

Cheltenham Borough Council

Cabinet – 9 July 2019

The Future of Public Convenience Provision

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman
Accountable officer	Director of Projects, Mark Sheldon
Ward(s) affected	Park, Lansdown, Pittville, College, All Saints
Key Decision	Yes
Executive summary	This report identifies opportunities and recommendations for improvements to the future of public conveniences in the town centre. It discusses alternative partnership initiatives that will increase the choice of amenities available to the public, potential cost savings and capital generation realised from rationalisation of the current stock.
Recommendations	That Cabinet resolves to: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Adopt the proposed strategy to guide future decision making with regard to public conveniences set out in paragraph [5]2. Undertake a consultation exercise in respect of option 3, set out in section 4, and to report back to AMWG, O&S and cabinet with the outcomes and recommended way forward.
Financial implications	As detailed in report and appendices. Contact Officer: Jon Whitlock, Financial Officer Email: Jon.Whitlock@publicagroup.uk Tel: 01242 264354

<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>Cheltenham Borough Council has power (but not a duty) under section 87 of the Public Health Act 1936 (as amended) to provide public conveniences, but is not obliged to do so. Where the authority provides such conveniences, regard must be had to the needs of disabled persons, and provision must be made so far as practicable and reasonable to meet those needs (s5 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970).</p> <p>If it chooses to exercise this power, it also has power to enter into agreements with third parties to achieve the outcomes, either under the Local Government Act 1972 or the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>When deciding whether or not to close the existing public conveniences (and to proceed with any changes), the authority needs to be satisfied that it has discharged its consultation duties imposed by section 3(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 (as updated by revised Best Value Guidance Statutory Guidance of March 2015) and has had regard to its duties under the Equality Act 2010. In terms of the Equality Act 2010 the Council has to bear in mind its wider Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) when proposing service changes i.e. the duty to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this (Equality) Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.” (‘protected characteristics’ are: Age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.) Again, in practical terms, the PSED requires any consultation regarding service change to be at the earliest opportunity, with persons possessing a protected characteristic who may be affected, be clear who it may affect and how, and give them the opportunity to express their views. The authority needs to be satisfied that meaningful consultation has taken place in accordance with the PSED. It would be important to consider whether the provision of such services by third parties, as an alternative to the Council’s provision, would satisfy the Council’s duty.</p> <p>With regard to any infrastructure changes involving works, the authority needs to comply with the Contract Rules and procurement law.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Shirin Wotherspoon, Head of Law (Commercial)</p> <p>Email: shirin.wotherspoon@teWKesbury.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel: 01684 272017</p>
<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>There are no direct HR implications identified in the report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Carmel Togher, HR Business Partner</p> <p>Email: carmel.togher@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel: 01242 775215</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<p>That Cheltenham Borough Council is unable to develop a commercial partnership with suitable businesses to provide the number of fit for purpose facilities to replace those public facilities identified for closure.</p> <p>That the proposals are viewed as being detrimental to Cheltenham’s amenity provision, by the public</p>

Corporate and community plan Implications	<p>The project supports the Place Strategy vision to be a place where our people, communities and environment thrives. Providing improved access to a greater number of well-maintained toilet facilities and investing in improvements to council owned facilities will contribute to improving the town centre and providing strong healthy inclusive communities.</p> <p>The project also contributes to our principles within the Corporate Plan to <i>“be commercially focused where needed and become financially self-sufficient to ensure we can continue to achieve value for money for the taxpayer”</i>.</p>
Environmental and climate change implications	<p>Reduction in use of energy and water on sites recommended to be closed.</p>
Property/Asset Implications	<p>Dependant on the delivery timescale for this scheme there may be resource availability issues within the Property team to undertake the activity proposed within this report.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Garrie Dowling, Senior Property Surveyor</p> <p>Email: gary.dowling@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel: 01242 264394</p>

1. Background

1.1 Property Services have been asked to review the public convenience facilities within the Town Centre. This report will consider their current condition and opportunities improved access to better facilities for all residents and visitors and for potential cost savings and revenue income, realised from further rationalisation of the stock and alternative initiatives that could realise potential revenue income from the assets.

1.2 The public convenience assets currently in operation are:

- Bath Terrace -
- Imperial Gardens
- Montpellier Gardens
- Pittville Park
- Royal Well
- Sandford Park

The following assets are not currently operational:

- Ambrose Street
- Town centre East

2. Rationale

2.1 The overall public convenience amenity serving residents and visitors is below standard as a result of the poor condition of some of the toilets. The majority of the facilities are in need of major refurbishment which will put substantial pressure on the planned maintenance budgets over the next ten years. Operationally, these facilities are also expensive to run, and while desirable, in terms of public amenity they will continue to be a costly obligation on the Council's budgets.

