

Appendix A - Community engagement and consultation

A.1 Method

A.1.1 The key consultation methods were as follows:

- holding a fully staffed exhibition by Forest Hill Train Station on the 18th and 19th July. The exhibition material included boards and models of the 3 development options together with a video fly through of option 3;
- holding an unattended exhibition subsequently in Forest Hill Library until the closure date for consultation of the 8th August 2008;
- setting up web pages detailing the redevelopment proposals and background information on the Councils website at www.lewisham.gov.uk/foresthillpools;
- conducting a survey via a questionnaire that was available at the exhibitions or could be completed online. The questionnaire asked respondents to state their preference for a redevelopment option and the rationale for this choice. It also asked for comments on the look and feel of the design and ideas as to what additional community facilities should be included in the facility. In addition respondents were asked for their views on how best to reflect the history of the old buildings in the new design;
- holding tailored focus groups with specific "seldom heard groups" to ensure that those members of the community who were unlikely to take part in the mainstream consultation activities had their voices heard;
- engaging with stakeholders via the Forest Hill Stakeholder group and through additional meetings and written correspondence;
- running a statutory consultation process under S105 of the Housing Act 1985 with Council tenants affected by the proposals. This process involved specific 'surgeries' for residents of the Dartmouth estate in addition to the main consultation activities.

A.1.2 The consultation was publicised through a variety of targeted methods, including:

- advertisements in the local press & newsletters,
- mail drop to residents and businesses of Forest Hill, Sydenham, and Perry Vale wards,
- posters in local shops and community notice boards,
- additional targeted mail outs and emails to specific stakeholders,
- word of mouth via the town centre managers and local assemblies,
- publicity and an information stand at Lewisham People's Day,
- online publicity via the Council's website.

The results of the consultation are contained in the rest of part 6 of this report.

A.2 Survey results summary

A.2.1 Respondent details

A.2.1.1 619 surveys were successfully completed during the consultation period. Approximately 50% were completed online and 50% completed on paper and submitted either at the public exhibitions or by post.

A.2.1.2 92.6% (551) of respondents live in the Forest Hill Area, with 61% (380) listing their postcode as SE23, and 27% (166) listing their postcode as SE26. 59.5% (354) of respondents are previous users of Forest Hill Pools and 34.8% (207) list themselves as a parent interested in the pools. 24 participants did not respond to this question.

A.2.1.3 Survey respondents were 57.3% (342) female and 42.7% (255) male. 46.2% (268) of respondents were between the ages of 35 - 54, and 27.1% (157) were between the ages of 25-34. The lowest represented age group was young people, with just 4.3% (25) respondents under the age of 25. 10.2% (59) of respondents were over the age of 65.

A.2.1.4 Just 5% (32) of respondents consider themselves to be disabled.

A.2.1.5 85.2% (420) of respondents classify themselves as 'White - British', with the next highest response rate being among 'Black or Black British - African' at just 3.4% (17).

A.2.2 Development options preferences

A.2.2.1 Survey participants were asked to view the three development options either at an exhibition or online, and to state their preferred option and the reason(s) for their preference. The table below illustrates the responses to this question, and the three most common reasons given for each choice:

	No.	%
Option 1 (minimal development)	168	27.1
More public space/ open space/ green space	51	
Don't want more housing	49	
Most in-keeping with the area/ least obtrusive	20	
Option 2 (medium development)	207	33.4
Want 2 pools but with minimal housing	91	
Best balance between leisure and housing	87	
Most in-keeping with the area	24	
Option 3 (extensive development)	179	29.0
Best leisure facilities/ community space	76	
Attracts business/ activity to the local area	35	
Provides badly needed housing for the area	25	
Did not vote	65	10.5
Total	619	100

A.2.2.2 Responses from the immediate local area (SE23 and SE26) were broadly similar to the overall response rate, as illustrated in the tables below.

