

FINAL REPORT
REVIEW OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 Review Team
- 1.3 Timetable
- 1.4 Terms of Reference

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE

- 2.1 Description of Service
- 2.2 Links to Corporate Objectives
- 2.3 Resources
- 2.4 Service Delivery Plan

3.0 OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW

- 3.1 Expected Outcomes
- 3.2 Factors Considered by the Review Team

4.0 COMPARE

- 4.1 Methodology
- 4.2 Other Councils in the Sub-Region

5.0 CONSULT

- 5.1 Methodology
- 5.2 Member Champion
- 5.3 Corporate Management Team
- 5.4 Public Consultation

6.0 CHALLENGE

- 6.1 Basis of the Service
- 6.2 Methodology
- 6.3 Cost Analysis (2014/15)
- 6.4 Fit for Purpose
- 6.5 Are all Facilities Required?

7.0 COMPETE

- 7.1 Methodology
- 7.2 Alternative Ways of Delivering the Service

8.0 OPTIONS AND DRAFT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- 8.1 The Causeway, Burwell
- 8.2 Main Street, Littleport
- 8.3 Carter Street, Fordham
- 8.4 Barton Road, Ely
- 8.5 Cloisters, Ely
- 8.6 Newnham Street, Ely
- 8.7 Palace Green, Ely
- 8.8 Sacrist Gate, Ely
- 8.9 Ship Lane, Ely
- 8.10 Summary
- 8.11 Draft Improvement Plan

9.0 APPENDICES

10.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

REVIEW OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The review of public conveniences was instigated by Asset Development Sub-Committee on 8 December 2014 (Ref: 8 December 2014 Minutes) and the Terms of Reference and timetable agreed by Commercial Services Committee on 13 January 2015 (Ref: Agenda Item 9). The Terms of Reference and timetable were amended and agreed by Commercial Services Committee on 28 July 2015 (Ref: Agenda Item 7).

1.2 Review Team

1.2.1 The review was undertaken by the Director, Commercial & Corporate Services, Open Spaces & Facilities Manager and the Tourism & Town Centres Manager. Councillor Bill Hunt, Councillor David Brown and Councillor Lorna Dupre assisted the review team.

1.3 Timetable

1.3.1 The review timetable, agreed by Commercial Services Committee on 28 July 2015 is set out below:-

Date	Committee	Report
13 January 2015	Commercial Services	Terms of Reference Stage 1 Report
16 September 2015	Commercial Services	Options Appraisal and Draft Improvement Plan

1.3.2 In August 2015 it was determined that the Options Appraisal and Draft Financial Improvement Plan would be a decision of the Asset Development Committee. A Change Control request was completed and approved.

1.3.3 In order to accommodate the change in committee reporting, public consultation, liaison with Local Parish Councils and carry out a thorough assessment of the options available to the Council it was determined that the timetable be amended. A Change Control request was completed and approved.

1.4 Terms of Reference

1.4.1 The Terms of Reference of the review were agreed by Commercial Services Committee on 13 January 2015 (Ref: Agenda Item 9) and 28 July 2015 (Ref: Agenda Item 7).

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE

2.1 Description of Service

2.1.1 The objective of the service is to clean, manage and maintain the public conveniences (Open Spaces & Facilities Service Delivery Plan 2015/16).

2.1.2 The service forms part of the Open Spaces & Facilities Service, and the public conveniences are situated in the following locations:

- Ely; Barton Road, Newnham Street, Palace Green, Sacrist Gate, Ship Lane and Cloisters
- Littleport; Main Street
- Burwell; The Causeway
- Fordham; Carter Street

2.1.3 The Open Spaces & Facilities Service provides other functions which do not form part of this service review.

2.2 Links to Corporate Plan 2015-2019

2.2.1 The table below links the service to the Council's Corporate Plan 2015-2019.

Delivering a financially sound and well managed Council	Access to public conveniences is important to the community and is valued by residents and visitors. The quality of service needs to reflect the needs of the community.
Genuinely affordable housing	
A fantastic place to live	
Improving local transport	
Improving infrastructure	
New jobs and funding	

2.3 Resources

2.3.1 The actual cost of the service (2014/15) is detailed in the table below:

Location	Cost
Main Street, Littleport	£13,462.27
Carter Street, Fordham	£10,047.68
The Causeway, Burwell	£9,294.82
Barton Road, Ely	£23,535.99
Cloisters, Ely	£27,725.41
Newnham Street, Ely	£21,612.05
Palace Green, Ely	£18,197.69
Sacrist Gate, Ely	£17,543.0
Ship Lane, Ely	£20,282.33
General*	£30,844.70
Total	£192,546.04

*Consumables and other costs (for example, delivery of consumables or maintenance work). Excludes service recharges.