Many towns and cities across the country have looked at alternative approaches to public toilet provision through successful community partnership schemes enabling public access to facilities within commercial premises. This has resulted in access to a greater number of well-maintained and more accessible facilities.

2.2 The high level assessment of the eight public conveniences, under Section 3.0, gives an overview of each property's condition and additional commentary on status and other considerations. This will assist in developing a strategy for the future provision of public conveniences in the borough.

2.3 There are commercial development opportunities that present themselves for a number of the public conveniences within the Town centre.

2.4 An additional consideration of this review is the cost of maintaining the new 'Changing Places' accessible toilet at Pittville Park. There is a commitment to off-set these costs by making savings elsewhere.

2.5 The review focuses on a number of options, namely:

- **Option 1** – Retain and invest in the facilities currently operational
- **Option 2** – Close all facilities and seek a community partnership initiative to provide public access to alternative facilities
- **Option 3** – Retain selective facilities and seek a community partnership initiative to provide public access to alternative facilities
- **Option 4** - Retain and invest in the facilities currently operational and introduce charging

2.6 The review includes the following information which may assist the Cabinet members in making decisions on a strategy for future provision of public conveniences.

3. Information on Current Status

Name	Location	Condition	Comments
3.1 Bath Terrace	Bath Terrace car park off Bath Road	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently a legal agreement in place with a representative of Bath Rd Traders Association that would need to be investigated • Commercial potential (additional car parking or commercial premises)
3.2 Imperial Gardens	Town Hall, Imperial Square	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services Imperial Park garden bar and park users as well as general public. • Is part of fabric of Town Hall listed building • Opportunity to transfer responsibility to The Cheltenham Trust
3.3 Montpellier Gardens	Off Montpellier Walk	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic refurbishment in 2004/2005 was part funded by HLF grant. • Adjacent to popular childrens' play area, tennis courts and refreshment kiosk. • Well used
3.4 Pittville Park	Off Evesham Road	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial refurbishment in 2005 • Adjacent to play area, refreshment kiosk and recently developed Changing Places accessible toilet facility. • Well used
3.5 Royal Well	Rear of Municipal Offices, Royal Well	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the footprint of the Municipal Offices so would be impacted by proposals for the building. • Opposite the bus station and consequently well used. • Alternative provision exists at bus station

3.6 Sandford Park	Off College Road	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The facility design is extremely basic and no longer fit for purpose. Open only during the summer months
3.7 Ambrose Street	Adjacent to Bowling Green	Closed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial potential
3.8 Town Centre East	Under TCE car park	Closed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to use as storage facility Commercial potential

4. Options Analysis

4.1 Option 1

Retain and invest in the facilities currently operational:

Continue to support the existing facilities from the Planned Maintenance reserve and include all necessary refurbishments in the ten year Planned Maintenance Programme (PMP). To keep the remaining six public conveniences open will cost the council an annualised net cost of approximately £320,300 p.a. over the next ten years. Currently there is no revenue income from these assets to off-set these costs.

4.2 Option 2

Close all facilities and seek a community partnership initiative to provide public access to alternative facilities:

Move to a similar strategy as adopted by other councils e.g. Gloucester City Council, (**Appendix A**) whereby the council could embark on a community partnership scheme with local businesses throughout the town. This initiative would provide the public with accessible toilets in convenient locations across the town, whereby the participating businesses would agree to let members of the public use their toilet facilities during normal working hours without the need to make a purchase from the business.

This would require negotiation and agreement with Cheltenham's business community but there could be a potential saving to the MTFS over the next ten years of up to £204,000 p.a., this would also relieve pressure on the Planned Maintenance reserve by approximately £102,300 p.a. This will be dependent on the cost of potential partnership grants or contributions to participating businesses. Some initial discussion with Cheltenham BID on community partnership for Cheltenham town has been undertaken by CBC's Business Transformation team and a proposal summary is included in **Appendix D**.

4.3 Option 3

Retain selective facilities and seek a community partnership initiative to provide public access to additional facilities:

Undertake negotiations to develop a community partnership scheme, as detailed in 4.2 and undertake a selection process to retain certain facilities, and invest where necessary, based on ability, or lack of, to provide suitable alternatives. The end result should provide an overall improvement to the current level of public convenience facilities within the town.

This option will enable the Property team to investigate revenue generation from disposal or commercial opportunity from the redundant amenities.

