
From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: 21 June 2007 08:38
To: David Crawley
Subject: FW: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)
Importance: High

From: Trudi Craggs
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2007 8:38:10 AM
To: dorringtonk@pbworld.com; mentiplayl@halcrow.com
Cc: Tony Glazebrook; gavin.murry@tie.ltd.uk; aileen.grant@dundas-wilson.com
Subject: FW: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)
Importance: High
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Kim/Laurie

I refer to Jamie's response. I also refer to other emails which were exchanged between Gavin, Aileen and Laurie yesterday but which Laurie chose not to copy me in on.

In light of this it is imperative that we meet on Tuesday as Gavin suggested. We need to resolve these issues asap to avoid prejudicing the prior approval process and programme. The way the prior approval process is being handled at present is frankly unacceptable from tie's perspective. At present tie has no confidence that the submissions will be right first time, that comments are being taken on board or that SDS can carry out the informal consultation process and update drawings to reflect comments within the agreed 8 week period.

We can discuss all of the concerns on Tuesday.

On a separate matter, Laurie I understand that you took exception to D&W resending the proforma for Roseburn - that was one of the emails from which I was removed from the circulation list. Aileen was carrying out an instruction from tie. Given that at best very few of the comments have been taken on board, I think Gavin was entitled to ask D&W to resend. However if you have an issue with this please discuss with me.

Finally I will touched on my concerns regarding the prior approval process with Tony Glazebrook and Steve Reynolds at the last progress meeting and will providing them with further feedback in light of recent developments.

Trudi

From: Jamie Gray [mailto:Jamie.Gray@edinburgh.gov.uk]
Sent: Wed 20/06/2007 13:05
To: Mentiplay, Laurie
Cc: Francis Newton; Linda Nicol; Duncan Fraser; Ian Spence; Clement, Gavin; Wright, Ailsa; Aileen Grant; Gavin Murray; Smith, Stefano; Wilson, Paul (Edinburgh Tram); Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram); Trudi Craggs
Subject: RE: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)

Laurie

Thanks you for your response.

Firstly with regards to the 8 week consultation period, this is an agreed protocol between CEC and SDS. If this structure is allowed to break down so easily it does beg the question as to why it is there in the first place. From a CEC planning point of view we have consistently worked within the 8 week framework and in the vast majority of cases have turned round a response within a week of receiving an informal consultation submission (you will be aware that SDS regularly submit plans on a Thursday/Friday expecting a response at the following Monday meeting

with CEC planning consistently stressing that a full week is required) providing SDS with 7 weeks to provide a submission for Prior Approval. CEC have recently devised an internal checklist to monitor the progress of applications from informal consultation submission through to the processing of a Prior Approval approval and it is clear that delay in terms of the 8 week informal consultation period is not exclusive to the Roseburn submission but is occurring within almost every informal submission received to this date. It is frankly quite concerning that at such an early stage in the programme the 8 week agreement is already being broken on such a regular basis.

In terms of the comments provided by CEC planning which I detailed in my previous e-mail it appears you have misinterpreted the information that I have provided. My apologies if this was unclear and I will attempt to clarify this. The response was colour coded to highlight the progress that has been made. Red signifies where there has been no action on a comment, green where SDS have actioned or responded to a comment and blue where the issue is still outstanding. The term "no changes made/explanation given" actually means that neither a change or explanation has been provided. On this basis from the 11 comments the current situation is as follows:

Comment/changes actioned by SDS	- 2
Comment/changes unactioned	- 7
Issues still outstanding/to be resolved	- 2

You have referred to the submission being presented to TDWG and I appreciate that this may have contributed to the delay. However from my review of the minutes many of the stated issues raised within the informal consultation meeting were also raised at TDWG and despite this second opportunity to discuss these points Mondays submission clearly shows that the majority of issues have not been dealt with as I have detailed above.