2.3.2 The budgeted cost of the service (2015/16) is £189,321. Excludes service recharges.

2.3.3 The Council employs 8 cleaning operatives; 4 in Ely, 3 across other areas and 1 casual worker.

2.4 **Service Delivery Plan**

Indicator	Target
Undertake a service review of public toilets	September 2015

3.0 **OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW**

3.1 **Expected Outcomes**

3.1.1 **Operation**

- i. Cessation of service provision (where the need can be met elsewhere)
- ii. Alternative ways of delivering the service

3.1.2 **Performance**

- i. Review of current performance and targets in the service delivery plan.

3.1.3 **Resources**

- i. Achievement of efficiency savings
- ii. Additional income from development opportunities

3.2 **Factors Considered by the Review Team**

3.2.1 The review team considered the following:

- Determine whether existing provisions are fit-for-purpose
- Determine whether there is a need for all 9 public conveniences
- Explore costs associated with improving/refurbishing existing facilities
- Compare the service with neighbouring authorities
- Consider alternative delivery models
- Identify and recommend cost savings
- Consider possible income streams

4.0 **COMPARE**

4.1 **Methodology**

4.1.1 There are no National Performance Indicators covering the delivery of this service, comparative analysis will rely on the following information sources:

- An assessment of what and how much it cost other Councils in the sub-region to deliver the service.

4.2 **Other Councils in the Sub-Region**

4.2.1 **Fenland District Council**

- Own and maintain 4 public conveniences; 1 in Chatteris, 1 in March, 1 in Whittlesey and 1 in Wisbech
- There is a charge at each of the locations; 20p per use
- In 2014/15 the net cost of the service was £67,930

4.2.2 **Huntingdonshire District Council**

- Own and maintain 2 public conveniences; 1 in Huntingdon and 1 in St Ives
- There is no charge for public conveniences
- The Town Council contribution £20,500 towards the cost of the service
- In 2014/15 the net cost of the service was £21,000

4.2.3 **South Cambridgeshire District Council**

- Do not own or maintain any public conveniences

4.2.4 **Cambridge City Council**

- Own and maintain 20 public conveniences
- 10 locations charge 20p per use, 9 locations require a Radar Key (£2.50 charge) and 1 location (Lions Yard) is free to use
- In 2014/15 the net cost of the service was £674,000
- In 2015/16 the net budget is £263,000

4.2.5 **West Suffolk**

- Own and maintain 11 public conveniences; 6 in Bury St Edmunds, 3 in Haverhill, 1 in Mildenhall and 1 in Newmarket
- Do not charge for their services
- In 2014/15 the net cost of the service was £268,582 (not including service recharges)

Note: The financial information provided in 4.2.1-4.2.5 above was extracted from each local authorities published budget book.

5.0 **CONSULT**

5.1 **Methodology**

The methodology for the 'Consult' element of the review is defined by the agreed statement of consultation by Commercial Services on 28 July 2015. The specific requirements are as follows:

- Member Champion: Councillor Neil Hitchin will be updated regularly on the progress of the review
- Corporate Management Team: The Corporate Management Team will be updated regularly on the progress of the review
- Members: Councillor David Brown and Councillor Bill Hunt will assist Officers with the review. Members will be involved through the formal process
- A public consultation will be carried out in August 2015 on the option as to whether or not the Council should introduce charging for new and improved public convenience facilities. The outcome of this consultation will inform Stage 2 of the review process

5.2 **Member Champion**

5.2.1 Councillor Neil Hitchin has been consulted as part of the review process and has agreed the draft improvement plan.

5.3 **Corporate Management Team**

5.3.1 The Corporate Management Team has received updates on the progress of the review and agree the draft improvement plan.

5.4 **Public Consultation**

5.4.1 A public consultation was carried out between 1 September 2015 and 13 October 2015. The consultation asked the following questions:

1. Would you be prepared to pay 20p per use if the Council were to provide improved facilities?

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being “Very Poor” and 5 being “Excellent” for each of the public conveniences, how would you rate the current provision in terms of cleanliness, décor, opening, safety and facilities?

152 responses were received.