Potential Opportunities

Asset	Opportunity
Bath Terrace	Consider offering up for commercial venture, leasing to Bath Traders Association under a full repairing lease or demolish and turn into parking spaces and cultivate community partnership additional facilities nearby.
Imperial Gardens	Propose to discuss transfer of all operational liabilities to the Cheltenham Trust and cultivate community partnership additional facilities nearby.
Montpellier Gardens	Retain to support parks activities and review cleaning contract

Pittville Park	Retain to support parks activities and review cleaning contract
Royal Well	Premises to be included in potential redevelopment of the Municipal Offices, Cultivate community partnership additional facilities nearby.
Sandford Park	Potential to relocate and redevelop facilities to support park activities (including increases in events), and review cleaning contract. Include additional commercial potential within redevelopment plans
Ambrose Street	Offer up for commercial venture and cultivate community partnership additional facilities nearby.
Town Centre East	Offer up for commercial venture or as storage facility for Ubico and cultivate community partnership additional facilities nearby.

This would require negotiation and agreement with Cheltenham’s business community but could deliver an annual MTFS saving of £77,000 and reduction of £62,500 expenditure from the property maintenance reserve which may result from the potential transfer of responsibility for some toilets to third parties or the closure of toilets as a result of the implementation of a successful community partnership scheme, following consultation.

These figures have excluded any additional revenue from commercial opportunities. A separate piece of work would need to be undertaken to understand those financial benefits

4.4 Option 4

Retain and invest in all facilities and introduce charging:

This is essentially the same as Option 1 but in order to deliver savings there has been an investigation into the viability of generating revenue via a pay-to-use initiative. For the purposes of this report a simple usage appraisal has been carried out and details are to be found in **Appendix C**.

Based on our observations on usage and a charge of 20 pence, which appears to be the optimum charge, CBC could generate gross revenue of c£38k p.a. However, cash collection, processing and other lifecycle costs could be up to £24k p.a., leaving a net profit of £14k p.a. to go toward MTFS.

Capital outlay of £85k would be recovered in approximately a six year period, and following years would potentially see an operational cost reduction of 6%/£14k p.a. on the annual revenue costs. This option could deliver a potential saving to the property maintenance reserve and MTFS over the next ten years of up to £5,500 p.a.

5. Reasons for recommendations

In reviewing the current status and future opportunities presented from our public convenience amenity, the project team makes the following recommendations:-

- Adopt the following strategy to guide future decision making with regard to public conveniences

“As part of Cheltenham Borough Council’s strategy to be a place where everyone thrives, the Council will make best endeavours to ensure that daytime access to a toilet provision is available to members of the public within the town centre and its major public open spaces, and that the provision is clean and safe to use.”

- Undertake a consultation exercise in respect of option 3, that is to retain selective facilities and seek a community partnership initiative to provide public access to additional facilities,
- Report back to cabinet with the outcomes and recommended way forward that is likely to include;-
 - Development of a community partnership scheme allowing public access to public conveniences in commercial premises where it is beneficial for the community.
 - Implementation of asset investment and rationalisation in line with potential opportunities detailed in Option 3 (4.3).

- Delivery of a communication plan that engages and informs the public and stakeholders on the project proposals in a timely manner.
- Consideration of wayfinding signage requirements

6. Costs & Funding

Summary of operational costs and capital investment requirements

The detailed breakdown of costs can be found in **Appendix B**.

6.1 As noted in Option 3, the financial summary above does not include any potential to generate additional income through commercialisation or disposal of any redundant facilities. This report proposes that this be undertaken as a separate piece of work utilising specific skills of the Property team, in parallel with the progression of this project.

	Annual Revenue Net Cost	10 Year Refurbishment Costs (PMP)	New Capital Expenditure	Total 10 Year Cost	Annualised Net Cost for comparative purposes (10years)	Overall Annual Saving compared to current state	GF MTFS Saving	Relieved PRM pressure
Option 1 (Current)	£218,000	£1,023,000	£0	£3,203,000	£320,300	£0	£0	£0
Option 2	£14,000	£0	£0	£140,000	£14,000	-£306,300	-£204,000	-£102,300
Option 3	£141,000	£398,000	£0	£1,808,000	£180,800	-£139,500	-£77,000	-£62,500
Option 4	£204,000	£1,023,000	£85,000	£3,148,000	£314,800	-£5,500	-£14,000	£0

Notes/Assumptions

- Please note that refurbishment costs quoted are indicative only.
- All Property Services management and resourcing costs are excluded.
- Income for Option 4 is estimated on a small amount of research, based on 20p charge
- Current cleaning costs from Ubico are all savings if all public conveniences close
- Allocation of costs between the different WC's is based on Ubico's costs
- Normal Revenue Operating costs are currently within existing budgets, however note that the budget for 19/20 isn't the full cost of public conveniences. (some costs are attributed to Parks and Gardens through the Ubico contract)

7. Consultation and feedback

7.1 As one of the project objectives is to improve the current public convenience provision there has been no public consultation at this point. However, the council must be mindful of its wider Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) when proposing service changes and to that end will consult partner groups on the Community Partnership Initiative opportunities to ensure they are fit for purpose for all residents and visitors.

