

Minutes of the Community Councils Together on Trams/Trams Team meeting on Thursday 13 April 2023 at 5:15pm, at Trams project compound (165 Leith Walk)

Actions and decisions are **RED ITALIC UNDERLINED SMALLCAPS**. 'TT' means 'Trams Team'. Names are mostly abbreviated to initials.

0 Summary of actions

item	actor	action
1.3	TT	when appropriate, provide a statement that all commitments have been completed
1.3	TT	facilitate a discussion with CCTT of the latest road-safety audit and reactions to it by TT, contractors etc
2.1	CCTT	populate CCTT tracker, then forward it to RA TO ADD IN COSTS
2.1	RA	Add costs to CCTT tracker
2.2	RA	Provide responses about agreement/disagreement on actions log status ASAP
3.1	RA	Advise CCTT if there are any errors in the record, e.g. about interpretation of Edinburgh Street design guidance
4	MB	Draft an articulation about discrepancies in statements about responsibility to repair diversion routes to Hannah Ross by the end of April.
5.1.1	RA	issue small-model tables prior to relevant meeting
5.6.2	RA	explain lack of lighting on Pilrig OLE poles
5.6.4	JM	send details of lighting issues to RA
5.6.5	RA	respond to details of lighting issues
5.7.1	TT	look into possible mitigations for kerb at Foot of Leith Walk
6.3	CCTT and TT	meet offline to resolve differences in expectations
7.1	TT	issue information requested in item 7.1 below
7.3	RA	send to CCTT the relevant test sheet and the schedule for completion of footpaths etc

1 Prelims

1.1 Welcome, apologies

1.1.1 Present

Robert Armstrong	TT/CEC	Rob Leech	TT	Harald Tobermann	CCTT/LCC C
Mike Birch	CCTT/NTBC C	Andrew Mackenzie	CCTT/LLCC		
Angus Hardie	CCTT/LLCC	Jennifer Marlborough	CCTT/LHNC C		

1.1.2 Apologies

Don Giles	CCTT/LHNC C	Chris Wilson	TT/CE C	Bruce Ryan	CCTT minutes secretary
-----------	-------------	--------------	---------	------------	------------------------

1.2 Draft minutes of March 2023 meeting (not for distribution until approved)

Approved as-is *nem con*

1.3 Actions from March

Cover yellow items only (light blue under item 4 below)

March item	Actor	Action	Status
1.2.1 (point 2)	RL/T T	check whether GDPR would prevent publication of commitments	- This touches on agreements – to do small things which are not fixing defects or snags – with third parties who may not wish to be named publicly, hence TT is very reluctant to release this information. It was suggested that CCTT could obtain information via a Freedom of Information request. ACTION: WHEN APPROPRIATE, TT TO PROVIDE A STATEMENT THAT ALL COMMITMENTS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED.
1.2.1 (point 3)	TT	review reporting of hard landscaping, e.g. by reporting percentages of work remaining	
1.2.1 (point 5)	RA/RL	issue timeline of how project proceeded in reality	

2	MB	review whether each item on action log is now closed or open	
2.1	RA	arrange meeting on traffic modelling	
2.3	CW	advise whether [redacted] APOG minute can be released to CCTT	These minutes cannot be released outwith the APOG
2.7	RA	go through road safety audit with TT	- There is no point in going through the RSA undertaken 2 years ago. - CCTT still wishes to see the recent 'third stage' RSA and contractor and TT's response to it, by the June CCTT/TT meeting at the latest ACTION: TT TO FACILITATE THIS DISCUSSION
2.8	HT	review and provide note of discussions about defect management	
4	HT	issue doodle poll to ascertain the final date	
4	RL	provide CVs of potential facilitators to CCTT	
5.1	TT	look into why collapsed personhole action was closed out implicit action: get the hole fixed.	
5.2	TT	look into lack of lighting on Pilrig poles	
5.3	TT	look into track-slab mastic issues	
5.4	JM	email details of lighting issues to RA	
5.4	RA	respond to JM's reports	
6	TT	keep CCTT informed of any changes to 'open for revenue service' date	

2 CCTT/TT Meetings Action Log (last updated 7 April 2023) with responses by Tram Team and comments from CCTT

2.1 To note: marked up in yellow where CCTT suggests a change to the open/close status

- Row 19: agreed to close this because it's a duplicate
- Row 28: RA has not received the necessary list
- Row 29: **CCTT IS TO POPULATE CCTT TRACKER, THEN RA TO PROVIDE COSTS**

