

Britannia site development proposal

Consultation summary report, March 2017

Contents

Introduction	3
Background	3
Consultation approach	3
Distribution	3
Events	4
Media coverage	4
Summary of results	5
Do you agree with the Council’s proposal to replace Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility?	5
Do you agree with the proposal to build some private housing on the site as a means of funding the new Leisure centre and the secondary school?.....	6
Do you agree with the proposal to provide affordable housing on the site?.....	6
Do you agree that the Council should continue to provide secondary school places in the borough in line with increasing parental demand?	7
Do you agree with the proposal to provide additional secondary school places by building a mixed, nondenominational (accepting people of all faiths) secondary school on the Britannia site at Hyde road?.....	7
Do you agree that Shoreditch Park Primary School, should remain in their current site, at Hyde road?.....	8
Support for feasible options	8
If you currently use Britannia Leisure Centre, what facilities do you use?	9
If you don’t use Britannia Leisure Centre, what would encourage you to use it?	9
Stakeholder responses.....	9
Profile of respondents	10
Conclusion	10

Introduction

This report presents the findings of a consultation on the proposed development of the Britannia Leisure Centre site. The consultation ran from **5 December 2016** to **12 February 2017**.

Background

The Council is considering whether it would be possible to build a new leisure centre to replace Britannia – which is coming to the end of its life – and a new secondary school to help meet the demand for school places for local children. This would be funded in part by the sale of housing, which would also be built on the site.

The Council is looking at the Britannia site, in Hyde Road and bordering Pitfield Street, because it is a large site in Council-ownership.

Over the summer, the Council commissioned a feasibility study to identify the options available to build a new leisure centre, six form of entry secondary school and co-located housing on the Britannia site. The study took account of the lack of central government funding to build a new leisure centre, the limited funds for building a new school, the desire for the current leisure centre to remain operational during the build period and also whether it would be beneficial to rebuild Shoreditch Primary School elsewhere on the site. All to be achieved whilst retaining the land in the Council's ownership.

The consultation questionnaire invited residents and stakeholders to feed back their views on the feasible options. The consultation made it clear that as the programme progresses, residents will be able to get involved in more detailed consultations on the design options for specific elements of the scheme; for example, the facilities for the leisure centre.

Consultation approach

The public consultation started on **5 December 2016** and ran for 10 weeks to **12 February 2017**.

Distribution

A development proposal and questionnaire was sent by Royal Mail to all 6,535 households in Hoxton East and Shoreditch, the ward in which the Britannia site is located.

Copies of the development proposal and questionnaire were also made available at Hackney Town Hall, Hackney Service Centre and Britannia Leisure Centre for the duration of the consultation period.

An online version of the questionnaire was made available on Hackney's dedicated consultation website (<http://consultation.hackney.gov.uk>) and featured on the homepage for the duration of the consultation. Residents were also able to download .pdf versions of the development proposal and questionnaire on the website.

The Britannia Leisure Centre webpage on the Hackney Council website (<http://hackney.gov.uk/britannia-leisure-centre>) featured information about the consultation and a link through to the online questionnaire.

An email was sent by Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) to members and groups regularly booking Britannia Leisure Centre on 13 December 2016, publicising the drop-in events organised at the centre, the link to the online questionnaire and raising awareness of paper copies of the consultation that were available for collection from the Britannia Leisure Centre reception.

Copies of the development proposal and questionnaire were also distributed directly to parents of pupils at Shoreditch Park Primary School via book bags on 27 January 2017.

Posters promoting the consultation and drop-in events were distributed to and displayed at key locations on and around the site including Britannia Leisure Centre, Shoreditch Park Primary School, Shoreditch Park, Colville estate and Mawson Court estate.

Events

A permanent exhibition about the proposed development was on display at Britannia Leisure Centre from 15 December 2016 until the end of the consultation period.

Drop-in events were also held, providing an opportunity to ask officers any questions relating to the consultation. These took place as follows:

- Shoreditch Park Primary School, 13 December 2016, 15.30-16.30 (parents of Shoreditch Park Primary School pupils only)
- Shoreditch Park Primary School, 13 December 2016, 17.00-19.00
- Britannia Leisure Centre, 15 December 2016, 8.45-12.00
- Britannia Leisure Centre, 17 December 2016, 12.00-14.00
- Colville Estate Community Hall, 5 January 2017, 18.00-20.00
- Shoreditch Park Primary School, 10 January 2017, 15.30-16.30 (parents of Shoreditch Park Primary School pupils only)
- Shoreditch Park Primary School, 10 January 2017, 17.00-19.00
- Hackney Service Centre, 11 January 2017, 10.00-12.00
- Britannia Leisure Centre, 12 January 2017, 17.00-21.45
- Hackney Service Centre, 18 January 2017, 14.00-16.00

Media coverage

The consultation featured as a front page article in Hackney Today on 12 December 2016 (issue 393). A reminder was also included in the 'Have your say' section on 16 January 2017 (issue 394). A full page advert was featured in Hackney Today on 30

January 2017 (issue 395). The consultation was also featured in regeneration news updates for the Colville estate (December 2016 issue).