7.2 Cheltenham BID manager has provided feedback on the findings and proposals, specifically the Community Partnership Initiative, and this has been encompassed within this report.

7.3 CBC Participation & Engagement Team Leader has commented on the Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix F)

- a. Previous consultation specific to those with complex disabilities was undertaken as part of the CBC Changing Places project and has been reviewed as background to this project
- b. The Research and Government guidance (March 2008 and November 2008) encouraging local authorities to provide better access and better quality toilets, provides useful information when considering Community Partnership Toilet Schemes

7.4 The councils Asset Management Working Group was consulted on 13th June and feedback on recommendations was generally positive. There was some discussion on the need to consider the following –

- Visitor experience impact from the Community Partnership Initiative
- Bath Terrace traders response to closure of Bath Terrace WC (to include in consultation)
- Royal Well bus/ coach station operatives (to include in consultation)
- Homeless, look into including the YMCA/YWCA into the Community partnership Initiative
- General wayfinding signage round town

7.5 A report was put together following a discussion with the Regeneration and Economic Development officer at Gloucester City Council, in 2017, on their Community Partnership Initiative. (Appendix A)

8. Performance management –monitoring and review

8.1 This project will follow the principles of Prince 2 project management.

8.2 The business case in this report will provide the benchmark for measuring the financial benefits over the following 10 years

8.3 The success of the project will be monitored as part of the councils standard performance management strategy

Report author	Contact officer: Jane Stovell, Project Manager Email: jane.stovell@cheltenham.gov.uk Tel: 01242 264367
Appendices	A. Gloucester City Council Community Partnership Initiative B. Detailed breakdown of operational costs and capital investment C. Pay-by-use initiative and detailed costings D. Cheltenham Borough Council Community Partnership Initiative proposals E. Risk Assessment F. Equality Impact Assessment
Background information	https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120920031420/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/1064520.pdf https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120920031546/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/713772.pdf

Appendix A

(Original report from 2018, updated May 2019)

<http://www.visitgloucester.co.uk/explore/tourist-information-centre/community-toilet-scheme>

Background

The scheme has been in place between 6-8 years and all public toilets have been closed in the town except for the facility located in the new bus station.

Cost in set up

Required to dispose of the 99 year lease tenure on the toilets owned by Council

- Sold on to a private buyer, a café
- Some were demolished
- One is now a storage unit for contractor
- Materials required: signs, stickers, promotion (newspapers, door to door, centre 'tell, radio)
- Mini campaigns, "tourists" annotated maps kept at TIC

The Commercial Partners

There were originally 15 partners which has been reduced to 11, of which 6 are commercial partners paid £600 per year; 4 sites are council owned and Debenhams do not accept any payment. The partners are:

- G1 Leisure Centre (CC owned, managed by Aspire)
- Gloucester Guildhall (CC owned)
- Gloucester Folk Museum (CC owned)
- Gloucester City Museum (CC owned)
- Warehouse Climbing Centre
- Debenhams
- Eastgate Shopping Centre
- Poppins Restaurant (near to bus station)
- The New Inn [Pub - Part of the RelaxInnz]
- Robert Raikes [Pub - Samuel Smiths Brewery]
- The Imperial Inn [Pub - Brains SA, Draught Bass]

Pay-to-Use Facilities

The bus station redevelopment includes 6 toilets with coin operated doors (2 female, 2 male, 1 baby change and 1 disabled). The footfall through the bus station is approximately 10m which includes those accessing the train station as well.

No feasibility study was carried out as the pay as you go toilets have been included in the wider Kings Quarter redevelopment, to offset the capital cost and discourage vandalism. The political decision to charge 20p instead of 30p considered that people would only need one coin and there were no other pay as you go toilets in the city. There will be a change machine available on site. The site will have also have an attendant, which will be an additional cost of 1fte to the cleaning contract. However the site will be leased to Stagecoach who will have responsibility to maintain the services.

Note: Community Partnership Initiatives in Poole, Oxford, City of London, Cardiff, Wealden and Penzance were also reviewed as part of the research undertaken.

