

Haymarket Interchange Study and Masterplan



Stage 2 : Results of Stage 1 and Stage 2 of
HISAM

June 2006

Halcrow Group Limited

Haymarket Interchange Study and Masterplan

Stage 2 : Results of Stage 1 and Stage 2 of HISAM

June 2006

Halcrow Group Limited

Halcrow Group Limited
16 Abercromby Place Edinburgh EH3 6LB
Tel +44 (0)131 272 3300 Fax +44 (0)131 272 3301
www.halcrow.com

Halcrow Group Limited has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of their client, for their sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© **Halcrow Group Limited 2006**

Halcrow Group Limited
16 Abercromby Place Edinburgh EH3 6LB
Tel +44 (0)131 272 3300 Fax +44 (0)131 272 3301
www.halcrow.com

Haymarket Interchange Study and Masterplan Stage 2 : Recommendations on Short List Options

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Signed
-------	----------	-------------	------	--------

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	1.1 <i>Background</i>	1
2	Stage 1 : Review and Findings	2
	2.1 <i>Background</i>	2
	2.2 <i>Scenarios and Options</i>	2
	2.3 <i>Option Appraisal</i>	4
	2.4 <i>Results</i>	5
3	Stage 2 : Recommendations	6
	3.1 <i>Procedures and Status</i>	6
	3.2 <i>Results and Recommendation by Option</i>	6
	3.3 <i>Summary</i>	14
	3.4 <i>Risk review</i>	15
	3.5 <i>Phasing</i>	16
4	Next Steps	18

1 Introduction

1.1

Background

1.1.1

The Study Brief indicated that Stage 2 of the HISAM Project should comprise a review period in which short listed options were to be discussed with the Client and their partner organisations, to allow assessment and sifting of proposals. Accordingly the purpose of this report is :

- To provide a brief review of Stage 1 and its findings in regard to options and their assessment
- To confirm recommendations as to the short list options
- To identify any other issues of significance
- To describe the next steps in the study with a focus on the tasks involved in Stage 3 : Development of Short List options

1.1.2

This short report, is also intended to record the deliberations of the Project Board in their consideration of the Stage 1 Report Final Version as well as their decisions regarding the recommendations for the Short List Options and other matters.

1.1.3

It is intended that both Stage 1 Report and the Stage 2 Report will be completed and submitted in their final forms no later than 16 June 2006.

2

Stage 1 : Review and Findings

2.1

Background

2.1.1

The Stage 1 Report examined Haymarket Station and the proposed interchange within a city wide context with specific reference to urban design and townscape, transport and engineering factors, urban space and site appraisal issues while also considering the development planning, property and regeneration factors which effect both the core and the context areas. Details of current operational characteristics, performance and the inter-modal passenger experience were considered against significant recent changes in development activity and employment in the wider area. Finally, consideration was given to likely future influences such as the introduction of the tram, new and enhanced rail services and changing bus passenger patronage and pedestrian patterns. In addition consideration was given to committed developments in the vicinity eg. the EDI and Fountain North projects, as well as development opportunities which may come forward directly or indirectly as a part of the Haymarket Project.

2.2

Scenarios and Options

2.2.1

Where possible forecasts were made of future travel demand and development activity as it might be assumed to exist in the Base Case situation, which, for the purposes of this study has been assumed to be 2011. It should be noted however that the HISAM team still awaits data and forecasts from Network Rail, First ScotRail, Lothian and Tie/SDS on a number of issues. It is against this background that a series of scenarios were derived relating to different 'gradations' of development. Based on the Study Brief the scenarios developed were as follows:

- Base Case
- Scenario 1 : Basic Interchange
- Scenario 2 : Enhanced Interchange
- Scenario 3 : Expanded Interchange
- Scenario 4 : Comprehensive Interchange
- Scenario 5 : Long Term Plan

2.2.2

Figure 1 illustrates the five scenarios and characterises these against three main issues which reflect the interest areas of each of the Sub Groups, the activities which have formed an integral part of the Stage 1 Process, ie. Transport (referring

to Linkages), Urban Space (referring to the Form of development) and Development Opportunities (referring to the economic activity dependent upon or generated by each of the scenarios).