	SE23	%
Option 1	111	32.3
Option 2	128	37.2
Option 3	105	30.5
Total	344	100

	SE26	%
Option 1	46	31.5
Option 2	58	39.7
Option 3	42	28.8
Total	146	100

A.2.2.3 Responses from those who consider themselves to be of a black or other minority ethnic (BME) background (21.32%), indicate a stronger preference for option 3 in comparison with the overall response rate, as illustrated in the table below:

	BME	%
Option 1	35	26.6
Option 2	45	34.1
Option 3	52	39.3
Total	132	100

A.2.2.4 Responses by age group indicate a preference for option 3 from younger people (aged 0 -24), with people aged 25-54 voting for similar preferences to the overall response rate, and older people (55 - 65+) showing a preference for option 2, as illustrated in the table below:

	0-24	%	25-54	%	55-65+	%
Option 1	7	28	117	30.5	35	30.7
Option 2	7	28	136	35.4	54	47.4
Option 3	11	44	131	34.1	25	21.9
Total	25	100	384	100	114	100

A.2.2.5 Responses by gender indicate no significant difference in preference, as illustrated in the table below:

	Male	%	Female	%
Option 1	67	29.9	93	29.8
Option 2	86	38.4	118	37.8
Option 3	71	31.7	101	32.4
Total	224	100	312	100

A.2.3 Comments on the design

A.2.3.1 Survey participants were asked for both positive and negative comments about the design. The table below illustrates the top 5 positive and negative categories of response to this question:

Positive comment	No.	Negative comment	No.
Nice design in general/ modernity of design	64	Would prefer to preserve old building/ facade	53
Like the design of the increased leisure/ community space provision	32	Doesn't complement the library/ local area	33
Like the open space - inhibit crime	30	Creates more housing/retail in Forest Hill	27
Complements the library/local area/ links to the library	24	Too bland	23
Like the curved design/frontage onto square	22	Not enough parking/ will create parking problems	21

A.2.4 Additional facilities

A.2.4.1 Participants were asked to state their preference for the type of additional facilities they would like to see in the new leisure centre, and asked to submit further ideas where these were not covered in the options given. The two tables below illustrate the responses to this question:

Option	No.
Gallery/ exhibition space	282
Space for local interests and education (e.g. wine tasting, book groups)	274
Larger community space (e.g. for local assembly meetings)	188
Arts and crafts room	167
Internet café	122

Other suggestion (categorised)	No.
Other dry leisure e.g. badminton, tennis, squash, climbing wall.	28
Crèche	28
Yoga/ pilates/ fitness classes/ specialist classes	24
Leisure facilities already mentioned in design (e.g. Gym/ studio/ pools)	22
Internal play space for toddlers/ children (soft play)	21
Would prefer resources to be concentrated on mainstream leisure	15
Café	14
Cinema/ flexible screen/ theatre/ performance area	12
Other	11
External play space for children/ teenagers	8
Parent and baby changing	6
Steam room/ sauna/ spa	5
Space for youth activities	5
Other suggestions for retail	2

A maximum of the first two choices from each respondent are included in these results.

A.2.5 History

A.2.5.1 Participants were asked to indicate their preference for the proposed methods for reflecting the history of the pools in the

new building, and asked to submit further ideas where these were not covered in the options given. A huge variety of suggestions were given ranging from a commemorative fountain to a mosaic on the floor of the new building. The two tables below provide a quantitative summary of responses to this question:

Option	No.
Integrate historical features (e.g. foundation stone) into the new design	322
A permanent exhibition on the history of the pools and the local area	206
A statue/ monument celebrating the old building	72

Other suggestion (categorised)	No.
Comment on keeping the old buildings/ facades	58
Specifics of first choice e.g. keep the griffins	52
Photos/ murals of famous swimmers/ pools history	35
Do not think money should be spent on pool history	32
Other	26

A maximum of the first two choices from each respondent are included in these results.