Finally I refer to your comment "SDS is proactively capturing these comments in the agreed Record of Review, rather than waiting on a letter from you." Again, as with the 8 week period, the Record of Review is an agreed protocol between CEC and SDS. As we are both well aware comments are recorded at informal consultation meetings and presented to CEC for sign off. The reference to SDS waiting for a letter from CEC is one which surprises me because as far as I am aware this has never taken place.

Regards

Jamie

Jamie Gray Msc (BA Hons) | Prior Approvals/Planning Officer | Strategic Development - Tram | Planning and Strategy | City of Edinburgh Council | Waverley Court | Level G3 | 4 East Market Street | Tel 013 [REDACTED]
| Fax 0131 529 6206 | jamie.gray@edinburgh.gov.uk | www.edinburgh.gov.uk |

From: Mentiplay, Laurie [mailto:MentiplayL@halcrow.com]
Sent: Tue 19/06/2007 18:13
To: Jamie Gray
Cc: Francis Newton; Linda Nicol; Duncan Fraser; Ian Spence; Clement, Gavin; Wright, Ailsa; Aileen Grant; Gavin Murray; Smith, Stefano; Wilson, Paul (Edinburgh Tram); Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram)
Subject: RE: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)

Jamie,

I refer to your email below about the above proposal.

As previously discussed, the 8 week, 'informal consultation' period has no statutory or legal basis in planning terms. This is part of the SDS Programme.

Some pre application discussions in the tram project have been reasonably straightforward. However, others have been more challenging and involved a wide range of design issues, disciplines and stakeholders.

The Roseburn proposal is one issue that has taken longer than the uniform 8 week period in the programme.

One of the triggers was that SDS presented the Roseburn tram stop to TDWG on 19 April, following discussion with Francis and you on 15 March. At the meeting, SDS was instructed by TDWG to combine the stop with the adjacent bridge and surrounding areas of track and OLE. This was subsequently delivered and presented on 30 May.

The purpose of SDS sending the package to you yesterday was to go through the comments from TDWG, Planning, Transport and Environmental Health, get your feedback and then progress towards a finalised design for formal submission.

In relation to the Roseburn Stop, there are 11 comments from CEC. Reading your interpretation of the comments, you have stated that SDS has added lighting and details of ground cover to the drawings. The bollards are described as unclear. This should be legible to scale at A1. If not, we will amend.

There are 3 comments which SDS has not been able to take on board. But you state that SDS has given an explanation.

Finally, there are issues under review or development. I understood CEC is addressing the Advertising Hoardings issue, surface finishing is being looked at by SDS (as discussed) in a 'Pros and Cons' style report and the landscaping work is being progressed as a result of previous guidance.

This leaves 2 comments where "no changes have been made". I will discuss these with the Section Design Manager tomorrow and a way forward can hopefully be agreed on Monday at our next meeting.

I can assure you there is no "apparent lack of regard for your comments". While we would like to see more movement in relation to comments from other Council Services, overall, we are extremely grateful for the constructive assistance and guidance given at our regular Monday meetings and at TDWG. I personally feel that the Planning team's constructive comments are assisting and enhancing the Prior Approval process.

SDS is proactively capturing these comments in the agreed Record of Review, rather than waiting on a letter from you. And as the Roseburn example above demonstrates, trying to incorporate these comments within the parameters of the project brief, budget and timescale where it is possible to do so.

Please call me or the relevant Section Design Manager if you have any concerns or issues you wish to discuss.

Regards,
Laurie

From: Jamie Gray [mailto:Jamie.Gray@edinburgh.gov.uk]
Sent: 19 June 2007 16:17
To: Clement, Gavin; Mentiplay, Laurie; Wright, Ailsa; Aileen Grant; Smith, Stefano; Gavin Murray
Cc: Francis Newton; Linda Nicol; Duncan Fraser; Ian Spence
Subject: RE: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)

All

According to CEC records Roseburn Tramstop/Roseburn Terrace Bridge has already been submitted for informal consultation on 15/03/07 with the record of informal consultation signed off by CEC on 12/04/07. Given the 8 week informal consultation period these plans should have been resubmitted for Prior Approval on 10/05/07. I am also aware the submission was discussed at Tram Design Working Group on 30/05/07.