Figure 1 : Scenario/ Option Development Process : Initial Considerations

Scenario 5 Blue Sky approach (Long term)	Optimise tram alignment, car restraint policies, implications for long term; future growth of PT	Review location of interchange vis a vis travel demand; revisit engineering constraints; Long term expansion opportunities	Long term expansion of city centre 'Haymarket Hub' as business/ leisure destination and full intermodal interchange
Scenario 4 Higher level intervention and change; later phases (Comprehensive)	Public transport priority (bus/trams) improved public realm; slow modes	Gateway presence (5 + storeys). High density, high rise, high profile. New form/free form; and architectural statement	City level activities; major office development, retail, leisure and other commercial uses 'city quarter' status
Scenario 3 Moderate levels of intervention (Expanded)	Pedestrian priority/slow mode; maximise public realm space; minimise private transport opportunities	New town scale (3-4 storeys) traditional blocks; Respecting urban grain of 3 rd New Town	Primarily public uses and public space; arts/leisure/cultural uses
Scenario 2 Modest levels of intervention (Enhanced)	Pedestrian priority/slow mode; maximise public realm space	New town scale (3-4 storeys) traditional blocks	Primarily public uses
Scenario 1 Lower level intervention and change; early phases (Basic)	Maintain maximum amount of road space for all traffic (including private transport and car parking)	Maintain current Haymarket scale (+ or - 2 storeys) of traditional/ historic development; low key, modest scale	Small scale development; shops/personal services; community activities
INTERVENTION ISSUES	Linkages (Transport SG) Future transport demand by all modes; promote intermodal approach	Form (Interchange /urban space SG) Core area; interchange buildings driven by operational requirements public realm considerations	Activities (Development opportunities SG) Context area; ancillary and associated buildings, economic regeneration

2.2.3 Following detailed discussion with the client group and wider stakeholders, these scenarios were developed further to illustrate the various ways of interpreting the scenarios on the ground. In most cases, two options were developed for each Scenario with a total of 12 options created for development and appraisal purposes.

2.2.4 Figure 2 illustrates the content of each option in broad terms and provides some clarification on their common characteristics eg the retention or removal of key buildings.

See attached Figure 2 – Scenario and Option Matrix

2.2.5 One of the main focus areas of the Stage 1 Report was the definition and description of each of the 12 options. This was presented in a series of illustrative plans supplemented with associated written description of the key features under

the sub headings of transport factors, urban space and development opportunities, with further reference to scheme size, engineering and phasing considerations.

2.3

Option Appraisal

2.3.1

Chapter 4 of the Stage 1 Report explained the appraisal method and presented the results. The method which has already been discussed and agreed with the client, and Project Board focused on the following parameters :

- An initial assessment of each option's performance against **Implementability** criteria eg technical and operational feasibility.
- Assessment of each option's anticipated performance against the **Planning Objectives** that were set at the Challenge Workshop and ultimately modified and agreed by the Project Board.
- Determination of each option's performance against the **Government's STAG Objectives** eg economy, environment, safety, integration and accessibility/ social inclusion.

2.3.2

Comprehensive appraisal summary tables were prepared and included in Appendix Volume 2 of the Stage 1 Report and summarised in Chapter 4, for each of the options.

2.3.3

In undertaking the Phase 1 appraisal the following principles were followed :

- A key requirement of the study is to facilitate the delivery of an operationally efficient interchange by 2011.
- For each option an 'end state appraisal' was carried out ie it was assumed that the option represented the ultimate state of development by the design year of 2031. It is recognised that the development of some of the larger scale options (Scenarios 4 and 5), is likely to be achieved through a series of phases. For this reason some of the smaller scale options (in Scenarios 1 and 2) are likely to be able to form early phases of the larger scale options.
- In recognition that it has been possible to assemble only limited information across a variety of topics during Stage 1, emphasis was laid on reasons for discarding options where there was clear evidence to do so.
- Under the implementability parameter, none of the options was assessed against either 'financial/ affordability' or 'public acceptability' criteria because of the lack of information. Both of these criteria will be considered in detail during Stage 3.