2.2 To discuss: items where 'new status' is not agreed

ACTION: RA TO PROVIDE RESPONSES ASAP

3 Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments

3.1 To note: as formal record of discussions

- RA: much of this will be picked up in the road safety audit
- ACTION: RA TO ADVISE CCTT IF THERE ARE ANY ERRORS IN THE RECORD, E.G. ABOUT INTERPRETATION OF EDINBURGH STREET DESIGN GUIDANCE**

4 Repairs to tram diversion routes

Agenda note: there appear to be discrepancies (minutes of CCTT/TT minutes, CEC Q&A, and Code of Construction Practice) of how these will be handled. How can these be best resolved?

- RA: I have been chasing about defects on Duke St etc. I'm aware that East London St is a sore point, but it is not part of TT responsibilities. CEC may handle this as part of its capital works.
 - MB: CEC has additional money to use for this, but this is different to the code of practice which states that all diversion routes will be inspected before the tram-project starts. If [post-project] damage is found, the costs will fall upon the trams project. Later, it was stated that any damage to Leopold Place running lanes would fall on the trams project but CEC would take responsibility for non-running lane matters. Hence there are discrepancies.
 - RL: These may stem from CEC being both a roads authority and a project promoter. It would be worthwhile taking these questions to CEC via Hannah Ross.
 - HT: if the code of practice is part of the contract, then SFN is clearly responsible for repairs to diversion routes.
 - ACTION: M BIRCH TO DRAFT AN ARTICULATION TO HANNAH ROSS BY THE END OF APRIL.**

5 Queries and issues identified by CCTT

All queries to be responded to by TT at the meeting or by an agreed date (some of these have been raised by email earlier this month).

5.1 Traffic models: dates to be agreed

5.1.1 'Big model'

Agenda note: CCTT understands that the overall system wide modelling has now been completed, which will allow us to better understand not only the impact on individual junctions but the overall movement of traffic at different points of the day. CCTT would like to look at the modelling of specific junctions and streets under different assumptions regarding traffic flows and junction design

- RA: I will meet with M Birch and other CCTT members on 25 April to discuss this.
 - This model does not take into account low-traffic neighbourhoods and controlled parking zones, only features of the plans in the final business case. For the effects of the LTN and CPZ, CCTT should speak with these projects.
 - This model goes hand in hand with small model.
 - CCTT: when do we see modelling of implications of different choices, e.g. not closing turns off Leith Walk?
 - RA: we have such detail, and can discuss it. The scope covers Leith Walk, major diversions (as far as Easter Rd), Leith Links, Great Junction St, The Shore etc.
 - RA: *I WILL ISSUE THE SMALL MODEL'S TABLES PRIOR TO THE MEETING*, so the meeting can focus on the areas of concern to CCTT.
 - MB: does the modelling include changes made subsequent to the final business case plans, e.g. around Antigua Place?
 - RA: no, but it will be updated to take into account such changes before the end of June.

5.1.2 'Small model'

Agenda note: tables showing AM/PM peak flows (and averages) for all individual junctions off Leith Walk (including Picard Place/London Road and Great Junction/Duke) based on original final design

See item 5.1.1

5.1.3 In case Brunswick Street stays closed, please provide revised tables for all side streets (both sides) from McDonald to Picardy

- RA: such tables can be obtained from Jacobs

5.2 Litter bins: welcome, but not clear how locations have been chosen, e.g. by the narrowest point of pavement near Pilrig Church (Pilrig Street) and near (too close?) the future 'Pilrig Muddle' tram cable wheels

- RA: the Pilrig bin should now have been moved. All bin positions are on the landscaping drawings. TT will replace a bin outside a fast-food stop, as requested by a local councillor.
 - CCTT: our main concerns are that CEC will be able to collect waste from bins regularly, and that bins do not inconvenience people. Hence CCTT is interested in how locations were chosen.
 - RA: they were chosen by a landscape artist under contract to SFN.

5.3 Three 'unhappy' lighting poles and stranded (?) cabinets by Pilrig Church: when and how will this be tidied up (simplified)? Who is responsible?

- RA: I have chased this up again today. Responsibility lies with Pegasus, a contractor to SFN.