A.2.6 Other results

A.2.6.1 A huge variety of additional comments were recorded, and are illustrated in the table below:

Comment	No.
Request for the new leisure centre to be built without further delay/ as soon as possible	66
Against the demolition of the old buildings	28
Compliments to the Council/ Wishes of good luck	23
Further suggestions for community facility content	21
Concerns about parking	18
Objections to new housing/ retail provision	17
Complaints about the consultation process/ previous consultation process/ previous decisions	17
Environmental concerns (eg. trees, sustainability initiatives for new centre)	10
Further comments on style of the design	9
Requests for further information	8
Need 2 pools whatever happens	6
Should have maintained old pools better/ comments on maintenance	4
Concerns from neighbours about privacy	4
Don't want a leisure centre - should use schools instead	4
Other	20

A.2.6.2 Quotes were as diverse as the following:

"We have waited already, too long for our pools. Please let there be no further delay."

"Let us please keep this beautiful Victorian building. It is part of the local heritage."

"Really pleased that we'll be getting a new pool. I hope we don't get delayed by those wishing to keep the old, unfit for purpose building."

"Free parking is a big issue in this area. How will you provide for users of the leisure centre without clogging up this area with traffic?"

"What local people need is a modern, leisure facility fit for the 21st century, that provides value for money for Council tax payers."

"We have never fully recovered from the closure of the pools and it has meant that we swim far less and dropped my daughter's swimming lessons. Please give us back our pool, we really miss it."

A.3 Focus group results summary

A.3.1 Focus groups were carried out with the 'seldom heard groups' as identified in the project consultation plan.

A.3.2 Older people

A.3.2.1 Amman Elderly Asian Group, 30th July 2008, Venner Hall, Sydenham (11 attendees).

The group were divided between options 2 and 3. The group regarded two pools as essential to allow flexibility, tolerance, and separate adult/ child swimming. Generally the group were very positive about the look and feel of the design. They liked the fact that it is a modern looking structure that doesn't overshadow the library and are keen on the glazed elements of the design and the open space. They disliked the small retail/ accommodation 'island' in option 2 as it reduces the size of the public square. The group felt that more parking is required to make the design a success. Additional facilities the group would like to see included:

- External play area.
- Women only swimming sessions.
- Sessions for kids in the learner pool.
- Adult only sessions in the main pool.

- External picnic space.
- Flexible community space with catering facilities to seat minimum of 300 people that can be hired out for parties, weddings, etc.
- Free spectator space to watch kids in the learner pool.

A.3.2.2 Forest Hill Seniors, 6th August 2008, Stansted Lodge (10 attendees).

This group were divided between options 2 and 3. They were divided over the extent of housing offered in options 2 and 3. Two pools were seen as essential to allow separate adult/ child swimming and water exercise classes. The group generally liked the design, in particular the new outside space, and thought it was important for the area as the current pocket park invites anti-social behaviour.

The group considered the current level of parking in the design to be inadequate, and thought that as little housing as possible should be provided whilst providing as much leisure provision as possible.

The group were sad about the general decline of the Forest Hill area including the pools. Many have lived in the area all their lives and learnt to swim in Forest Hill. Many remember what they consider to be a happier time when Forest Hill was a thriving place with many successful independent businesses. The group were keen for the new leisure centre to open as soon as possible as they stated that time is very precious to them at their age.

A.3.3 Young people

A.3.3.1 Lewisham Young Advisors, 4th August 2008, Baseline Youth, Lewisham (14 attendees).

Most of the group preferred option 3, with some of the group preferring option 2, and no-one preferring option 1. The group generally liked the modern, bold nature of the design for option 3 and thought this would bring about positive change for the Forest Hill area. They would like the scheme to provide as much housing as possible, as they think it is necessary for the area and will help with regeneration.

The group would like as large a leisure space as possible, and said that this is essential for attracting young people to the centre.

It was very important to the group that the new building is as environmentally friendly as possible, even if this will cost more.