5.4.2 **Response to Question 1**

	Yes	No	Undecided	N/A	Total Respondents
Ely	19.57% (27)*	71.01% (98)	7.97% (11)	1.45% (2)	138
Burwell	13.49 % (17)	58.73% (74)	4.76% (6)	23.02% (29)	126
Fordham	12.4% (15)	59.5% (72)	4.13% (5)	23.97% (29)	121
Littleport	12.2% (15)	60.16% (74)	5.69% (7)	21.95% (27)	123

5.4.3 Response to Question 2

Cleanliness						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total no. respondents
Newnham Street, Ely	4.29% (3)	12.86% (9)	34.29% (24)	34.29% (24)	14.29% (10)	70
Cloisters, Ely	6.25% (6)	16.67% (16)	38.54% (37)	26.04% (25)	12.5% (12)	96
Sacrist Gate, Ely	18.57% (13)	24.29% (17)	34.29% (24)	17.14% (12)	5.71% (4)	70
Palace Green, Ely	18.57% (13)	15.71% (11)	37.14% (26)	20.00% (14)	8.57% (6)	70
Barton Road, Ely	8.47% (5)	13.56% (8)	35.59% (21)	20.34% (12)	22.03% (13)	59
Ship Lane, Ely	2.94% (2)	4.41% (3)	30.88% (21)	35.29% (24)	26.47% (18)	68
The Causeway, Burwell	0	5.26% (1)	36.84% (7)	36.84% (7)	21.05% (4)	19
Carter Street, Fordham	0	0	46.15% (6)	15.38% (2)	38.46% (5)	13
Main Street, Littleport	9.09% (2)	4.55% (1)	31.82% (7)	40.91% (9)	13.64% (3)	22

*Number brackets indicates number of respondents

Décor						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total no. respondents
Newnham Street, Ely	10.61% (7)	10.61% (7)	42.42% (28)	22.73% (15)	13.64% (9)	66
Cloisters, Ely	11.69% (11)	22.83% (21)	40.22% (37)	17.39% (16)	7.61% (7)	92
Sacrist Gate, Ely	25.0% (16)	26.56% (17)	29.69% (19)	12.5% (8)	6.25% (4)	64
Palace Green, Ely	26.15% (17)	21.54% (14)	35.38% (23)	7.69% (5)	9.23% (6)	65
Barton Road, Ely	16.36% (9)	12.73% (7)	30.91% (17)	21.82% (12)	18.18% (10)	55
Ship Lane, Ely	7.81% (5)	6.25% (4)	31.25% (20)	29.69% (19)	25.0% (16)	64
The Causeway, Burwell	5.88% (1)	11.76% (2)	58.82% (10)	11.76% (2)	11.76% (2)	17
Carter Street, Fordham	0	9.09% (1)	45.45% (5)	27.27% (3)	18.18% (2)	11
Main Street, Littleport	10.0% (2)	0	40.0% (8)	35.0% (7)	15.0% (3)	20

*Number brackets indicates number of respondents

Opening hours						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total no. respondents
Newnham Street, Ely	14.29% (9)	7.94% (5)	38.10% (24)	26.98% (17)	12.7% (8)	63
Cloisters, Ely	13.25% (11)	6.02% (5)	30.12% (25)	36.14% (30)	14.46% (12)	83
Sacrist Gate, Ely	13.33% (8)	10.0% (6)	38.33% (23)	28.33% (17)	10.0% (6)	60
Palace Green, Ely	12.70% (8)	12.70% (8)	38.10% (24)	26.98% (17)	9.52% (6)	63
Barton Road, Ely	12.0% (6)	10.0% (5)	26.0% (13)	38.0% (19)	14.0% (7)	50
Ship Lane, Ely	9.84% (6)	11.48% (7)	34.43% (21)	27.87% (17)	16.39% (10)	61
The Causeway, Burwell	0	7.14% (1)	42.86% (6)	42.86% (6)	7.14% (1)	14
Carter Street, Fordham	0	0	33.33% (3)	55.56% (5)	11.11% (1)	9
Main Street, Littleport	11.11% (2)	0	27.78% (5)	50.0% (9)	11.11% (2)	18

*Number brackets indicates number of respondents

Safety						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total no. respondents
Newnham Street, Ely	0	8.33% (5)	25.0% (15)	43.33% (26)	23.33% (14)	60
Cloisters, Ely	2.60% (2)	7.79% (6)	22.08% (17)	42.86% (33)	24.68% (19)	77
Sacrist Gate, Ely	18.18% (10)	14.55% (8)	27.27% (15)	32.73% (18)	7.27% (4)	55
Palace Green, Ely	14.04% (8)	14.04% (8)	21.05% (12)	38.68% (21)	14.04% (8)	57
Barton Road, Ely	4.35% (2)	10.87% (5)	21.74% (10)	34.78% (16)	28.26% (13)	46
Ship Lane, Ely	1.85% (1)	7.41% (4)	22.22% (12)	42.59% (23)	25.93% (14)	54
The Causeway, Burwell	0	0	23.08% (3)	53.85% (7)	23.08% (3)	13
Carter Street, Fordham	0	0	28.57% (2)	42.86% (3)	28.57% (2)	7
Main Street, Littleport	13.33% (2)	0	13.33% (2)	53.3% (8)	20.0% (3)	15