5.4 Tram testing and commissioning

Agenda note: please advise at which times in the night this happens and at what speeds, whether noise is being monitored (if so, what are the results?). Is the tram bell being used and are there any late-night mitigating measures in place?

- RA: times are currently variable, starting from 8am and lasting to 4am or 5am. Bells are run every time trams reach and leave stops.
 - CCTT: the route being constructed is much closer to housing than the original route, e.g. along Constitution St. Residents are likely to be unhappy about the bell-noises. There have been some expression of concern.
 - RA: while testing (and consequent bells) will go on to early morning, but tram service will only be from 4am or 5am to 11pm. The bells are a safety requirement.
 - RL: it is important that people are aware that once service starts, there will be no bells in the middle of the night.
 - CCTT: is it essential for tests to cover all of the route [at night], and at what speed are test-trams running?
 - RA: yes; walking speed. It's not possible to avoid parts of the route, but we can take heed of concerns. There have been concerns about rail-noise at tight turns but this should improve over time. Testing is currently being done at night to minimise impacts on traffic. Day-time testing will start soon.

5.5 Tram Safety Audit: when will it be completed and reviewed, when will it be shared, when will it be actioned?

- RA: It will be actioned as part of the defect process, i.e. within 5 weeks of completion, and managed by Turner Townsend – with ultimate responsibility lying with CEC

5.6 Light blue actions from March

5.6.1 Look into why collapsed personhole action was closed out; implicit action: get the hole fixed.

- MB: this is at the London Rd/Leith Walk junction, and was reported to both CEC roads and to TT. It was closed out by CEC before the work was done. Why?
 - RA: we have raised this with CEC but not received a response. TT has asked CEC why, if CEC thought this was a matter for TT (because it's on the tram route), CEC didn't tell this to TT.
 - CCTT: this is an example of CEC's systems being weak. Can we expect more incidents?
 - RA: TT is also looking into how it can use CEC systems for defect management. If anything is picked up by the public, it should not be closed out. Ensuring this is part of TT's handover plans.

- CCTT: we insist on a full answer: what went wrong and how systems will be improved, by May

5.6.2 Look into lack of lighting on Pilrig poles

- CCTT: there are two overhead lighting poles, one each side of the junction – both have no lighting. Why?
 - RA: *I WILL RESPOND TOMORROW*

5.6.3 Look into track-slab mastic issues

- RA: this has been tackled recently.
 - CCTT: small cuts are being made by the tracks every 5 to 10 metres.
 - RA: this is part of the snagging/quality control process.
 - RL: the mastic question has been escalated to senior management within the joint venture. A full program of works has now been agreed, and will be completed by the end of May. There are no structural issues but there is an aesthetic issue that needs to be remedied. The issue is more prevalent in certain areas and non-existent in others.
 - CCTT: is this due to the crews working on these areas?
 - RA: it's due to the conditions in the areas, e.g. contractors' machines had to be on the track-slab from Pilrig to the Foot of the Walk.

5.6.4 Email details of lighting issues to RA

- *ACTION: JM TO SEND THESE DETAILS TO RA*

5.6.5 Respond to JM's reports

- *ACTION: RA TO RESPOND TO JM'S COMMUNICATION IN 5.6.4.*

5.7 **Other CCTT concerns**

5.7.1 Kerb at bottom of Leith Walk (north-west corner)

- CCTT: traffic is swerving here. A crash is very likely.
 - RA: the cycleway here is part of Leith Connections. *TT WILL LOOK INTO POSSIBLE MITIGATIONS*, and send responses to CCTT.

5.7.2 Planters

- RA: TT is has reviewed planter locations, to deal with planters that may block pavements.
 - CCTT: this is also about aesthetics. Consultation with CCs had been agreed.
 - RL: CCTT had previously not appeared to be concerned.
 - CCTT: people had asked for greenery on Leith Walk but this 'solution' has appalled people. It needs thought and consultation.
 - RA/RL: plans have been available for a couple of years. There are over 40 planter locations. The review was undertaken this week. We don't yet have a timescale for moving planters, but will develop maintenance schedules. TT can share a specimen schedule. Planters are difficult to move if they are filled with earth. They will be placed and planted as public-realm work is completed. The contractor, not CEC, is responsible for planting for 2 years .

