



**Parsons
Brinckerhoff**

Edinburgh Tram Project Design Office
CityPoint, 1st Floor
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh EH12 5HD
United Kingdom
44-(0)131-623-8600
Fax: 44-(0)131-623-8601

Our Ref: ULE90130-01-LET-00053

30 November 2006

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

Attention: Ailsa McGregor

Dear Ailsa

Meeting with CEC for Charette Area Comments on 28 November 2006

We write with reference to tie progress with resolution of design issues which have formed the basis of the series of charettes and the planning summits. Through this process SDS had understood that the proposed solutions for Foot of Leith Walk, Leith Walk, Picardy Place, St.Andrews Square, Shandwick Place and Haymarket had been discussed and resolved in concept and that the proposed design presented and agreed at the planning summits could be developed into detailed design.

This was further reinforced at a meeting on 22nd November 2006 at which SDS presented the design developments resulting from the series of charettes and associated planning summits to the Tram Design Working Group (TDWG) attended by CEC Transport, CEC Planning, Historic Scotland, Edinburgh World Heritage, tie and SDS. At the meeting it was understood that all parties had accepted the concepts proposed, with minimal comments.

On 28 November, SDS were called by CEC to go through the plans submitted on 8 November for Design Approval Panels (DAP). The plans were consistent with the plans presented at the TDWG. CEC attendees included Duncan Fraser, Andy Conway and David Cooper.

At this meeting CEC advised that contrary to the decisions made at the planning summit and the advice received at the meeting of the TDWG on 22 November 2006, several areas covered by charettes would receive a red status at DAP (ie. could not proceed into detailed design).

The issues raised were as follows:

Leith Walk – CEC's principal concerns with the proposed design solution are associated with the northern end of Leith Walk. SDS have incorporated modifications resulting from charettes, associated with the geometric constraints and the frontager parking issues and attempted to achieve the optimum balance to provide a safe and efficient system within the space available. In resolving the spatical planning issues, SDS have provided tram, vehicular lanes, and standard width pavements through the area, and also maximize the amount of parking and loading space in this area. The solution offers a safe and operational solution. SDS acknowledge that there are impacts to all parties involved in order to achieve a balance that would allow approvals and consents to be obtained. Comments received from CEC previously at the planning summits directed SDS to provide additional parking and maximise pavement widths. At the meeting on the 28 November 2006, CEC advised that the solution presented does not meet the expectations, and that they require wider pavements, additional loading and parking and provision for cycle movements. SDS advised that they consider the proposed solution optimises the safe use of available space within allowable standards and requested how CEC considered further space could be created. CEC advised that they

**Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence**

**In association with Halcrow
Corderoy, Ian White Associates
Quill Power Communications, SDG**

*Parsons Brinckerhoff Ltd
Registered in England and Wales
No. 2554514. Registered Office:
Amber Court, William Armstrong Drive
Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 7YQ*

CEC01829874_0001



wanted SDS to minimise/eliminate central reservations, consider shared tram and vehicle running and consider shared use of pavements for pedestrians and parking.

In their follow up email (Andy Conway to Scott Ney) on 29th November 2006, CEC indicated that they require SDS to consider shared running through a portion of Leith Walk and also introduce provision for the bicycle movement. It is critical that SDS understand the priorities in the area, and this has obviously not been made clear by CEC through this integrated design development process.

Picardy Place – SDS had previously understood through charette and planning summit process that the use of the space and limits of the proposed roads remodelling works had been resolved and agreed through consultation with tie and various parties, including CEC. At the meeting of 28th November 2006, the general layout of the space was questioned by CEC. Several comments were raised relating to changing kerb lines and the extent of associated highway works. Whilst SDS understand that further refinement of the layout is required including – traffic signal layouts, road markings, hand rails etc, we had understood that the footprint for the scheme has been agreed and that the design could move into the detailed design phase. We had understood this to be the fundamental outcome of the charette/planning summit process, which now does not seem to be the case as CEC are requesting SDS to review general arrangements/concepts.

St. Andrew Square – CEC indicated that there are continuing internal discussions about the concept to move forward with at St. Andrew Square. SDS have completed extensive optimising and layout options, and have moved forward with the preferred design as directed by tie as an outcome of the Planning Summit meeting notes as of 22 September 2006.

CEC have advised that the proposed design will remain as 'RED' until such time as the issue of side platforms versus island platform are resolved internal to CEC. There has been no indication of timescales for this action.

Shandwick Place – Further to charettes and planning summit meetings, SDS had understood that the concept for transport movement and spatial planning for Shandwick Place was understood and agreed. CEC have advised that this is not the case, with the main issue being the ability of a bus to pass a stopped tram at the stop. The proposed transport movements associated with the stop layout was also noted at a recent bus coordination meeting. Upon further request of acceptance and clarification to bus operations, TEL have now indicated that they will require the ability to pass be retained, which was not conveyed at the coordination meeting or previous planning summit meetings.

In general, SDS were extremely disappointed by the comments received, and that they were not highlighted at earlier opportunities with the amount of detailed dialogue that has occurred on the areas in recent months. The designs have been progressed in good faith in coordination with the outcomes of the charettes and in close coordination with CEC during the developments. As such, we believe that we have met the intents of the charette requirements, and this additional work being imposed upon SDS in order to be able to move forward to Detailed Design is not within the original expectations of the work set forth to resolve these areas.

We are also extremely concerned on the impact that the lack of resolution on these issues is having on our programme. We request your assistance in reaching a speedy conclusion to these matters in the earliest possible timescale.

Yours sincerely



David Hutchison
Parsons Brinckerhoff