful brief of the meeting. It was very positive.

I stated that tie were still reviewing the programme and that a formal issue would be made to CEC when this was complete. I also offered to discuss what useful filters they might want rather than them having to trawl through the whole thing.

If you want to discuss any of the above in more detail please let me know

Sorry, presenattion too big for e mail - will put on disk

Regards,

Jason