*Number brackets indicates number of respondents

Facilities						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total no. respondents
Newnham Street, Ely	3.39% (2)	10.17% (6)	28.81% (17)	32.2% (19)	25.42% (15)	59
Cloisters, Ely	3.75% (3)	12.5% (10)	28.75% (23)	32.5% (26)	22.5% (18)	80
Sacrist Gate, Ely	7.14% (4)	17.86% (10)	35.71% (20)	28.57% (16)	10.71% (6)	56
Palace Green, Ely	7.14% (4)	16.07% (9)	39.29% (22)	21.43% (12)	16.07% (9)	56
Barton Road, Ely	4.55% (2)	6.82% (3)	27.27% (12)	31.82% (14)	29.55% (13)	44
Ship Lane, Ely	0	5.77% (3)	25.0% (13)	42.31% (22)	26.92% (14)	52
The Causeway, Burwell	7.69% (1)	0	0	61.54% (8)	30.77% (4)	13
Carter Street, Fordham	0	0	14.29% (1)	57.14% (4)	28.57% (2)	7
Main Street, Littleport	11.76% (2)	0	5.88% (1)	52.94% (9)	29.41% (5)	17

*Number brackets indicates number of respondents

Full details of the responses to the public consultation are provided at Appendix 4.

6.0 **CHALLENGE**

6.1 **Basis of the Service**

6.1.1 The service is not a statutory service. Nevertheless it is recognised that providing public conveniences, at appropriate locations, is in the interest of the public.

6.2 **Methodology**

6.2.1 This section will challenge the contribution of the service to the achievement of the Corporate Plan 2015-2019. The 'Challenge' element will involve a cost analysis of the service, determine whether the existing facilities are fit-for-purpose and determine whether all the facilities are required.

6.3 **Cost Analysis (2014/15)**

6.3.1 A detailed cost analysis (2014/15) is provided at Appendix 5.

6.4 **Fit-For-Purpose**

The Council instructed an independent to carry out a survey on each of the facilities and make recommendations based on this survey.

6.4.1 **Main Street, Littleport**

- The facility was in a good, clean state when visited. In comparison to other sites was in a good state of repair
- The facility is tucked away at the far end of the car park off the main street. It would benefit from better signage directing non-local visitors
- Recommend a deep clean (steam/pressure hoses)

6.4.2 **Carter Street, Fordham**

- Considering the age of the building, the facility was generally clean
- The facility was lightly used during the week, and more heavily used at weekends to accommodate for the sports on the nearby recreation area
- The usage does not warrant a facility of this size, meaning excessive cleaning time is required
- Recommend a new facility either on the existing site or behind the sports pavilion/next to the play area

6.4.3 **The Causeway, Burwell**

- A comparably new building, tucked away behind the Parish Council offices
- No other facilities nearby that would appear to warrant the building of this size, in this position
- The building would benefit from a basic refurbishment or deep clean
- Recommend a deep clean (steam/pressure hoses)

6.4.4 **Newnham Street, Ely**

- A large building in a busy central car park close to Waitrose and shopping precinct
- The facility is starting to show signs of age with tiles falling off
- Grout is generally grubby
- The layout of the facility increases cleaning time and encourages anti-social behaviour
- Recommend a single occupancy cubicle refurbishment

6.4.5 **Cloisters, Ely**

- A very well used facility in the centre of the City
- Facility was clean when visited, however, there was some unpleasant smells
- Good facilities for less able and good changing facilities in the family room
- Layout of toilet increases cleaning time and encourages anti-social behaviour
- Recommend extensive internal cosmetic refurbishment

6.4.6 **Sacrist Gate, Ely**

- No signage to show visitors where the facility is

- Not inviting to use- potentially quite intimidating with no windows
- UV lighting tells people drugs are used
- Although cleansing was okay, the facility has become grubby over time
- Close to Palace Green facility
- Recommend internal cosmetic refurbishment

6.4.7 **Palace Green, Ely**

- Just off the main shopping area, near to the Cathedral in a pleasant grassed area
- Generally clean, but years of dirt showing
- Tight entrances
- Recommend an internal cosmetic refurbishment

6.4.8 **Barton Road, Ely**

- This facility is in the worst condition of all the facilities in the District
- Tiles falling off the walls
- Cisterns leaking
- Well used facility
- Recommend an internal refurbishment

6.4.9 **Ship Lane, Ely**

- In a busy car park close to the park area and river
- Large internal space encourages anti-social behaviour
- Large internal space increases cleaning time
- Recommend modulet single occupancy cubicle refurbishment

6.5 **Are all the Facilities Required?**

6.5.1 The review team contacted each of the local Parish Councils to ascertain what provision is made by them. Of all the Parish Council's that responded, only 1 Parish Council confirmed that they managed public conveniences in their area; Cheveley (only in the summer time).