2.4

2.4.1

Results

Figure 3 : Combined Assessment of Options, presents the results of the STAG Part 1 Comparative Appraisal. This covers of all five scenarios which together contain some 12 options. Assessment was against three main parameters containing a total of 12 criteria, of which three were omitted from the Part 1 appraisal at this stage (cost/financial and public acceptability etc). In the cases of implementability and planning objectives, options were assessed against criteria on a 'pass or fail basis' only. In the case of the Government's five STAG objectives, a standard seven point scale was applied indicating the comparative performance on the positive or the negative side.

2.4.2

In summary, when viewed as end state options only, both options under the Basic and Enhanced scenarios plus Option 3.1 and Option 5.4 fail on a number of planning objectives and achieved a comparatively poor or negative performance against the STAG criteria.

2.4.3

The results of the Stage 1 study can be summarised in the following observations:

- All options pass both the Technical Feasibility and Operational Feasibility assessment under the Implementability criteria.
- None of the options has yet been assessed against the Financial/Affordability of the Public Acceptability criteria at this stage, but will be during Stage 3.
- If viewed as 'end state options' in their own right, Basic options 1.1 and 1.2, Enhanced options 2.1 and 2.2, Expanded option 3.1 and Long Term option 5.4, fail to meet all of the 11 Planning Objectives.
- Expanded options 3.2 and 3.3, Comprehensive options 4.2 and 4.3 and Long Term options 5.2 and 5.3 all pass the Planning Objectives
- When assessed against the Governments STAG criteria, option performance broadly falls into two categories. Better performance is achieved by six options all of which also pass the Planning Objectives; while a comparatively poorer performance is achieved by the six options which fail the Planning Objectives.

See Figure 3 : Combined Appraisal Table

3 Stage 2 : Recommendations

3.1 *Procedures and Status*

3.1.1 Following submission of the Stage 1 Report Volume 1 : Main Report and Volume 2 : Appendices (Draft), they were presented and discussed at a HISAM Steering Group on 26 April. From this, adjustments were made and points clarified, and these included in papers then presented to a subsequent Steering Group on 24 May. This meeting duly authorised the transmission of Volumes 1 and 2 of the Stage 1 Report to the Project Board with their support to approve its recommendations. These are now made in the paragraphs below for each option with a brief explanation of the Advantages, Disadvantages and Major Issues worthy of further examination in Stage 3.

3.1.2 The results from the STAG Part 1 appraisal are summarised below on the basis that these are 'end state options'. However, to account for the fact that phasing construction will be a key feature of the Haymarket development, section 3.2 below describes ways in which certain components of the lower level options could be expected to be adopted as early phases of the higher grade options.

3.2 *Results and Recommendation by Option*

3.2.1 **Option 1.1:** This "Basic" Scenario option performs poorly against the objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process as it offers minimal improvement to the base case scenario. It does not lead to any improvement in the public realm, includes no property development opportunities and the resultant opportunities for related economic development are minimal.

Advantages

- Implementation feasible by 2011 at relatively low cost.
- Potential to improve pedestrian connectivity between bus-tram-train through shortened links and greater priority.

Disadvantages

- Limited capacity for future growth.
- Limited improvements over current situation and does not offer development opportunity.
- Significant impacts on frontage of Grade A listed building.

Major Issues

- Represents a solution to fulfil short term commitments (DDA compliance) but misses the opportunity to add value.

3.2.2

Option 1.2: This “Basic” Scenario option performs poorly against objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. While it provides some improvement to the base case scenario, it will lead to a minimal improvement in the public realm, provides no property development opportunities and the resultant opportunities for related economic development are minimal.

Advantages

- Implementation feasible by 2011 at relatively low cost.
- Enhanced pedestrian access and improved internal circulation within the existing station building at relatively low cost.

Disadvantages

- Limited improvement over current situation and limited capacity for future growth.
- Does not offer development opportunity.

Major Issues

- Could form early phase of larger scale longer term development but design/construction specifications may need to be increased if pursued.

3.2.3

Option 2.1: This “Enhanced” Scenario option does not meet a number of planning objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. While it provides a moderate improvement to the base case scenario and will lead to a slight improvement in the public realm, it does not provide any opportunities for property development, and the resultant opportunities for related economic development are minimal.

