

# Planning Summit – Held on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2006

In attendance      **David Mackay, Neil Renilson, Bill Campbell, Andrew Holmes, Keith Rimmer, Andie Harper, David Hutchison, Jason Chandler, Riccardo Marini, Aileen Grant**

Circulation          Attendees

1. Previous Meeting – the note of meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> August was agreed.  
Andrew Holmes will confirm by e-mail how the decisions made last week are to be signed off.
2. Picardy Place – the following were noted
  - Should aspire to retain hardened area for unloading if current ship load cannot be retained.
  - Junction is already over-saturated with road traffic
  - Reducing the number of pedestrian crossings is an important aspiration
  - Extra space created should be functional – there may be potential for locating some building (s) within this space
  - Separate roundabout is not necessary – the new space created should be in the form of a gyratory to permit buses to turn around – but geometry should be as tight as possible and not dictated by ease of bus movement.
  - Right turn from top of Broughton Street west along York Place to be accommodated.
  - Make something more of stop location – important arrival point - cross platform interchange (tram-bus)
  - Public transport movement westbound along York Place should be allowed for

Conclusion & Action – The solution for Picardy Place has the potential to be a big selling point for tram – proposals should be taken forward with this in mind. Charette Option 2 is emerging as the preferred option, with Charette Option 1 a fall-back second.

(a) SDS to review PWay design for next week to determine if Charette Option 2 will work in principle.

(b) A Holmes to consider how to handle discussion with Tom Farmer regarding relocation of Paolozzi

3. Foot of the Walk – the following were noted
  - Access is not needed at the south end of Constitution Street
  - The bus stops must be relocated to be as close as possible to the end of Constitution Street
  - Street furniture (existing and proposed) and stop equipment should be minimised.

Conclusion & Action – Charette option has advantages over Pre-charette Design and should be pursued.

(a) SDS to progress with preliminary design for Charette Option

(b) TEL to consider/pursue options for off-street equipment storage.

4. St Andrew Square – the following were noted

- there are difficulties with road alignment/design – it should be achievable but there are issues about height differences.
- A flush carriageway may be possible on Princes Street but some remedial works will be outside LODs
- Andrew Holmes as promoter will advise CEC officials and advisors of his decision.

Conclusion and Action – there are no showstoppers apparent at this stage but further work is needed. Environmental impacts will need to be properly assessed/compared once detailed.  
 (a) SDS to complete roads design and present to the next meeting. Coordination needs to be given to sending and unloading needs.

(b) D&W to advise about legality of remedial works outwith the LOD but within the highway boundary.

(c) A Harper and A Grant to organise special meeting with Historic Scotland and EWH

#### 5. Princes Street – the following were noted

- Minimum width still requires space to be taken from pavements, but only at the tram stop.
- Need to consider pedestrian space in Princes Street as a whole and assess if net gain or net loss
- If only 1 stop is located in Princes Street it will be important to ensure there is sufficient space around it to allow for high numbers of passengers. It should also avoid impacting on accesses to the Gardens.
- Bus shelters will have to be reconsidered (both design and position). More pedestrian space can be created through this reconsideration. Council has no contractual commitments which limit this.
- The principle of linearity (straight lines to be followed in design) remains important

Conclusion & Action – Charette design to be pursued, assuming 1 stop in Princes Street.

(a) SDS to take forward designs on the basis of 1 stop in Princes Street in the block between Hanover and Frederick Streets. This is the widest part of the street and should be able to accommodate the extra space required for the platform. There is a need to optimise overall the transport position – pedestrian concentration, plus movement, plus space

(b) Details of losses and gains to pavement space should be linked to street furniture rationalisation and the extra space which can be gained through this.

(c) Provision to be made for cycling to fit within overall road space.

(d) Coordination of the adequacy of a single stop to meet needs should be undertaken during modelling.

#### 6. Charette Sign Off – the following was agreed

- Reference was made to a paper prepared and circulated by A Grant, with annotations by A Harper.
- Meetings of the “Planning Summit” are now acting as the Charette Review Panel
- Further consideration to be given to how the decisions are communicated to Sir Terry Farrell.

#### Conclusion & Action

- (a) A Holmes and R Marini to take this up and discuss with Sir Terry Farrell.
- (b) It was agreed that SDS are now to take forward all the Charette Options – with the exception of Shandwick Place – to Preliminary Design. Pros and Cons for each space should be drawn up at an early stage.
- (c) There are key issues relating to “selling” the emerging designs to the public, particularly at Picardy Place and Foot of the Walk. More consideration of this is needed.

#### 7. Structures Designs – the following were noted

- There is a case for “signature structures” in certain key locations – quality of design is an issue for the City Council and Sir Terry Farrell.
- Changes to designs may impact on the Programme
- Important to address design concerns and not leave them as issues – Nottingham is an example of how extra costs arose out of a design conflict.
- Current concerns are four key structures – Coltbridge Viaduct, Carrick Knowe Bridge, Edinburgh Park and bridge over the Water of Leith at Murrayfield.
- SDS need additional guidance/clarification/support through a Charette or other route.

Conclusion & Action – It may be possible to lever in some additional urban design resource – a designer could work alongside SDS to provide the necessary design input.

- (a) A Holmes and R Marini to give further consideration to possibilities and bring suggestions forward.