6.5.2 Comments were made in the public consultation (as referenced above in 5.4 of this report) relating to the need for all of the public conveniences. Respondents raised the question as to the need for six public conveniences in Ely, stating that they would rather see half of them close as opposed to introducing charges.

6.5.3.1 **The Causeway, Burwell**

The facilities are located next to the Parish Council offices. There are no other facilities nearby and as such the Parish Council has expressed a desire for the continued operation of the services.

If efficiency savings can be achieved there is public benefit in the continued operation of these services.

6.5.3.2 Main Street, Littleport

The facilities are located next to the Parish Council offices, in a public car park, close to the shops. The Parish Council has expressed a desire for the continued operation of the services.

If efficiency savings can be achieved there is public benefit in the continued operation of these services.

6.5.3.3 Carter Street, Fordham

The facilities are located close to the pavilion. There are no other public facilities nearby, however, there are private facilities available in local pubs and social clubs.

The facilities are not very well used; higher period of usage is when sports are being played on the nearby recreation ground. There is a potential development opportunity for this site. The Council does not own any land in Fordham that could accommodate a relocation of these facilities.

The Parish Council has been notified that closure is one of the options being considered for this site and has not made any representations.

6.5.3.4 Ely

The Council manage and maintain six public conveniences in Ely. In order to make efficiency savings, closure of three of the public conveniences should be considered. In determining which of the facilities could be closed the review team has considered the location, current condition of existing facilities and possible alternative uses for each of the sites.

Barton Road

The facilities are located near the car park. There is adequate alternative provision of conveniences nearby. The survey indicated that the facilities were in poor condition. There is a potential development opportunity for this site.

In order to achieve efficiency savings and realise development opportunities, this site could be considered for closure.

Cloisters

The facilities are located in the Cloisters Shopping Centre, the Council does not own these facilities, and these facilities are leased to the Council and can only be used for the operation of public conveniences. These facilities are in a prime location, are in a good condition and are very well used.

There is public benefit in the continued operation of these facilities.

Newnham Street

The facilities are located in a busy car park. There are other facilities close by. The survey indicated that the facilities were showing signs of ageing and the layout of the toilet increased cleaning time and encourages ant-social behaviour. There is a potential development opportunity for this site.

In order to achieve efficiency savings and realise development opportunities, this site could be considered for closure.

Palace Green

The facilities are located close to the Cathedral, near to the green. These facilities are in a prime location and are very well used, especially when events are held on the green. The facilities are in a relatively good condition.

There is public benefit in the continued operation of these facilities.

Sacrist Gate

The facilities are located close to the Cathedral, near the Palace Green facilities. The Council does not own these public conveniences, they are leased from the Cathedral and can only be used for the operation of public conveniences.

The Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) has met with representatives from the Cathedral to ascertain whether the Cathedral would continue to operate the facilities if the lease was to be surrendered. The Cathedral has confirmed that they would not continue to run the service as there is adequate provision nearby. They have indicated that they would use the building for storage purposes.

Under the terms of the lease, if the Council were to surrender the lease they would be required to make good the land, i.e. to remove the building. The Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) has negotiated a situation where this would not be necessary. The Cathedral would be prepared to accept the surrender of the lease without the need for the building to be demolished as long as the Council made a contribution to the Cathedral that would enable them to reconfigure the building to enable them to use it for storage.

In order to achieve efficiency savings this site could be considered for closure and the lease could be surrendered to the Cathedral.

Ship Lane

The facilities are located in a busy car park close to the park and river. The facilities are in a relatively good condition and are very well used.

There is public benefit in the continued operation of these facilities.

7.0 **COMPETE**

7.1 **Methodology**

7.1.1 This element of the review considered alternative ways of delivering the service including, improving the facilities and introducing charges, self-cleaning facilities, transfer of facilities to a third party and closure of facilities (where need can be met elsewhere). This will be informed by the 'Compare' and 'Challenge' element of the service review outlined in sections 5.1 and 6.1 of this report.

7.2 **Alternative Ways of Delivering the Service**

7.2.1 **Transfer to a Third Party**

7.2.1.1 The review team invited two management and maintenance companies (Contractor A and Contractor B) to put together proposals to take over the maintenance and management of the facilities.