Advantages

- New pedestrian entrance to station from Dalry Road.
- Implementation feasible by 2011 and at relatively low cost.
- Incorporates some extensive public realm improvements.

Disadvantages

- Limited improvement over current situation and limited capacity for future growth.

- Does not offer development opportunity.
- Implications for frontage of Grade A listed building.

Major Issues

- Principally focuses on public realm improvements with few additional interchange improvements.

3.2.4

Option 2.2: While this “Enhanced” Scenario option performs better against objectives compared to Option 2.1, it does not meet a number of planning objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. It provides a moderate improvement to the base case scenario and will lead to a slight improvement in the public realm, but it does not provide any opportunities for property development, and the resultant opportunities for related economic development are minimal.

Advantages

- Provides enhanced pedestrian access and improves internal circulation within the existing station building.
- New pedestrian entrance to station from Dalry Road.
- Implementation feasible by 2011 at relatively low cost.
- Potential to improve urban realm and pedestrian connectivity between bus-tram train through shortened links and greater priority.

Disadvantages

- Limited improvement over current situation and limited capacity for future growth.
- Does not offer development opportunity.

Major Issues

- Could form early phase of larger scale development but design/construction specifications may need to be increased if pursued.

3.2.5

Option 3.1: While this “Expanded” Scenario option provides a significant improvement to the base case, it does not meet a number of the planning objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. Although a limited amount of new commercial floorspace would be created through a new concourse, the quantum of development does not maximise the opportunities for private sector funding and limits the wider economic development opportunities at the site.

Advantages

- Improved pedestrian connectivity from Dalry Road, improved capacity, provision of adequate concourse space, introduction of additional escalators to platforms, improved linkages with bus and tram.
- Small air rights development concourse containing modest amount of retail accommodation.

Disadvantages

- Removal of right turn for general traffic from Morrison Street.
- Complexity of constructing limited decking over railway presents substantive difficulties offset by a limited development of “air rights”.

Major Issues

- Removal of right turn for general traffic from Morrison Street, impacts on some north-south movements requires review.
- Engineering solution to be sought to minimise disruptive access over railway for limited decking.
- Could form early phase (beyond option 1.2) of larger scale longer term development but design specifications may need to be reviewed if pursued.

3.2.6

Option 3.2: This “Expanded” Scenario option meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing a more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House. Overall, it would enhance amenity value of the location and provide a significantly better image for the site as a gateway location.

Advantages

- Expansion pedestrian concourse and improved access for pedestrian desire lines including provision of escalators.
- Options for bus stop relocation include moving to centre of existing junction.
- Larger development footprint.

Disadvantages

- Complexity of constructing deck over railway.
- Significant disbenefits to general traffic arising from road closure.
- Taxi and car drop-off further away from main station entrance, with reduced flexibility for onward direction of travel due to road closure.

Major Issues

- Potential road closures cause disruption to general traffic.(although this may be significantly reduced in the base case.
- Consideration given to risk/costs associated with disruptive access over railway.

3.2.7

Option 3.3: This “Expanded” Scenario option meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing a more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House. Although the option includes the removal of listed buildings which would lead to a loss of cultural heritage, it provides an opportunity to improve the aesthetic value of the Haymarket area through sensitive design of new buildings.

Advantages

- Expanded pedestrian concourse and significantly improved access for pedestrian desire lines.
- Options for bus stop relocation include centre of existing junction.
- Larger development footprint.

Disadvantages

- Complexity of constructing deck over railway.
- Significant disbenefits to general traffic arising from road closure.
- Taxi and car drop-off further away from main station entrance, with reduced flexibility for onward direction of travel due to road closure.
- Listed buildings removed.

Major Issues

- Wider impact of potential road closure to general traffic to be considered at a future stage.
- Risks/costs associated with disruptive access over railway.
- Case for removal of listed buildings requires review.
- Investigate scope for “West Bridge”

3.2.8

Option 4.2: This “Comprehensive” Scenario option performs meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House and removal of Rosebery House. Overall, it would enhance amenity value of the location and provide a significantly better image for the site as a gateway location.