Appendix B

Detailed breakdown of operational costs and capital investment

Existing Costs

	Bath Terrace	Imperial Gardens	Montpellier Gardens	Pittville Park	Changing Places Pittville Park	Royal Well	Sandford Park	Ambrose Street	Town Centre East	Total
Ubico Costs	£7,428	£29,254	£35,787	£45,707		£35,206	£14,176			£167,557
Utilities - Electricity	£458	£1,803	£2,206	£2,817		£2,170	£874			£10,327
Utilities - Water	£294	£1,158	£1,417	£1,810		£1,394	£561			£6,634
Utilities - Sewerage & Drainage	£335	£1,319	£1,614	£2,061		£1,588	£639			£7,556
Compliance	£167	£756	£357	£508	£2,500	£364	£52			£4,704
Maintenance	£5,706	£4,446	£7,816	£6,603	£600	£8,336	£1,432			£34,939
Business Rates	£2,470	£1,656	£2,928			£1,646				£8,700
Contribution		-£14,600								-£14,600
Current Revenue Running Costs	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 17,734			£225,817
Refurbishment Due	2021	Overdue	2024	2025		Overdue	Overdue			

Realigned cost breakdown

Option 1	Bath Terrace	Imperial Gardens	Montpellier Gardens	Pittville Park	Changing Places Pittville Park	Royal Well	Sandford Park	Ambrose Street	Town Centre East	Total
Current Revenue Running Costs	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 225,817
New Revenue Costs Yr 1	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 225,817
Annual Saving NNDR Yr2-10	-£ 2,470	-£ 1,656	-£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	-£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	-£ 8,700
NEW Revenue Saving Yr2-10	£ 14,389	£ 24,137	£ 49,196	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 49,057	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 217,117
Refurbishment costs next 10 years	£ 200,000	£ 200,000	£ 250,000	£ 60,000		£ 225,000	£ 88,000	£ -	£ -	£ 1,023,000

Option 2	Bath Terrace	Imperial Gardens	Montpellier Gardens	Pittville Park	Changing Places Pittville Park	Royal Well	Sandford Park	Ambrose Street	Town Centre East	Total
Current Revenue Running Costs	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 225,817
Adjusted by										
Remove All costs as closed	-£ 16,859	-£ 25,793	-£ 52,124	-£ 59,505	-£ 3,100	-£ 50,703	-£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	-£ 225,818
Add back NNDR, costs will be until asset disposal	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ 8,700
Community Partners 10 @ £500										£ 5,000
New Revenue Costs Yr 1	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ 13,699
Annual Saving NNDR Yr2-10										£ -
NEW Revenue Saving Yr2-10	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ 13,699
Refurbishment costs next 10 years	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -

Option 3	Close	Close	Retain	Retain	Retain	Close	Retain	Close	Close		
	Bath Terrace	Imperial Gardens	Montpellier Gardens	Pittville Park	Changing Places Pittville Park	Royal Well	Sandford Park	Ambrose Street	Town Centre East	Total	
Current Revenue Running Costs	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 225,817	
Adjusted by					Changing Places						
Remove All costs as closed	-£ 16,859	-£ 25,793			£ 50,703			£ -	£ -	-£ 93,355	
Add back NNDR, costs will be until asset disposal	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ 5,772	
Community Partners 10 @ £500										£ 5,000	
New Revenue Costs Yr 1	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	£ 1,646	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 143,235	
Adjusted by											
Annual Saving NNDR Yr2-10			-£ 2,928	£ -	£ -		£ -			-£ 38,428	
Daily Coin Collection & Processing										£ 15,600	
New Revenue Saving Yr2-10	£ 2,470	£ 1,656	£ 49,196	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 1,646	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 146,369	
Other Lifecycle costs										£ 3,400	
New Revenue Costs Yr next 10 years	£ 16,859	£ 25,793	£ 52,124	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 50,703	£ 88,000	£ -	£ -	£ 388,028	
Annual Saving NNDR Yr2-10	-£ 2,470	-£ 1,656	-£ 2,928	£ -	£ -	-£ 1,646	£ -	£ -	£ -	-£ 8,700	
NEW Revenue Saving Yr2-10	£ 14,389	£ 24,137	£ 49,196	£ 59,505	£ 3,100	£ 49,057	£ 17,734	£ -	£ -	£ 203,029	
Refurbishment costs next 10 years	£ 200,000	£ 200,000	£ 250,000	£ 60,000		£ 225,000	£ 88,000	£ -	£ -	£ 1,023,000	
Capital Expenditure for Installation of Charging @ £5k per door * 17 doors										£ 85,000	

Appendix C

Option 4 Pay-by-use initiative and detailed costings

Included below are some high-level costing which have assisted in making a decision on whether or not to pursue a pay-to-use initiative further and commission external expertise to report on the adaptability of CBC's remaining public conveniences, management costs and revenue potential.

This would need to be evidenced through a comprehensive operational study and options appraisal in order to collect empirical data on use and capital outlay required.