The consultation featured in Hackney Citizen (“Council makes a splash with Britannia Leisure Centre plans”, 6 December, online) and Hackney Gazette (“Mayor of Hackney says Britannia Leisure Centre must be rebuilt to secure its future”, 6 December, online).

Summary of results

The public consultation received 479 responses in total via the online and paper completion surveys. The majority of responses, 349, were received via paper completions, 130 were completed online.

Ten drop-in sessions were held to promote the consultation, which were attended by approximately 130 people in total.

Four additional stakeholder responses to the consultation were received.

Do you agree with the Council’s proposal to replace Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility?

The majority of respondents, 59.7% (282), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 26.5% (125) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 13.8% (65) neither agreed nor disagreed. 159 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 7 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1 – the area in which Britannia is situated – 65.2% (206) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 20.6% (65), disagreed with the proposal and 14.2% (45) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal. These results indicate a higher level of support for replacing the Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility amongst residents in close proximity to the site.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to replace Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility indicated a preference for the centre to be refurbished rather than rebuilt. Respondents also questioned the costs outlined and stated the money spent (approx. £300,000) on a recent refresh of Britannia. Some of the respondents stated a low quantity/ratio of affordable housing in the proposal.

Overall, respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to replace Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility indicated concern that existing facilities would not be replicated at a new leisure centre. Some of the respondents acknowledged the state of repair of facilities at the existing leisure centre, demonstrating a need for a new centre.

Do you agree with the proposal to build some private housing on the site as a means of funding the new Leisure centre and the secondary school?

A large proportion of respondents, 47.8% (224), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 38.2% (179) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 14.1% (66) neither agreed nor disagreed. 202 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 10 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1 – 51.1% (161) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 33.3% (105), disagreed with the proposal and 15.6% (49) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal. These results indicate a higher level of support for building some private housing on site amongst residents in close proximity to the site.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to build some private housing on the site as a means of funding the new Leisure centre and the secondary school indicated a concern that building private housing would not directly benefit the local population. Respondents also challenged the quantity/ratio of affordable housing to private housing outlined in the proposal. Some of the respondents also stated that the proposed development would create a division in the community between existing and new residents.

Overall, respondents that strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal to build some private housing on the site as a means of funding the new Leisure centre and the secondary school indicated concern about the quantity/ratio of affordable housing to private housing outlined in the proposal. Some of the respondents referenced overbuilding in the area.

Do you agree with the proposal to provide affordable housing on the site?

The majority of respondents, 62.0% (289), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 23.2% (108) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 14.8% (69) neither agreed nor disagreed. 158 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 13 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1 – 61.9% (195) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 21.6% (68), disagreed with the proposal and 16.5% (52) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to provide affordable housing on the site indicated a concern that building affordable housing would not necessarily be affordable to residents. Respondents also challenged the quantity/ratio of affordable housing to private housing outlined in the proposal. Some of the respondents also stated that affordable housing would not

directly benefit the local population. Respondents also stated the increase in population density.

Overall, respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to provide affordable housing on the site questioned whether the flats would be genuinely affordable to residents and indicated concern about the quantity/ratio of affordable housing to private housing outlined in the proposal. Some of the respondents stated that the development would not directly benefit the local population.

Do you agree that the Council should continue to provide secondary school places in the borough in line with increasing parental demand?

The majority of respondents, 72.3% (340), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 11.3% (53) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 16.4% (77) neither agreed nor disagreed. 90 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 9 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1– 72.5% (229) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 11.4% (36), disagreed with the proposal and 16.1% (51) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to provide secondary school places in the borough in line with increasing parental demand stated a lack of evidence for demand in the local area. Respondents also stated a preference for other local schools expanding rather than a new school opening.

Both respondents that disagreed and agreed with the proposal stated a lack of clarity in the phrasing of the question.

Do you agree with the proposal to provide additional secondary school places by building a mixed, nondenominational (accepting people of all faiths) secondary school on the Britannia site at Hyde road?

The majority of respondents, 58.7% (272), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 21.8% (101) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 19.4% (90) neither agreed nor disagreed. 118 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 16 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1– 58.9% (185) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 20.7% (65), disagreed with the proposal and 20.4% (64) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to provide additional secondary school places by building a mixed, nondenominational (accepting people of all faiths) secondary school on the Britannia site at Hyde road stated a preference for leisure facilities to be prioritised over the school.