Advantages

- Removal of Rosebery House offers major development opportunities and potential economic benefits.
- Limitations to construction access and storage space may be assisted by the removal of Rosebery House.
- Allows easier access for taxi/car drop off to rear of station.

Disadvantages

- Significant disbenefits to private car users due to road closure for general traffic.
- Taxi and car drop-off relocated from main station entrance.

Major Issues

- Risks/costs associated with disruptive access over railway.
- Road closures to general traffic require further consideration.
- Feasibility of PT Link to be reviewed.
- Rosebery House solution provides opportunity to involve “interested” development partner.

3.2.9

Option 4.3: This “Comprehensive” Scenario option meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House and removal of Rosebery House. Although, the option includes the removal of listed buildings which would lead to a loss of cultural heritage, it still provides an opportunity to improve the aesthetic value of the Haymarket area through sensitive design of new buildings.

Advantages

- Removal of Rosebery House and listed buildings offers major development opportunities and economic benefits and facilitate construction.
- Development footprint anticipated to be increasingly commercially viable.
- Allows access for taxi/car drop off to rear of station.

Disadvantages

- Complexity of constructing deck over railway.
- Temporary facilities required during the works.
- Road closures will cause disruption to general traffic.
- Listed buildings removed.

Major Issues

- Risks/costs associated with disruptive access over railway.

- Benefits of removing listed buildings need to be identified.
- Road closures to general traffic and effect on traffic movements to be considered including PT link.
- Investigate scope for “West Bridge”

3.2.10

Option 5.2: This “Long Term” Scenario option meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing a more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House and removal of Rosebery House. Overall, it allows the site to be promoted as a new “city quarter”, significantly enhancing the sense of place and the role of Haymarket as a major gateway location.

Advantages

- Large project could generate contributions for interchange construction.
- New ‘Dalry Link’ public transport route improves profile and maximises retail frontage of EDI site.
- Location of tram stop in Haymarket is more ‘front-of-house’.
- PT link between Dalry Road and A8.

Disadvantages

- Complexity of construction of major deck over railway requires review in detail including disruptive access over railway and substantive ventilation provision will be required beneath deck of station.
- Significant disbenefits to road users due to road closure for general traffic.
- Review capacity/operation of ‘Dalry Link’

Major Issues

- Potential road closures to general traffic requires careful consideration.
- Tram stop relocation requires detailed consideration in design and operational terms.
- Platforms may require to be considered as part of a sub-surface station.
- Land acquisition gives opportunity to consider partnerships with interested developers.

3.2.11

Option 5.3: This “Long Term” Scenario option performs meets all of the planning objectives and has not been rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. It offers a significant improvement to the base case scenario, while providing more substantial air rights concourse development as well as the re-development of Haymarket House and removal of Rosebery House. Although, the option includes the removal of listed buildings which would lead to a loss of cultural heritage, it still provides an opportunity to improve the aesthetic value of

the Haymarket area through sensitive design of new buildings. Overall, it allows the site to develop more as a new “city quarter”, significantly enhancing the sense of place and the role of Haymarket as a major gateway location.

Advantages

- New tram alignment offers significant interchange benefits, with train/ tram lines and stops in close proximity.
- Comprehensive redevelopment of the Haymarket corridor and major local and wider regenerative benefits for city centre (West).
- Locating PT west of junction would allow Haymarket to continue. accommodate all-traffic movements.
- PT link between Dalry Road and A8.

Disadvantages

- Bus proximity to interchange core marginally compromised.
- Construction of deck over railway complex and disruptive. Temporary accommodation also adds problems.
- Listed buildings removed.
- Disbenefits to road users due to road closure for general traffic (but option to retain).

Major Issues

- Removal of listed buildings needs to be clearly justified.
- New tram alignment gives opportunity to confirm new tram stop location. Need for third tram line to be clarified.
- Potential road closures to general traffic requires comment when information becomes available in due course.
- Land acquisition and resulting opportunities for development partnerships to be considered.