A similar study was commissioned by Gloucester City Council in 2014 and the report is a useful insight to the complexities of a wide-ranging bespoke optional appraisal. The study is included in Appendix A for reference.

Use data study

For the purpose of this report and in order to assimilate some basic cost information, Property Services carried out a series of brief observations on use for each of the six assets.

Review of usage

The count was based on two half-hourly observations made mid-week, one morning and one afternoon. The analysis below serves as a test-bed only and used as an example of what is possible and not what is probable. It is strongly advised that a more detailed study is undertaken on how often the conveniences are used to better inform use data as extrapolated in the study. This may require installation of automatic step-counters at each location to provide records obtained over a much wider period of time to give more reliable footfall figures for each location.

An assumed charging rate of 20 pence has been used for the purpose of the following analysis as market research has suggested this is a reasonable rate.

Use data calculations (Count based on two half-hourly observations mid-week am and pm)

Criteria							
Opening times (winter):	8	x	6 months	=	1456	hrs	
Opening times (summer):	10	x	6 months	=	1820	hrs	
Ave opening time:	3276	/	365	=		9	hrs
Opening days:	6	x	52	=	day x weeks	312	days
Assumed charging rate:	20	pence		=		0.2	pence

Property	Count	x	Uses/day	x	Uses/year	x	Revenue
Bath Terrace WC							
Male	11	x	99	x	30,888	x	£6,177
Female	5	x	45	x	14,040	x	£2,808
Disabled	0	x	0	x	0	x	£0
Imperial Gardens WC							
Male	8	x	72	x	22,464	x	£4,493
Female	1	x	9	x	2,808	x	£562
Disabled	0	x	0	x	0	x	£0
Montpellier Gardens WC							
Male	8	x	72	x	22,464	x	£4,493
Female	4	x	36	x	11,232	x	£2,246
Disabled	0	x	0	x	0	x	£0
Pittville Park WC							
Male	4	x	36	x	11,232	x	£2,246
Female	9	x	81	x	25,272	x	£5,054
Disabled	2	x	18	x	5,616	x	£1,123

Royal Well WC								
Male	10	x	90	x	28,080	X	£5,616	
Female	3	x	27	x	8,424	X	£1,685	
Disabled	0	x	0	x	0	X	£0	
Sandford Park WC								
Male	1	x	9	x	2,808	x	£562	
Female	2	x	18	x	5,616	x	£1,123	
Total Potential Annual Revenue:							£38,188	

Consider further, factors that may affect use:

- Locations e.g. parks and gardens, car parks, taxi rank, bus station etc.
- Human nature re charging and rather not pay
- All the facilities are communal (no single use WCs e.g. pods), therefore prone to vandalism, tailgating, propping doors open etc.
- No on-site supervision

Operational calculations and payback

The following table gives an indication of predicted benefits of implementing a pay-to-use initiative and the likely effect on future operational costs. We have included indicative cost information from CBC Support Services team regarding the coin collection and processing operations which will be additional to existing operational costs. Also included are the obvious additional servicing and maintenance costs together with other life-cycle costs associated with the new coin-operated doors.

Following on is the capital outlay and pay-back calculation which in turn is off-set against predicted operational costs less anticipated annual revenue income which in turn reduces the existing operational costs overall. Daily coin collection and process costs were extrapolated from existing cash collections overheads for car parks.

Property Services have made enquiries with two suppliers of coin-operated doors. Supply costs together with associated builders work alterations to doorways have an average cost per unit (door) of £5,000.00 and the potential number of doors to be upgraded is 17, ergo $17 \times 5,000 = £85,000$ capital outlay.

Capital costs and pay-back

Revenue			
Potential annual revenue from pay-to-use	based on use data	£	38,188.00
Less annual operational costs:			
Daily coin collection & process	£50.00 x (6 x 52)	£	15,600.00
Specialist door servicing & maintenance		£	5,100.00
Other life-cycle costs (replacement etc.)		£	3,400.00
Residual:		£	14,088.00
Implement pay-to-use initiative			
Capital costs:	Year 1	£	85,000.00
Pay back from pay-to-use revenue in years:	Year 6		6
Off-set against current operational costs:	Year 7	£	225,200.00
Annual revenue income:		£	14,088.00
Reduced operational costs:		£	211,112.00

Appendix D

Cheltenham Borough Council Community Partnership Initiative proposals

Proposal

It is proposed to use the same model as Gloucester City Council and work with Cheltenham's Business Improvement District (BID) to assist with promoting the scheme. The project proposes £500 per annum per business would be offered to incentivise participation in the Cheltenham scheme.

