

The key issues if the masterplan is to proceed are:

1. Scope of the masterplan
 2. Timescale of the masterplan
 3. Funding
-
1. The masterplan boundaries include Waverley Bridge, Market St, New St and Calton Rd. These are the surrounding streets (which is essential) except Princes St. As Princes St is the most heavily used access route for arriving/departing passengers this is a strange omission, even if the boundaries are 'fuzzy'.
 2. The timescale is not entirely clear, but it appears that the concept is progressively to develop the station over 30 years. This may be realistic in terms of phasing and funding, but begs the question of how the masterplan will be sustained over 30 years. It covers several generations of key staff, and multiple political cycles. How will the masterplan be managed and progressed over such a timescale? Unless this is addressed, it will become another concept that is forgotten and/or reinvented as a new generation of developers, funders and managers takes over. We cannot identify a similar project in the UK with such a timescale*.
 3. The outline has some similarities to Option B of the previous redevelopment plan (estimated at £592 million, 2004 prices). A guesstimate might suggest a ballpark of at least £1.5 billion at current prices may be reasonable. Over 30 years this is relatively inexpensive, but begs the question of how to sustain funding over this period (see 2 above).

Regarding specifics, the references to improving interchange are welcome. However, interchange with bus is critical. The data previously gathered shows a very high proportion of arriving and departing passengers connect to buses; this is not given appropriate prominence in the documents. (See previous point about Princes St and the masterplan boundary).

The nearest tram stop is some distance away. We are concerned that, in (rightly) addressing this, the project does not lose sight of the real benefit of interchange with 'less glamorous' bus services.

Careful thought must be given to provision for bus operations within the site. At the very least there is a case for accommodating services which currently terminate on Waverley Bridge. There is also the issue of temporary rail replacement services.

*The obvious comparisons are Kings Cross, Birmingham New St, and London Bridge; all developed and completed much quicker.