7.2.2 **Contractor A Proposal**

7.2.2.1 Would charge the Council £170,000 per annum (a minimum contract period of 15 years) and would provide the following:

- Cleaning, maintenance and management (including covering the cost of all consumables) across all the facilities
- Would invest £500,000 to cover the cost of the installation of coin entry systems and all refurbishment/new installations across all the facilities
- Provide a remote monitoring system
- Provide a coin collection and crediting system

Facility	Works	User Charge	Investment
Main Street, Littleport	None- only deep clean required	No	£1,000
Carter Street, Fordham	A new facility to installed	No	£55,000
The Causeway Burwell	None- only a deep clean required	No	£1,000
Newnham Street, Ely	Single occupancy cubicle refurbishment	20p	£80,000 + £15,000 (coin collector)
Cloisters, Ely	Internal cosmetic refurbishment	20p	£68,000 + £15,000 (coin collector)
Sacrist Gate, Ely	Internal cosmetic refurbishment	20p	£30,000 + £15,000 (coin collector)
Palace Green, Ely	Internal cosmetic refurbishment	20p	£40,000 + £15,000 (coin collector)
Barton Road, Ely	Internal cosmetic refurbishment	20p	£55,000 + £15,000 (coin collector)
Ship Lane, Ely	Single occupancy	20p	£80,000 + £15,000

	cubicle refurbishment		(coin collector)
			£500,000

7.2.2.2 Estimate of income generation from introducing charges in Ely

Facility	Average Weekly Footfall	Weekly Income @ 20p	Annual Income @ 20p
Newnham Street	900	£180.00	£9,360.00
Cloisters	2603	£520.60	£27,071.20
Sacrist Gate	756	£151.20	£7,862.40
Palace Green	940	£188.00	£9,776.00
Barton Road	1061	£212.20	£11,034.40
Ship Lane	851	£170.20	£8,850.40
		Total	£73,954.40

Whilst the sample size is relatively small and it is recognised that usage falls significantly when charging systems are installed, these figures were taken during February/March and its expected there would be more usage in the tourist season. A modest annual income of £96,000 is estimated on the basis that there would be increased footfall in high season.

7.2.2.4 The Council would be required to continue to meet the costs of insurance of and utilities. In 2014/15 these costs were:

Location	Utilities	Insurances
The Causeway, Burwell	£2,193.13	£61.69
Carter Street, Fordham	£760.30	£61.69
Main Street, Littleport	£2,441.21	£0.00
Palace Green, Ely	£3,945.88	£53.98
Newnham Street, Ely	£5,098.49	£92.54
Cloisters, Ely	£11,910.55	£7.77
Ship Lane, Ely	£4,368.06	£107.96
Barton Road, Ely	£6,118.25	£123.38
Sacrist Gate, Ely	£3,203.20	£69.40
Total	£40,039.07	£578.41

7.2.3 Contractor B Proposal

7.2.3.1 Contractor B carried out a survey of all of the public conveniences. Whilst they were invited to make a proposal for the maintenance and management of the facilities they did not do so. As part of their survey they explored the possibility of introducing charging of the facilities. They did not recommend that charging is considered. Having evaluated the costs for 2014/15 and what income could be generated, they recommended that the Council should not charge for the service as the income would not realistically cover such costs as, in their opinion, introducing charges would see a 50% decrease in footfall.

7.2.4 Transfer to Parish Council

7.2.4.1 The Causeway, Burwell

Discussions have taken place with Burwell Parish Council to ascertain whether they would be prepared to take over the running of the facilities. Whilst Burwell Parish Council were prepared to take over the maintenance and management of the facilities, concerns were raised as to the implications of TUPE transfer of staff and the ongoing liabilities that may be associated with maintenance.

The Parish Council expressed desire for the facilities to remain open. Mindful of the concerns raised by the Parish Council, the Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) revised the proposal to Burwell Parish Council; the Council would be prepared to continue to manage and maintain the public conveniences if the Parish Council made an annual contribution of £4,500.

7.2.4.2 Main Street, Littleport

Discussions have taken place with Littleport Parish Council to ascertain whether they would be prepared to take over the running of the facilities. Whilst Littleport Parish Council were prepared to take over the maintenance and management of the facilities, concerns were raised as to the implications of TUPE transfer of staff and the ongoing liabilities that may be associated with maintenance.

The Parish Council expressed desire for the facilities to remain open. Mindful of the concerns raised by the Parish Council, the Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) revised the proposal to Littleport Parish Council; the Council would be prepared to continue to manage and maintain the public conveniences if the Parish Council made an annual contribution of £7,000.

7.2.4.3 Carter Street, Fordham

This facility is not well used, other than at times when the pavilion is being used. The level of usage does not warrant the need for public conveniences to be provided in the village; there are adequate alternative facilities being provided in the area (local pubs and social clubs). The Council is also aware that the Parish Council has a desire to make improvements to the pavilion. Furthermore, this site has been identified as a development opportunity. The Council does not own any land in Fordham where the facilities could be relocated to.

The Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) has written to the Parish Council to inform them that one of the options under the review is to close the facility and has made an offer (equivalent to one year running costs) as a compensation payment for the closure. The Parish Council would be able to use this payment to assist them in providing public facilities elsewhere.

7.2.5 Self-Cleaning Solution

7.2.5.1 The review team considered the self-cleaning facilities solution.

7.2.5.2 There is no product on the market which could be installed in an existing building. To have a self-cleaning facility a new modular facility would need to be installed either on a new site (costs would be incurred to run services to it) or demolish the existing site and install it as a replacement.

7.2.5.3 Self-cleaning toilets refer to facilities that clean the floor, the toilet pan and the hand wash basin. There would still be a need for have a cleaner to clean the walls and other areas and the facilities would still need to be visited to refill toilet rolls and hand

wash solution. It is advised that staffing costs would not reduce much as a result of self-cleaning toilets.

7.2.5.4 Annual costs would increase as self-cleaning facilities use more water and electricity. As there are more 'moving parts' it is likely that there will be increased annual maintenance costs.

7.2.5.5 The indicative cost of a self-cleaning facility is approximately £65,000 per use. This price does not include the cost of installation, running services to the installation or demolition of the existing facility.

8.0 **OPTIONS AND DRAFT IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Director (Commercial & Corporate Services) considered the option of transferring the services to a maintenance and management company. However, given the cost of such a contract and the liabilities (i.e. utilities and insurances) that would still need to be met by the Council no efficiency savings would be made and would result in an increase in cost to the Council. For this reason transferring to a private management company is not a viable option.

8.1 **The Causeway, Burwell**

8.1.1 Direct costs (2014/15)- £8,071. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Burwell:

1. Continue with the status quo
2. Transfer facilities to Burwell Parish Council, on a three year lease (£1 per annum), with a one year parachute payment (equivalent of one year running costs),
3. Continue to manage and maintain the facilities for a three year period with a contribution of £4,500 per annum from Burwell Parish Council, or
4. Cessation of the service from 1 April 2016.

8.1.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings in 2016/17 but would represent a saving of approximately £16,142 (total in 2017/18 and 2018/19).

Option 3 would reduce the cost to the Council by £4,500 per annum, leaving the Council to meet the remaining cost of approximately £3,571 per annum.

Option 4 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £8,071 from 2016/17.

8.1.2 **Recommendation**

8.1.2.1 The Parish Council have indicated that the facility is important to the community and is well used. Option 3 is recommended. In the event an agreement cannot be reached with the Parish Council Option 4 is recommended.

8.2 **Main Street, Littleport**

8.2.1 Direct costs- £11,794. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Littleport:

1. Continue with the status quo,

2. Transfer facilities to Littleport Parish Council, on a three year lease (£1 per annum), with a one year parachute payment (equivalent of one year running costs),
3. Continue to manage and maintain the facilities for a three year period with a contribution of £7,000 per annum from Littleport Parish Council, or
4. Cessation of the service from 1 April 2016.

8.2.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings in 2016/17 but would represent a saving of approximately £23,588 (total in 2017/18 and 2018/19).

Option 3 would reduce the cost to the Council by £7,000 per annum, leaving the Council to meet the remaining cost of approximately £4,794 per annum.

Option 4 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £11,794 from 2016/17.

8.2.2 **Recommendation**

8.2.2.1 The Parish Council have indicated that the facility is important to the community and is well used. Option 3 is recommended. In the event an agreement cannot be reached with the Parish Council Option 4 is recommended.

8.3 **Carter Street, Fordham**

8.3.1 Direct costs- £7,427. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Fordham:

1. Continue with the status quo, or
2. Close the facilities and make a compensation payment to Fordham Parish Council (equivalent to one year running costs) to enable them to make alternative provision and explore development opportunities for the site.

8.3.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings in 2016/17 but would represent an ongoing saving of approximately £7,427 per annum from 2017/18 and could potentially generate an income if the site could be developed.

8.3.2 **Recommendation**

8.3.2.1 The Parish Council were notified of this review and have not responded to the offer that the Council has made. Option 2 is recommended.

8.4 **Barton Road, Ely**

8.4.1 Direct costs- £22,308. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Barton Road, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Cessation of service and explore development opportunities for the site.

8.4.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £22,308 per annum from 2016/17 and could potentially generate an income if the site could be developed.

8.4.2 Recommendation

8.4.2.1 Whilst it is recognised that there is a need to manage and maintain public conveniences in Ely, it is not recommended that the Council continue to manage and maintain all six public conveniences. As there is an adequate provision of toilet facilities nearby and there is potential development opportunity for this site Option 2 is recommended.

8.5 Cloisters, Ely

8.5.1 Direct costs- £31,261. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Cloisters, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Continue to run the service after a deep clean and minor refurbishment work, or
3. Cessation of the service from 1 April 2016.