3.2.12

Option 5.4: This “Long Term” Scenario option fails to meet the key planning objectives and is recommended to be rejected as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. The option imposes negative Transport Economic Efficiency impacts to the base case scenario as significant delays will be incurred by buses. Overall Integration and Accessibility and Social Inclusion impacts are moderate adverse. This scheme imposes adverse impacts on the Government’s five objectives and is rejected on this basis.

Advantages

- Creation of major civic square between Haymarket and EDI site.

- This ‘public realm only’ option can sit alongside any of the architectural schemes and proposes a full pedestrianisation of Haymarket proper to form a more formal civic space.

Disadvantages

- Major disruption to all road users and consequences of diversionary traffic.
- Potential disbenefits to road users due to road closure for general traffic.
- No development opportunities (beyond EDI site).

Major Issues

- Major disruption to all users.
- Closure of roads to through traffic causing very significant impact on traffic movements, with associated diversions which requires investigation when information becomes available.

3.3

Summary

3.3.1

In summary, options 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 5.4 have been rejected on the grounds of failing to address the Planning Objectives as part of the STAG Part 1 appraisal process. All other options (3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2 and 5.3) have passed the Planning Objectives and the STAG Part 1 appraisal criteria and are therefore recommended for further consideration. It should be noted that options 4.2 and 4.3 are recommended for detailed appraisal but would require further refinement relating to the current absence of a public transport ‘breakthrough’ between Haymarket Terrace and Morrison Street/Dalry Road, in these proposals.

3.3.2

The remaining six options follow three broad scenario options: ‘Expanded’, ‘Comprehensive’ and ‘Long Term’ – it is anticipated that in taking forward these scenario options, there remains flexibility relating to the components of the six remaining options to find the optimum solution for the Haymarket Interchange Study and Masterplan. At this stage of the appraisal process, it is recommended that there are valuable attributes of each scheme option which cannot be rejected at present. The components relate to retaining or removing listed buildings and Rosebery House together with the inclusion of a public transport ‘breakthrough’ opposed to full road closures. It is recommended that these components are considered further in the next stage of detailed scheme option development. Similarly, the ‘Expanded’, ‘Comprehensive’ and ‘Long Term’ scenario options will include a phasing of incremental improvements to the base case scenario in advance of 2011 before the “end state option” is introduced.

3.3.3

A smaller number of options will be subject to more detailed analysis as part of the STAG Part 2 appraisal in Stage 3.

- 3.4 Risk review**
- 3.4.1** The approach to risk management within the HISAM project has been developed and applied in accordance with recognised best practise in Risk Management. The project plan for risk management is confined within Appendix J of this Stage 1 Report.
- 3.4.2** The development of risk management on HISAM has included 4 separate strands, Identification, Analysis, Economic Control and effective monitoring/update.
- 3.4.3** The project risk register was developed during the HISAM workshop on 26th January 2006. This initial risk register has been updated and reviewed on a monthly basis since the inception project. A copy of the most recent risk register is included within the Appendix J
- 3.4.4** In summary, as a result of the Combined Assessment Process, it is recommended that six options deriving from three scenarios be carried forward to Stage 3 for further development, analysis and/or modification and ultimately to their appraisal in Stage 4.
- 3.4.5** As noted previously, scenarios were created in Stage 1 to represent different gradations of development at the interchange site and masterplan. These were subsequently supplemented with options designed to interpret objectives and take advantage of development opportunities in different ways. However these options contain components which, in many cases are transferable from one option to another and indeed from one scenario to another (eg. road closures/restrictions, public realm elements, tram, taxi and bus stops, new accesses etc.)
- 3.4.6** The benefits of such flexibility are expected to become more apparent during Stage 3, when those components which perform better against specific appraisal criteria, and would be mutually compatible could be adopted into different options in order to optimise their performance.
- 3.4.7** Thus the important messages from the Stage 1 appraisal relate both to the recommendation to carry forward three scenarios (Expanded, Comprehensive and Long Term) as well as the six component options developed to illustrate different ways of interpreting the scenarios, for further deliberation in Stage 3.
- 3.4.8** Ultimately in Stage 5 it is expected that a 'Preferred Option' will be created as a hybrid i.e. an amalgam of the 'best' or most appropriate components of each of the

short listed options and any new combinations or permutation of components which may be formulated during Stage 3.

