

## **CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL (PORTOBELLO PARK) BILL**

### **OBJECTION 38 – SANDY SUTHERLAND**

**This objection was signed by the objector and reproduced in typed (electronic) form by the clerking team**

I am writing to object to the whole of the above bill, which is being promoted by the City of Edinburgh Council.

Having lived in Portobello for more than 40 years I wish to make clear my strong objections to this Private Bill which reeks of “short-term-ism”.

This remarkable endowment which was left to this city is a tribute to the vision and values of those in power in the past, particularly at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century yet the current regime have seen fit to forget those values and the fact that the land at Portobello Park was left IN TRUST and jump on a populist bandwagon which does not brook opposition.

I object on the grounds of loss of green space, on the potential loss of clean air and on the grounds that if the current new Holyrood School is any guide there will be considerable noise and light pollution.

And it is not as if there are no brown site alternatives. Yet the Council who are the guardians of the land in trust on behalf of the residents of Portobello have pressed on regardless and in spite of the verdict of the legal lords who decisively rejected their actions.

As a long-standing and active member of the historic Portobello Golf Club, the origins of which go back well over a century, I personally also deplore the impending threat of this new development, not only to the course itself which is threatened with changes to at least two holes but also to its environs with the prospect of our having to play at the second hole for example with a large high fence in close proximity in front of the existing trees, which may also be under threat.

This being viewed by most current members as fundamentally changing its character and therefore likely in the long term to influence their decisions as to remaining in membership.

There is also the likelihood that, however many assurances are given, some pupils will stray across the course on their way to and from school, with the dangers that implies. This will cause the golf course to deteriorate and eventually become unplayable. This could lead to the likely demise of this valuable facility and then the Council will have an excuse to use it for something else.

Portobello Golf course may only have 9 holes but it is easily accessible for those living in the immediate area and attracts young and old, parents and families and is a gentle and cheaper introduction to our second national sport which may be

increasingly attractive to the public given the way the game is now developing. Woe be on us if we destroy that!

If this bill is successful then I foresee a very likely scenario arising, whereby other councils will try to follow the same route in order to take common good land for any purpose they wish. Having allowed one council permission via this route, how could they refuse others? It would be the thin end of the wedge.

I therefore ask that this bill is rejected.

20 June 2013