8.5.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council and would require an investment of approximately £5,000.

Option 3 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £31,261 from 2016/17.

8.5.2 Recommendation

8.5.2.1 The review team has recognised the need to maintain some level of provision of public facilities in Ely. Under the terms of the lease the Council can only use this site for the operation of public conveniences. Option 2 is recommended. The costs identified in Option 2 can be met from Section 106 contributions.

8.6 Newnham Street, Ely

8.6.1 Direct costs- £20,042. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Newnham Street, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Cessation of service and explore development opportunities for the site.

8.6.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £20,042 per annum from 2016/17 and could potentially generate an income if the site could be developed.

8.6.2 Recommendation

8.6.2.1 Whilst it is recognised that there is a need to manage and maintain public conveniences in Ely, it is not recommended that the Council continue to manage and maintain all six public conveniences. As there is an adequate provision of toilet

facilities nearby and there is potential development opportunity for this site Option 2 is recommended.

8.7 **Palace Green, Ely**

8.7.1 Direct costs- £17,836. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Palace Green, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Continue to run the service after a deep clean and minor refurbishment work, or
3. Cessation of the service from 1 April 2016.

8.7.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council and would require an investment of approximately £5,000.

Option 3 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £17,836 from 2016/17.

8.7.2 **Recommendation**

8.7.2.1 The review team has recognised the need to maintain some level of provision of public facilities in Ely. This site is in a prime location, close to the Cathedral and is well used when there are events on the green. Option 2 is recommended. The costs identified in Option 2 can be met from Section 106 contributions.

8.8 **Sacrist Gate, Ely**

8.8.1 Direct costs- £14,473. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Sacrist Gate, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Cessation of service and surrender lease to the Cathedral.

8.8.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 represents an efficiency saving of approximately £14,473 from 2016/17.
Note: This option would require the Council to make a contribution of £2,000 to the Cathedral towards the cost of renovating the building to enable the Cathedral to use the space for storage.

8.8.2 **Recommendation**

8.8.2.1 Whilst it is recognised that there is a need to manage and maintain public conveniences in Ely, it is not recommended that the Council continue to manage and maintain all six public conveniences. This site is leased from the Cathedral and can only be used for the provision of public conveniences. There is adequate provision nearby (Palace Green). Option 2 is recommended.

8.9 **Ship Lane, Ely**

8.9.1 Direct costs- £20,855. The following options have been considered for the facilities in Ship Lane, Ely:

1. Continue with the status quo,
2. Continue to run the service after a deep clean and minor refurbishment work, or
3. Cessation of the service from 1 April 2016.

8.9.1.1 Option 1 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council.

Option 2 would not generate any efficiency savings for the Council and would require an investment of approximately £5,000.

Option 3 would represent an efficiency saving of approximately £20,855 from 2016/17.

8.9.2 Recommendation

8.9.2.1 The review team has recognised the need to maintain some level of provision of public facilities in Ely. There are no facilities nearby. Option 2 is recommended. The costs identified in Option 2 can be met from Section 106 contributions.

8.10 Summary

Based on the recommendations set out in 8.1 to 8.9 above the following table provides a summary of the identified savings.

Location	Cost 2014/15	Cost 2015/16	Cost 2016/17	Cost 2017/18	Cost 2018/19
The Causeway, Burwell	£9,294	£8,071	£3,571	£3,571	£3,571
Main Street, Littleport	£13,462	£11,794	£4,794	£4,794	£4,794
Carter Street, Fordham	£10,047	£7,427	£9,555	£0	£0
Barton Road, Ely	£23,535	£22,308	£0	£0	£0
Cloisters, Ely	£27,725	£31,261	£31,261	£31,261	£31,261
Newnham Street, Ely	£21,612	£20,042	£0	£0	£0
Palace Green, Ely	£18,197	£17,836	£17,836	£17,836	£17,836
Sacrist Gate, Ely	£17,543	£14,473	£2,000	£0	£0
Ship Lane, Ely	£20,282	£20,855	£20,855	£20,855	£20,855
General Costs	£30,844	£35,254	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000
Total	£191,541	£189,321	£109,872	£98,317	£98,317
Net Savings			£79,449	£91,004	£91,004

8.11 Draft Improvement Plan

8.11.1 The Draft Improvement Plan is based on the recommendations above and is provided at Appendix 3.

9.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 3- Draft Improvement Plan
Appendix 4- Public Consultation

Appendix 5- Detailed Cost Analysis (2014/15)

10.0 **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Asset Development Sub-Committee- 8 December 2014- Minutes.
Commercial Services Committee- 13 January 2015- Agenda Item 9.
Commercial Services Committee- 28 July 2015- Agenda Item 7.