The group liked the contemporary nature of the design and felt that it doesn't look out of place with the surrounding buildings. The group liked the glazed sections of the design, and commented on how this would liven up the streetscape as well as allowing natural light into the building. They were very positive about opening out the site by using the space in front of Salcombe House.

Additional facilities that the group would like to see included:

- External green space for five a side
- Dance studios
- Spaces for youth activities - e.g. youth club, outdoor activities
- Dry leisure - badminton, squash, football, tennis, larger gym
- Acting space
- Small cinema screen

A.3.4 Disabled people

A.3.4.1 Lewisham Disability Coalition, 12th August 2008, Civic Suite (10 attendees).

The group were divided between options 2 and 3. They thought that two pools are essential to allow for all members of the community to feel encouraged to use the centre. A one pool centre would be intimidating for people with disabilities.

Parking was a key issue for this group. It was felt that the parking in the design might force disabled users to enter the building from a back entrance and there was concern that there may not be enough disabled parking spaces. The group also raised the need for a drop-off point to be near the entrance for those who are not wheelchair users but have walking difficulties. The group like the link to the library in option 3 as many of them currently use the library and the disabled access arrangements are considered to be very poor.

The group saw a hydro-therapy pool as the highest priority for people with disabilities. The group stated that there is currently no suitable hydro pool in the borough and that a large number of Lewisham residents could benefit from a hydro pool for water-based exercises, including people with a wide variety of disabilities and also for elderly people.

The group made many detailed points about the design not included in this report that will be considered as the design

progresses (e.g. quantity of fire safe lifts, location of hand rails, etc.).

A.4 Stakeholder meetings and feedback

A.4.1 Additional stakeholder meetings or targeted written feedback requests were conducted with the following specific stakeholders

- Saxon Crown swimming club - 11th August 2008
- Holy Trinity School - 25th July 2008
- Forest Hill Boys School - 25th July 2008
- Local businesses - 28th July 2008
- Sport England - 8th August 2008
- Forest Hill Society - 8th August 2008
- Sydenham Society - 8th August 2008

The feedback and output was as follows:

A.4.2 Saxon Crown swimming club - meeting - 11th August 2008

The swimming club preferred option 3, and would like to see the most extensive leisure facilities possible provided on the site. They are encouraged by the pools that the Council have delivered in recent years and feel that things are moving in the right direction. They would like to see the project progressed as quickly as possible as water time for swimmers in the borough is badly needed. Generally the club like the new design and consider housing provision to be a bonus as it is needed to accommodate growth in the borough. Specific additional facilities the club would like to see are:

- Disabled and elderly access including hoists for both pools.
- Storage for swimming club equipment.
- A small amount of pool side seating for parents and carers.
- Pool time for swimming club.
- 8 lanes would be better!

The Club have also participated in the Forest Hill Stakeholders Group meetings

A.4.3 Holy Trinity School - written response from head teacher - 29th July 2008

This school preferred option 2 as 'the best plan for this area', with a learner pool seen as essential for school use and a feeling that option two is most in keeping with the library. The school feel that a small number of residential units would be acceptable, but

that this could create a parking issue, with concerns around the leisure users adding to the numbers already making use of the limited parking spaces available and potentially double parking and stopping on the zigzag lines outside the school.

The School have also participated in the Forest Hill Stakeholders Group meetings

A.4.4 Forest Hill Boys School - telephone record with head teacher - 25th July 2008

The school would like to see the old buildings demolished as quickly as possible as they are keen to be able to use the site for school swimming lessons. They favour option 3 as this has the best leisure facilities, but think that option 2 would also be acceptable. The pull in bay for school buses is important to them, along with the ability to separate the learner pool for swimming lessons.

A.4.5 Local businesses - 6 meetings - 22nd July 2008

Meetings were held with six businesses, all situated on Dartmouth Road on the opposite side to Forest Hill Pools. These businesses were: a barber's shop, an off-licence, a hardware shop, a grocery shop, an employment agency and an internet café.