Navigation/Signposting Tools

The following communication tools could be used:

- BID website

- CBC website
- Google Maps
- Wayfinding signage

Potential Partners

The following businesses have been identified as potential partners who, depending upon the outcome of consultation, we would propose to approach initially:

Town Centre

- John Lewis
- Marks & Spencer
- Cavendish House
- Regent Arcade Shopping Center
- MacDonald's
- Cheltenham Trust
- Weatherspoons
- The Brewery
- Municipal Offices
- Premier Inn
- Copa
- Whittle Tap
- Old Courthouse
- Costa
- Starbucks
- Swan
- Restoration
- YMCA/YWCA

Montpellier

- Queens Hotel
- Brasserie Blanc
- 131
- Montpellier Lodge
- The Quadrangle (Swallow Bakery)

Lower High Street

- Grove St Community Centre
- One Stop
- Frog & Fiddle
- Bottle of Sauce

Bath Road

- Norwood Arms PH
- Exmouth Arms PH
- The Bath Tavern
- Weatherspoons

Note: This would not preclude other businesses from being considered

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register	Risk Status
		Owner										
1.01	If Cheltenham Borough Council is unable to develop a community partnership with suitable businesses to provide fit for purpose facilities then there will be a reduction in the number of public conveniences that are currently available.	MS	29/05	4	3	12	Reduce	Engagement with Cheltenham BID to support the initiative will assist with developing partnerships. Plan to approach more businesses that required to increase options Consult with partners to understand detailed requirements of our PSED	tbc	JS	N	open
1.02	If the proposals are determined to be detrimental to Cheltenham's amenity provision by residents then the reputation of the council will be damaged	MS	29/05	2	4	8	Reduce	Ensure that communications stress the benefits of the proposals to residents. Provide clear information about the toilets available as part of the community partnership on CBC website. Provide clear signage for businesses involved in the community partnership scheme.	tbc	Comms	N	Open
1.03	If the proposals are determined to be detrimental to Cheltenham's amenity provision by visitors then there could be a detrimental	MS	29/05	2	3	6	Reduce	Ensure that communications stress the benefits of the proposals to visitors. Share information with Marketing Cheltenham	tbc	Comms	N	open

	impact on tourism							Provide clear information about the toilets available as part of the community partnership on CBC and Visit Cheltenham websites. Provide clear signage for businesses involved in the community partnership scheme.				
1.04	If the proposals are determined to be detrimental to Cheltenham's amenity provision by those with specific needs then the council could be accused of being unsupportive to disadvantaged groups.	MS	29/05	3	3	9	Reduce	Consult with partners to ensure the community partnership initiative delivers facilities suitable for all residents and visitors and PSED is considered. Ensure that communications stress the benefits of the proposals to residents. Provide clear information about the toilets available as part of the community partnership initiative on CBC website. Provide clear wayfinding signage to businesses involved in the community partnership scheme. Engage with 3 rd sector organisations to ensure information is available to those groups with specific needs. Complete equality impact assessment	tbc	JS	N	Open

1.05	If the costs of refurbishment of the retained toilets has been underestimated then the business case will not deliver the level of benefits identified in this document	PJ	29/05	3	3	9	Accept	Ensure refurbishment costs are competitive and design brief details cost effective requirements	tbc	Property	N	Open
------	---	----	-------	---	---	---	--------	---	-----	----------	---	------

Explanatory notes

Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)

Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6

(1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)

Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

What is an equality impact assessment?

An equality impact assessment is an important part of our commitment to improving equality practice. The form will help us find out what impact or consequences our functions, policies, procedures and projects have on our citizens, employees and potential employees.

By undertaking an impact assessment, we are able to:

- Take into account the needs, experiences and circumstances of those groups of people who use (or don't / can't use) our services.
- Identify any inequalities people may experience.
- Think about the other ways in which we can deliver our services which will not lead to inequalities.
- Develop better policy-making, procedures and services.

Impact assessment are required by law; The Race Relations Amendment Act, The Disability Discrimination Act and the amended Sex Discrimination Act all require local authorities to assess the impact of their functions, policies, projects and services, or the likely impact of any that are proposed, on equality.

However, our view is that we should be using the results of impact assessment to improve service delivery so that we become more accountable to the people that we serve.