3.5

Phasing

3.5.1

The year 2011, as the first full year of tram operations, has been selected as the initial year for assessment, with 2031 selected as the design year, representing tram operations plus 20 years. For illustrative purposes only the principle of an interim design year(s) has been adopted in order to determine and illustrate how options may be phased in and evolve over time to achieve an optimum 'end state' by the design year.

3.5.2

The key elements of project phasing relate to ensuring that a practical and operationally efficient interchange is delivered by 2011, at a cost acceptable to all participating parties and involving as little 'potentially abortive expenditure' as possible, in relation to its future adaption to suit larger scale options later in the project's timeframe. Such phasing can be expected to be influenced by :

- Future travel demand patterns and take up of mode transfer opportunities
- Land and property availability and acquisition
- Planning policy and consents
- Developer, user and investor interest
- Local and national factors affecting Edinburgh's profile

3.5.3

The phasing of the development could be expected to influence :

- Construction and total costs
- Cost profile over time funding requirements and therefore project viability
- Public support and attitudes
- Economic activity and regeneration in the immediate and wider area

3.5.4

Accordingly, in Stage 3 it will be necessary to consider, the phasing implications and opportunities arising in each option. As part of this exercise it would also be appropriate to indicate a 'do-minimum' option (ie beyond the Base Case) as a bench mark against which the incremental costs and benefits of larger scale options could be assessed. This could be viewed as an opportunity to illustrate a phase 1 of a larger scale option, which nonetheless, could function in its own right for a period beyond 2011 before being fully built out, but prior to which efforts would have been made to avoid abortive expenditure on components which may otherwise have required modification or demolition.

3.5.5

In practical terms, Option 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 or 3.1 could all be viewed as possible candidates as Phase 1 of a larger scale option. It will be for Stage 3 to develop the short listed options further and consider their phasing in more detail.

4 Next Steps

4.1.1

Following two earlier meetings of the Steering Group and the actions thereafter, the HISAM Project Board met on 5 June to consider the Stage 1 Report and its recommendations. The following is a summary of key comments and decisions :

- Following a brief presentation of the significant changes made between the first and final version of the Stage 1 Report Volume 1, the Project Board suggested that, in Stage 3, further investigation be undertaken of first, an additional 'west bridge pedestrian link', crossing the rail tracks west of the existing station, and second, the phasing of options and the practical implications. It was also observed that all cost information should be contained in a paper separate from the Stage 1 documentation.
- With reference to the above comments, the Project Board then approved the Stage 1 Report and confirmed that Halcrow could proceed with the Stage 3 immediately.
- Following discussions regarding modelling outputs expected from the tram project, it was agreed that the programme Stage 3 of HISAM was rather optimistic and that a more likely completion date would be December or even later.
- In recognition of the above it was agreed that the team should prepare more detailed programme for activities that could be undertaken independently from tram modelling data, during 'Stage 3.1', without incurring the risk of potentially abortive work. A programme for 'Stage 3:2' should also be prepared, indicated the range, timing and integration of tasks and then any critical dependencies there may be on tram modelling outputs. This would allow Stage 3.1 to be commenced immediately but would permit a 'hold period' to be invoked (with some resource consequences) prior to the commencement of Stage 3.2, if that proved necessary.
- It was agreed that Stage 3.1 should be embarked on immediately for completion by mid July and a Project Board convened for 25 July to discuss progress and determine the timing of future activities.
- The content of the HISAM Communication strategy (regarding User Survey and consultations with stakeholders and the public) and its relationships to the trams project and the Waverley Station Enhancement Project was raised and CEC agreed to discuss any final modifications to

the Comms Strategy, with Harrison Cowley at a separate meeting and to consider the implications of any additional work incorporated therein.

4.1.2

The proposed Study Programme for Stage 3 is illustrated in the Stage 1 Report Volume 1, Figure 5.1. However it should be noted that completion of Stage 3 is now envisaged no earlier than December and that a detailed exercise is underway to consider the tasks and activities in what will now be known as Stage 3.1 (immediate work) and Stage 3.2 (work dependent on modelling output from trams projects).