Most of the businesses believe that the closure of the pools has had a negative impact on their business due to the reduction in the number of people walking along Dartmouth Road from the town centre. Of the redevelopment options four of the businesses most preferred option 3 and two of the businesses most preferred option 2. The main reasons given for the preferences was the increase in business that new housing and a new leisure centre would bring to the area, and there was a feeling that the redevelopment would help restore the vibrancy to the area that they feel has been lost in recent years. It is important to the businesses that the redevelopment happens quickly. Some of the businesses expressed concerns about parking and some would like the opportunity to occupy new retail space if provided in the scheme.

A.4.6 Sport England - written response from Planning Manager

Sport England submitted detailed comments illustrating their views at this stage of the project, which are summarised here:

- options 2 and 3 are preferred as they include more water space than option 1.

- The facilities within the building will need to comply with Sport England's Relevant Design Guidance, e.g. changing space, numbers of WCs etc.
- The larger fitness area and studios were welcome and will contribute to the buildings financial viability as well as supporting other activities and contributing to increased activity.

Comments were also made regarding a strategic deficit of water space provision in Lewisham. However, officers are confident that when new provision is completed at Forest Hill, Loampit Vale and Wavelengths, the Borough will exceed the recommended figure.

A.4.7 The Forest Hill Society

The Forest Hill Society participated in the Forest Hill Stakeholder Group meetings.

In addition officers presented to a meeting of the Society in Forest Hill on 7th May 2008.

In late July the Council's Director of Programme Management & Property wrote to the Chair of the Forest Hill Society and offered the Society the opportunity to express their opinions in relation to the redevelopment of Forest Hill Pools, stating that their response could be included in this report. The Society sent a response to the Council and the full version of this response is available at Appendix C. A high level summary is as follows:

- an improved leisure facility on the site of the pools and Louise House is seen as vital to the continued success of Forest Hill as town centre;
- the two most important requirements are a two pool configuration and a strong connection between the library and the leisure centre;
- useful suggestions were made for the new facility interior e.g. a moveable floor for children of different ages;
- disappointment was expressed that the same baseline design was included in all three options;
- comments both positive and negative were made on the designs;
- concerns and disappointment were expressed in relation to the consultation process e.g. the fact that it was the school holidays;
- support was given for options 2 and 3 although concern was expressed about the layout of the housing on option 3.

A.4.8 The Sydenham Society

The Sydenham Society participated in the Forest Hill Stakeholder Group meetings.

In addition the Programme Management team had an extensive dialogue with the Society starting in March 2008 over proposals made by the society to keep and residentially convert Louise House and the Pools frontage building (referred to in the proposals as Superintendents House).

An initial proposal was received in March 2008 that was rejected by officers for basic reasons e.g. the new swimming pool building was not wide enough for a two pool configuration and no space was allocated for a changing village.

Subsequent to this proposal officers sent the Society a comprehensive suite of information to inform a subsequent proposal from the Society. This information included RIBA stage C drawings from the new Wavelengths pool and the Authority's Requirements for the new Wavelengths Pool.

The Society returned with a second proposal in May 2008 and requested that this proposal be included in the subsequent consultation. When the Programme Management team reviewed the proposals it became evident that:

- the new leisure centre design at 2009m² was materially undersized;
- the new leisure centre costs were materially understated by at least £2.5m;
- the commercial viability of the residential conversion proposals with respect to Louise and Superintendents House were overstated by 40% and were hence unrealistic;
- the development appraisal was unrealistic and incomplete e.g. there was no allowance made for forecast construction inflation or developer profit;
- there were numerous issues with the design e.g. the rear of the changing village fronted onto a replacement park.

In early July 2008 the Council's Director of Programme Management & Property wrote to the society thanking them for their proposal and informing them that for the reasons above the proposal was not valid and would not be included as an option for consultation.