Respondents also expressed concern that the development would encroach on Shoreditch Park. Respondents indicated a concern about the size of site to support a school. Some respondents also stated a preference for other schools expanding rather than a new school being built.

Overall, respondents that strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal to additional secondary school places by building a mixed, nondenominational (accepting people of all faiths) secondary school on the Britannia site at Hyde Road stated a positive effect this type of school would have on the community. Some respondents also specified a preference for the school to be maintained by the Council as opposed to an academy.

Do you agree that Shoreditch Park Primary School, should remain in their current site, at Hyde Road?

The majority of respondents, 61.4% (286), agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 3.9% (18) disagreed or strongly disagreed and 34.8% (162) neither agreed nor disagreed. 49 of those who responded to this question explained their reasons in the comment box, whilst 13 did not provide a response to the question.

The analysis considered responses by postcode area. Of those that indicated that they lived in the postcode area, N1– 65.1% (205) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, 3.5% (11), disagreed with the proposal and 31.4% (99) neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal. These results indicate a slightly higher level of support for Shoreditch Park Primary School remaining in their current site amongst residents in close proximity to the site.

Overall, respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal that Shoreditch Park Primary School, should remain on its current site, at Hyde Road stated a preference for housing to be prioritised over keeping the school on its current site.

Overall, respondents that strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal that Shoreditch Park Primary School should remain on its current site, at Hyde Road stated concern regarding the funding model for the development. Respondents also expressed concerns about the proposed development encroaching on the playground of Shoreditch Park Primary School.

Support for feasible options

Respondents were asked to rank the three feasible options from 1 to 3 with 1 indicating the most preferred option and 3 the least preferred option. The ranking was then calculated. The highest rank option was 'Approximately 480 housing units, of which 80 are affordable homes'. The ranking results are shown in the table below.

Feasible option	Ranking
Approximately 480 housing units, of which 80 are affordable homes	1.57
Approximately 440 housing units, of which 40 are affordable homes	1.45
Approximately 400 housing units, with no affordable homes on site	0.94

If you currently use Britannia Leisure Centre, what facilities do you use?

The main swimming pool was the most popular facility, used by 38.2% (183) of respondents. This was followed by the fitness gym, used by 30.3% of respondents. 14.4% (69) respondents used the sports hall and 14.4% (69) used the exercise studios.

If you don't use Britannia Leisure Centre, what would encourage you to use it?

155 responses were received for this question. The key themes that emerged included a new swimming pool, improved gym and studio and lower membership/facilities cost.

Stakeholder responses

In addition to the online and paper consultation submissions, 4 responses were received from stakeholders:

Anthology

Letter received on 10 February 2017 from Adam Gaymer, Executive Director of Anthology, who are currently working with Hackney Council to redevelop the Colville estate.

Shoreditch Park Primary School

Letter received on 1 February 2017 from teachers at Shoreditch Park Primary School.

Hoxton Citizens Charter

The Charter was launched at the inaugural meeting of Hoxton Citizens on 28 January 2017. Hoxton Citizens group includes representatives from St Anne's Church Hoxton, St John's Hoxton, St Monica's Church, Hackney Community College, St John the Baptist School, Randal Cremer Primary School and St Monica's Roman Catholic Primary School.

Save Britannia Leisure Centre petition

Prior to the consultation period, a petition was started on Change.org to halt the Britannia development. The petition gained a total of 2,913 supporters, 2,500 of which signed before the development proposal document and consultation were launched on 5 December. The petition was presented to the Council on 11 February 2017.

Profile of respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate the first part of their postcode. 95.4% (457) of respondents provided a Hackney postcode. Of these, the majority of respondents, 70.2% (321) were from N1, the area in which the Britannia site is located. This was followed by E8, 8.5% (39) and E2, 4.4% (22).

Conclusion

The majority of respondents to the questionnaire were generally supportive of the proposals to develop the Britannia site. Support for the proposal to replace Britannia Leisure Centre with a brand new leisure facility was slightly higher amongst residents of the N1 postcode, compared to all respondents. Of the three feasible options presented, respondents indicated a preference for the development of approximately 480 housing units, of which 80 are affordable homes.

Those that were opposed to the proposals raised concerns about the quantity and ratio of affordable housing outlined, that the private housing would not directly benefit the local community and potentially create a division in the community between new and existing residents. Respondents that were opposed also stated a preference for the leisure centre to be refurbished rather than rebuilt and some voiced concerns about the transparency of the funding model.

The Britannia Development Board will consider the results of this consultation in addition to other evidence and information from stakeholders. The results will inform a report for Cabinet.

The results of the consultation will be considered by Cabinet on 19 April 2017.