Having compared the contents of the plans submitted yesterday with the record of informal consultation it appears that CEC planning's comments have been largely overlooked by SDS with only very minor changes made from the plans submitted on 15/03/07. Below is the agreed CEC/SDS record of informal consultation (12/04/07) and their current status from yesterdays submission.

Design Section	Drawing/ Document reference	Issue	Comments received	Made By (initial)	Action (initial)	Current Status
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Boundary wall	Is 1800mm high wall required adjacent to boundary fence? Suggest landscaping boundary to the east of stop (double edge effect with existing wall could create a litter	FN	SDS	No changes made.

			trap) and reduction in height to the middle wall between ramps. Proximity of wall to mature trees not detailed. Wall to rear of east platform considered ok.			
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Access	Potential to open up DDA access point to make it more visible from the road. Investigate possibility for widening entrance by extending southern edge. Need to consider how to control access, i.e. bollards, staggered fence entrance etc.	FN	SDS	No changes made.
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Access	Do existing bollards at DDA access point provide a barrier?	FN	SDS	Unclear
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Access	Can access point to the southwest of stop be made DDA compliant – GC stated no this is not possible.	FN	n/a	No changes made/explanation given
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Lighting	Lighting to be added along western footway/cycleway.	FN	SDS	Added
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Stop equipment cabinet	Rationale behind positioning of stop equipment cabinet?	FN	SDS	No changes made/explanation given
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Signage	Additional tram stop sign to be visible from east of stop – suggested location on the corner of Western Coates Terrace and A8.	FN	SDS	No changes made/explanation given.
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Landscaping	Details of types of new trees to be provided to west of stop (LHMP issue). Critical the appearance is correct as this area is highly visible.	FN	SDS	Not provided
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Advertising	Will advertising boards remain?	FN	SDS	Currently under review
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Landscaping	Details of new ground cover to be provided.	FN	SDS	Added
3A	ULE90130-03-STP-00001	Track surface	Is grass track to be continued through the tram stop?	FN	SDS	Currently under review

Please could SDS provide an explanation regarding the delay with this submission, the reasons for yesterdays resubmission and the apparent lack of regard for comments made during the informal consultation period by CEC planning.

Jamie

Jamie Gray Msc (BA Hons) I Prior Approvals/Planning Officer I Strategic Development - Tram I Planning and Strategy I City of Edinburgh Council I Waverley Court I Level G3 I 4 East Market Street I Tel 0131 [REDACTED] I Fax 0131 529 6206 I jamie.gray@edinburgh.gov.uk I www.edinburgh.gov.uk I

From: Clement, Gavin [<mailto:ClementGa@pbworld.com>]
Sent: Mon 18/06/2007 18:06
To: Francis Newton; Jamie Gray; David Cooper
Cc: Mentiplay, Laurie; Aileen Grant; Wright, Ailsa
Subject: Informal Consultation - Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge (1 of 2)

Francis,
Please find attached the draft design statement and planning drawings for Roseburn Tramstop & Roseburn Terrace Bridge, for discussion at the Informal Consultation meeting on 25th May 2007.

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.
<<UKPB1-#70090-v1-Roseburn_Terrace_Bridge_-_INFORMAL_CONSULTATION_SUBMISSION_18_06_2007 - 1 of 2.pdf>>

Gavin Clement

Sub-Section Design Manager
Edinburgh Tram

PB
1st Floor, CityPoint
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5HD

Direct : +44(0)1 [REDACTED]
Mobile: +44(0)7 [REDACTED]
Email: clementga@pbworld.com

www.pbworld.com

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.

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

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.