In addition in late July 2008 the Council's Director of Programme Management wrote to the Chair of the Sydenham Society and offered the Society the opportunity to express their opinions in relation to the redevelopment of Forest Hill Pools, a summary of which could be included as a paragraph in this report. The

Society sent a response to the Council, the full version of which is available at Appendix C. A high level summary is as follows:

- the Society wish to retain the current Victorian streetscape of the facades of Louise House and the pools frontage and reasons were given for this argument;
- negative comment and objection were made to all three redevelopment options;
- the redevelopment strategy is seen as high risk;
- the consultation process has been poor;
- an architectural competition should have been held to appoint an architect;
- the existing buildings should not be demolished prior to planning approval on the new facility;
- limited support was given to option 1.

A.5 Statutory Consultation under S105 of the Housing Act 1985

A.5.1 All redevelopment options in the HLM feasibility study require the change of use of a small area of amenity space to the front of the Dartmouth estate, on Dartmouth road (shown hatched on the plan at Appendix B). The space would be used to widen the pedestrian approach to the pools complex, creating a safer, more pleasant approach to the area, including a new public square. The space in question is shown hatched on the plan at Appendix B and is currently designated as housing land.

A.5.2 Section 105 of Part IV of the Housing Act 1985 makes it a requirement for a landlord authority to consult with those of its secure tenants who are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of housing management. The Act specifically identifies a matter relating to the improvement of housing properties and to services or amenities provided, in connection with housing properties, to be a matter of housing management to which Section 105 applies.

A.5.3 As a consequence in July 2008 letters were hand delivered (together with a reply-paid envelope) to all secure tenants at Kingswear, Salcombe and Torcross House, on the Dartmouth Estate, allowing 28 days for their observations or comments to be received. The letter set out the Council's proposals for the redevelopment of Forest Hill Pools and the green amenity space in front of Salcombe House as part of this redevelopment. The letter explained that the Council was proposing to landscape and create a new public walkway leading to the redeveloped pools complex. It also explained that all 3 options (with varying amounts of housing) would require at least partial use of the amenity area.

- A.5.4 The letter publicised open surgeries whereby residents were given the opportunity to discuss the proposals with Council officers in more detail. There were a total of four two-hour surgeries, two were held during office hours at Dunlop Hayward housing office in Kingswear House (22 July and 29 July 2008) and two were held in the evening at Forest Hill library (23 July and 31 July 2008).
- A.5.5 The section 105 consultation was carried out in addition to the programme of consultation undertaken on the redevelopment described in this appendix. Residents were informed of this and encouraged to take part in the mainstream consultation events as well.
- A.5.6 At the close of the statutory consultation period of 28 calendar days and after allowing for late responses, a total of 20 responses had been received from residents of the Dartmouth Estate. These responses include informal discussions at the public exhibitions as well as written and online responses.
- A.5.7 The majority of responses were receptive to the changes to the green space and were in favour of the development. One respondent believed it would make the green space a pleasant area for children to play as it has little use at the moment. Another respondent wrote, 'It's a great idea, I support it 100%'.
- A.5.8 There were some general concerns raised, such as disturbance and pollution during construction, heights of the proposed residential blocks, and parking. However these comments related to the development itself rather than the change of use of the amenity area.
- A.5.9 On the whole, responses received from residents favoured a development which would retain as much green space as possible and would not be too dominating in terms of building heights. An emphasis on as little disturbance and pollution as possible was also a key priority.
- A.5.10 Letters were also sent to the leaseholders of properties on the Dartmouth Estate who were also generally supportive of the change of use. The only concern raised was a potential increase in service charges. However they were advised that the service charge might actually decrease if the amenity space was no longer classified as housing land for maintenance.
- A.5.11 Regardless of the final design scheme chosen, officers consider the change of use of this amenity area to be a positive idea for the site, and given the results of the Section 105 consultation this report asks the Mayor to agree in principle to the inclusion of the

land within the redevelopment, subject to planning permission. A further report will be submitted to the Mayor detailing the appropriations required once a final design scheme has been chosen.

A.6 Other input and comment

A.6.1 The Council received additional input and comment after the main consultation closing date of 8th August, which is included here.

