

OPTIONS FOR PUBLIC TOILET PROVISION IN THE DISTRICT FROM 2010/2011

(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)

(It was noted that Councillor Langhorn had previously declared a personal interest in this item in view of his role as the Chairman of Caton with Littledale Parish Council.)

The Head of City Council (Direct) Services submitted a report outlining proposals for toilet provision for the district. The options, options analysis, including risk assessment and officer preferred option, were set out in the report as follows:

Option	Pros	Cons
1-Status quo	In the short term maintains existing levels of toilet provision	The condition of some of our toilets is already poor. Without investment they will further deteriorate to the point where they have to be closed for safety reasons (eg Red Bank Shore). Those toilets that have had capital investment show considerable savings in terms of ongoing maintenance, cost of electricity/water, reduced vandalism etc, compared with some of our older
		toilets.
2- Mothball a number of toilets in 2010/11	It is estimated that revenue savings of approximately £100K could be made by mothballing toilets outside of the main visitor areas of Lancaster and Morecambe. £20K of this saving could allocated to a community toilet scheme. If toilets were already mothballed it would make implementation of the scheme much easier.	Would be seen as a kneejerk reaction to the current financial situation as opposed to a strategic decision. Even with £20K allocated to the community toilet scheme there is no guarantee that businesses would sign up. There is even less guarantee that businesses in the areas most affected by the mothballing would sign up. Mothballed toilets would further deteriorate and create further maintenance issues for future years.

<p>3- Adopt the plan in Appendix B for the District's toilet provision.</p>	<p>A planned approach to toilet provision would allow the Council to plan future investment and service provision.</p> <p>The plan proposes toilets in key locations that should be improved (Carnforth, Glasson, Bull Beck). However, it also identifies toilets in non key locations that should be closed or at the request of the Parish Council be considered for transfer (with an appropriate grant).</p>	<p>Could result in less toilet provision within the District.</p> <p>Requires capital investment to realise full savings.</p>
---	--	---

The officer preferred option is option 3.

It was moved by Councillor Barry:-

- “(1) That the plan for future provision of toilets as outlined in appendix B of the report be approved.
- (2) That the elements of the plan that do not require capital funding be implemented from April 2010.
- (3) That the capital growth required be considered as part of the budget process. Subject to value for money considerations and availability of capital funding, the elements of the plan that require capital funding be implemented as soon as capital funding is available and the plan be subsequently updated accordingly.
- (4) That authority to negotiate with Parish and Town Councils and other partners (e.g. Adshel) on possible transfer of toilets and management of toilets be delegated to the Head of City Council (Direct) Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member with special responsibility for CCDS and that the City Council be prepared to contribute up to 50% of current revenue costs.
- (5) That revenue and capital budgets are updated accordingly.”

(At this point in the meeting, Councillor Langhorn declared that, as a result of this proposal, his interest had become prejudicial and left the meeting.)

The Chief Executive called for nominations to Chair the meeting for the remainder of the item. Councillor Archer nominated Councillor Mace, seconded by Councillor Ashworth. There were no further nominations and Councillor Mace took the chair.

Councillor Fletcher seconded Councillor Barry's proposal above.

By way of amendment, Councillor Mace proposed:-

- “(1) That further consideration of the funding for the provision of public toilets set out in Appendix B of the report be deferred until such time as a framework for the funding of public toilets in parished areas is in place.”

However, it was noted that there was no seconder to the amendment and the amendment was deemed to have fallen.

By way of amendment, Councillor Mace proposed and Councillor Thomas seconded:-

- “(1) That Cabinet believes that the provision of toilet facilities is a district responsibility and not a parish responsibility and requests an alternative report to be presented at the next meeting.”

2 Members (Councillors Mace and Thomas) voted in favour of the amendment, 5 Members (Councillors Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning and Fletcher) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Archer) abstained from voting, whereupon the Chairman declared his amendment to be lost.

With the acceptance of the meeting, Councillor Barry amended the wording of his original proposal at (3) as follows:-

- “(3) That the capital growth required be considered as part of the budget process. Subject to value for money considerations and availability of capital funding, the elements of the plan that require capital funding, for example demolition on the grounds of safety, be implemented as soon as capital funding is available and the plan be subsequently updated accordingly.”

Resolved:

(6 Members (Councillors Archer, Ashworth, Barry, Blamire, Bryning and Fletcher) voted in favour, 1 Member (Councillor Mace) voted against and 1 Member (Councillor Thomas) abstained)

- (1) That the plan for future provision of toilets as outlined in Appendix B of the report be approved.
- (2) That the elements of the plan that do not require capital funding be implemented from April 2010.
- (3) That the capital growth required be considered as part of the budget process. Subject to value for money considerations and availability of capital funding, the elements of the plan that require capital funding, for example demolition on the grounds of safety, be implemented as soon as capital funding is available and the plan be subsequently updated accordingly.
- (4) That authority to negotiate with Parish and Town Councils and other partners (e.g. Adshel) on possible transfer of toilets and management of toilets be delegated to the Head of City Council (Direct) Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member with special responsibility for CCDS and that the City Council be prepared to contribute up to 50% of current revenue costs.
- (5) That revenue and capital budgets be updated accordingly.

Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Community Services)
Head of City Council (Direct) Services
Head of Financial Services

Reasons for making the decision:

The decision will allow the Council to sustainably manage toilet provision in the district.