

From: Liam Roarty <REDACTED>
Sent: 28 April 2022 23:51
To: Commercial Property <Commercial.Property@edinburgh.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to proposed asset transfer for section of Ravelston Park.

I wish to lodge my objection in respect of the proposed asset transfer for the following reasons;

The loss of land outdoor space and parkland will imply more people in a negative manner than it will benefit. The BCT business case that accompanies confirms the benefit is a maximum of 10 additional nursery spaces.

The application question B14 answer is not a true person reflection as the asset transfer request has caused a significant rift in the local community with in excess of 20 people calling out their objection. Application question C1 has been answers false - there is a suggestion access to sport and leisure will be increased but it will decrease As the land transferred will be built upon and people charged to us that facility when they can enjoy for free currently. Local boys and girls football teams, walking clubs, orienteering clubs as well as guides and scout organisations all use this section of park on a regular basis and will lose the space being transferred.

The application incorrectly states there are a lack of bookable spaces in the area and list only 2 but they have omitted at least another 5 venues in ravelston golf course clubhouse, Blackhall tennis courts clubhouse, Blackhall bowling green club, holiday inn hotel, Blackhall library.

Application question c3 states they will be able to redirect funds back into the community which might be spent elsewhere and cites football as an example but they football teams currently utilise this space and would lose space. Their proposed build is not big enough for indoor football.

Application question e4 is false as the answer states the benefit is 60 nursery places but Thai is false as 50 already exist and the actual benefit derived is a maximum of 10 spaces.

The application does not outline how the build costs of £1m plus for the new pavilion will be sourced or the timeline to source as no monies have been committed yet.

The business plan has not said where the children who attend nursery will go while they have to decant the building to build the new pavilions.

In addition to the above BCT do not operate in the local community in an open, honest and transparent manner. Their website and social media pages lack detail on board members, meeting minutes, agendas or how to attend. When asked for details on proposals or progress I was told attend writings in person to receive updates.

People who have voiced opposition to the asset transfer and not permitted to attend their meetings and are blocked from their social media pages.

When asked for additional details on the Consultations referred to in their application the data and questions asked cannot be retrieved but they claim to have only the statistics from the consultations.

The estimated value of the land in question 2b is based on a different land request and is not based on the current asset transfer request. In addition the one valuation is nearly 5 years old and under RICS rules this will no longer be valid and should not be used

The application submitted is dated December 2017 and was not based in the latest proposals, meaning the business case, coatings, benefits and opposition are not accurately reflected.

Many thanks

Liam Roarty