Background

Name of service / policy / project and date	Improvements to the Future of Public Convenience Provision
Lead officer	Mark Sheldon, Director of Projects
Other people involved in completing this form	Jane Stovell, Project Manager Louise Forey, Participation and Engagement Team Leader

Step 1 - About the service / policy / project

<p>What is the aim of the service / policy / project and what outcomes is it contributing to</p>	<p>The project aim is to improve access to public conveniences for residents and visitors; to identify and generate cost savings to offset the additional costs of the providing the Changing Places facilities and realise the commercial potential from rationalisation of the public conveniences in the town centre; refurbish/replace the retained toilets and develop alternative partnership initiatives that will increase the choice of amenities available to the public.</p> <p>These outcomes contribute to enable our people, communities and environment to thrive. The project also contributes to our principles within the Corporate Plan to “be commercially focused where needed and become financially self-sufficient to ensure we can continue to achieve value for money for the taxpayer”.</p>
<p>Who are the primary customers of the service / policy / project and how do they / will they benefit</p>	<p>The public, both residents and visitor are the customers of this project.</p> <p>Providing public access to a greater number of well-maintained toilet facilities, with increased opening hours, and investing in improvements to council owned facilities will contribute to improving the town centre and providing strong healthy inclusive communities.</p>
<p>How and where is the service / policy / project implemented</p>	<p>The scope of the project covers Cheltenham Town centre and central parks</p>
<p>What potential barriers might already exist to achieving these outcomes</p>	<p>Ability to develop community partnerships with businesses that would provide sufficient suitable accessible toilet facilities</p>

Step 2 – What do you know already about your existing / potential customers

<p>What existing information and data do you have about your existing / potential customers e.g. Statistics, customer feedback, performance information</p>	<p>A small survey was undertaken with regard to number of users of public toilets and results are found in Appendix C of Cabinet report.</p> <p>Previous consultation specific to those with complex disabilities was undertaken as part of the CBC Changing Places project.</p> <p>Research and Government guidance (March 2008 and November 2008) encouraging local authorities to provide better access and better quality toilets, provides useful information when considering Community Partnership Toilet Schemes –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of scheme • Signage both external and within the business facility • Accessibility for those with disabilities • Consideration of the nature of the business (e.g. single women or people with specific religious beliefs may not be comfortable using a pub toilet)
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of businesses to meet needs at different times of the day • Improvements to poor quality facilities that attract anti-social activity
What does it tell you about who uses your service / policy and those that don't?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anyone may need to use a public toilet. • Some people are comfortable using public facilities within businesses whilst others feel they should only use these facilities if they are a customer of said business. • Some people feel vulnerable using council facilities due to perceived isolated environment or threat of anti-social behaviour. • Some people cut short their time spent in the town centre as do not feel comfortable using a public facility at all • Council facilities opening hours do not always support the business hours within the town.
What have you learnt about real barriers to your service from any consultation with customers and any stakeholder groups?	
If not, who do you have plans to consult with about the service / policy / project?	

Step 3 - Assessing Impact

How does your service / policy / project impact on different groups in the community?

Group	What are you already doing to benefit this group	What are you doing that might disadvantage this group	What could you do differently to benefit this group	No impact on this group
Ethnicity / Race			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	
Sex			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	

Gender Reassignment			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	
Age			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice and easy access for the user	
Disability			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice and easy access for the user	
Religion or belief			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	
Sexual orientation			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	
Marriage and Civil Partnership			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice for the user	
Pregnancy & Maternity			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice and easy access for the user	
Other socially excluded groups or communities			Ensure the community partnership scheme engages with a variety of businesses to provide choice and easy access for the user	

Step 4 - what are the differences

Are any groups affected in different ways to others as a result of the service / policy / project?	Financially disadvantaged groups may be more likely to be impacted as may not have easy access to transport options which gives them greater mobility flexibility. This could result in these groups being more dependent on facilities within the town centre. People with disabilities that currently use the facilities may need to consider planning alternative pedestrian routes around the town to ensure ease of access to facilities in new locations.
Does your service / policy / project either directly or indirectly discriminate?	No
If yes, what can be done to improve this?	
Are there any other ways in which the service / project can help support priority communities in Cheltenham?	Promotion of the community partnership scheme needs to consider those who are visually impaired. Ensuring refurbishment of retained council facilities is undertaken in line with relevant Equality and Disability legislation.

Step 5 – taking things forward

What are the key actions to be carried out and how will they be resourced and monitored?	It is essential that the objectives of the Community Partnership Toilet Scheme are achieved and that the locations secured as part of the scheme are fit for purpose for all residents and visitors and successfully promoted through various channels, prior to implementing closure of existing facilities
Who will play a role in the decision-making process?	Propose to engage CBC community partnerships officers and partners to ensure no group is disadvantaged in decisions on the location and facilities on offer as part of the community partnership scheme.
What are your / the project's learning and development needs?	Discuss with partner groups the most appropriate way to promote the new facilities and ensure people are aware of the scheme.
How will you capture these actions in your service / project planning?	Captured as part of the project risks and individual considerations when determining locations and businesses to engage with as part of the Community Partnership Scheme