5.7.3 Cycle-lane surfaces

- CCTT: have these been passed as fit for purpose? Some areas are very rough.
 - RA: some areas need further defect-fixing but in general the surfaces meet the relevant 'design manual for roads and bridges' specifications. Much of the surface has been hand-rolled. The Leith Walk cycle-lanes will be closed until near completion of the trams project. TT has publicised this. Some marking work remains to be done.

6 **Lessons Learned**

6.1 **To note: any updates to plans**

No updates

6.2 **To note: [Trams to Newhaven Timeline](#) as one of the background papers for the Lessons Learned session**

noted

6.3 **To agree: the following timeline of preparatory steps**

14 April	Agree timeline and facilitator for lessons learned - T minus 8 weeks
21 April	Agree meeting outline/agenda and documents* to be issued to participants in advance - T minus 7 weeks
28 April	Issue meeting outline/agenda, documents and request for input from CCTT members - T minus 6 weeks
26 May	Deadline for responses from CCTT members - T minus 2 weeks
2 June	Issue summary of responses and confirm meeting arrangements and final agenda - T minus 1 week
9 June	CCTT/TT 'Lessons Learned' session

* Documents to include: a detailed timeline and a table outlining the other/wider lessons learned sessions; there may be a number of other papers CCTT members would find useful (e.g. a graph showing contractors staff on site over the whole time).

- RL: I am working on recruiting facilitators. We need to agree on documentation and links that will be issued. I am not convinced that the graph mentioned above will help with the overall questions of *what went well for the community?*, *what did not go well?*, *what can be changed going forward (i.e. what should be done differently in future projects)?*

- CCTT: The point is that time needs to be spent on working out what information would be useful to the lessons learned process, and then on making this information available, if this can be done. CCTT members need some time to work out what they wish to know.
- TT: the workshop is about community views, not about what went well for TT
- CCTT: please can the workshop also cover change management? CCTT needs clarity in able to prepare for 9 June, and the facilitator needs time to consider requests for additional information and potential response.
- RL: this will be costly – I'd need to get approval for such spending.
- CCTT: it is puzzling that such spend wasn't in CEC's plans. Lessons learned processes are part of any project, and naturally incur costs. Who is paying for this project's lessons learned work?
- RL: the trams project, but CCTT's expectations are higher than in other LL work. The trams project will report on this session, not the facilitator. CCTT and TT should meet separately to resolve differences in expectations. There is no requirement to undertake an LL process, but there is a requirement to undertake a post-project evaluation.
- CCTT: we reiterate that in order for the LL session to work, CCTT members need to be able to prepare.

○ **ACTION: CCTT AND TT TO MEET OFFLINE TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES IN EXPECTATIONS**

7 TT reports and updates

Papers:

- [Trams to Newhaven Timeline.xlsx](#)
- [CCTT Dashboard March 2023.pdf](#)
- [CCTT TT Meetings Action Log \(last updated 7 April 2023\).xlsx](#)
- [Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team TTN responses and CCTT comments.pdf](#)
- [March Geographical breakdown master ver 2.xlsx](#)
- [TM Update 05-04-23.pdf](#)

- 7.1 To discuss: indicator/s showing progress of (percentage relative to total contractual sqm) completion of the public realm outside the tram track, ideally broken down by pavement, roadway, cycle path and other surfaces.**
- RA: we are working on collating this information, and *WILL ISSUE IT SOON*
- 7.2 To discuss: *full versions* of 'sectional completion dates' and 'escalated defects' (only partially shown on dashboard)**
- RA: the detail given on slide 6 of the dashboard is complete. The 'stray current' item is not an issue for the project.
- 7.3 To note: verbal update and 'walk-through' the remaining 72 days to completion: what we can expect to see and when**
- RA: TT is working on testing and commissioning. I will send CCTT the relevant test sheet and the schedule for completion of footpaths etc
- 7.4 To note: remaining dashboard sections**
- Noted.
- 7.5 To note: summary of the most recent Tram Project Board (and sub-groups) meeting/s on a confidential basis**
- RL/RA: this covered testing and commisisoning
- 7.6 To note: Summary of TT meetings with Active Travel and Business Groups**
- none

8 AOB

8.1 Coaches

- MB: where should these unload outside the Mariott? The loading bay here is too small for coaches.
 - There is parking near the Omni centre, and at the back of the hotel.

8.2 Picardy Place

- RA: this work will be undertaken by TT, starting this week. The relevant contractors have the design.

9 Date of next meeting/s and guests:

11 May, 8 June (or was this moved to 15 June)