A.6.2 Public Meeting - Forest Hill Methodist Church, 21st August 2008.

On the 21st August 2008 the Executive Director for Community Services held a public meeting in Forest Hill to give local people a further opportunity to ask questions and give the Council their views about the Forest Hill Pools redevelopment. A presentation was given outlining the history of the project and the redevelopment proposals. The panel to answer questions at this meeting consisted of Council officers, Cllr Best, and Cllr Russell. Minutes of this meeting are available (see 'background documents'). The main themes that arose at the meeting are briefly summarised here:

- The meeting took place just a day after the listing of Louise House, and there were many questions about what this meant for the redevelopment and how the Council would proceed. The panel informed those present that the implications of the listing would be carefully considered by officers and that the Mayor would make a decision on the best way forward in the autumn. It was also indicated that this would most probably cause a delay to the project and that no demolition of the pool building would take place before the Mayor had made a decision.

- Many people voiced negative views about the HLM design for the redevelopment, and some thought that the project should be opened up to a public design competition. There were also some positive comments about the HLM design, and further queries around the detail of the design such as the level of housing, retail provision, and parking.

- There was a general consensus that two swimming pools are essential for any redevelopment.

- There was a general consensus that design quality is important and that the community wanted a redevelopment that local people would be proud of in the future.

- There were some complaints about the consultation process, including the level of publicity, and the restricted nature of the options being consulted on. Some people expressed a desire for further consultation with different design options, as well as development density, to comment on.
- Some people expressed their affection for the old buildings, their historical importance, and a desire to see a fourth option that keeps the facades of the old buildings. Some people expressed their disagreement with this idea and stated that they did not like the look of the old buildings, and that they would prefer a new build leisure centre.
- There was a degree of confusion around the long history of decisions made on the project and a lack of understanding as to why the old buildings could not be refurbished.
- Many people expressed a desire for the redevelopment to go ahead as soon as possible and were disappointed that the project had been delayed.

A.6.3 On the 8th August 2008 the programme management team received a detailed written response from Councillor Feakes, sent on behalf of all the Forest Hill Ward Councillors. This is attached as Appendix C.

A.6.4 During the consultation period of 18 July – 8 August 2008, the Programme Management team received a number of responses via email or letter:

- 25 email correspondences were received, 8 via the Mayor's Office, 16 via the website or direct emails to Council officers;
- 3 letters were received, 1 via the Mayor's Office;
- 90 responses to a local petition organised by a campaign group called 'Save the Face of Forest Hill', advocating the retention of the frontages of the existing buildings, were received via the Mayor's Office.

At the time of writing, officers have been informed that further signatures are being collected for the above petition and that it will be presented to the Council formally at a later date. The campaign group have submitted a statement as follows:

"[Our] second petition is called Save the Face of Forest Hill and the wording is:

“We, the undersigned, reject options 1, 2 and 3 of the Council's proposed designs. We wish to see the retention of the Pool's frontage block (the Superintendent's House) and Louise House and demand that these significant local landmark buildings be retained as part of the new pools complex.”

This petition was opened on 16th July 2008 and is ongoing. At the time of writing the petition has been signed by 1,043 people (333 online and 710 on paper).”

Some of the other correspondence included requests for further information, which was provided. The majority of email and letter correspondence was in favour of the redevelopment, specifically stating that 2 pools were necessary for the area.

Of the written correspondence received, option 2 was stated as the most preferred. The majority of people understood the need for a land receipt from new housing in order to accommodate increased leisure facilities, but were concerned about the consequences more housing would have in terms of parking and traffic. Others felt that the proposed housing would be better placed in another location, either within the development site or on another site, such as the Dartmouth Estate. The majority of correspondence was from local residents adjacent to the site. Seven of the responses expressed a wish to refurbish the existing buildings.

A.7 Consultation Summary

A.7.1 A summary of the consultation findings is available in section 6 of the main report.