

# **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA**



**Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> August 2006**

**at 2.00 pm**

**in the Council Chamber**

**MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:**

Councillors S Allison, Brash, Clouth, R Cook, Cranney, Gibbon, Hall, Henery, Lilley, Rayner, and D Waller.

Resident Representatives: Allan Lloyd and Linda Shields

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

**3. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

No items

**4. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No Items

**5. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS/BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

No Items

**6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- 6.1 Draft Final Report – Scrutiny Investigation into Public Convenience Provision in Hartlepool – *Chair of Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum*

**7. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

**FOR INFORMATION**

Date of next meeting Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> September at 2.00pm in Committee Room B.

## **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

**31 August 2006**



**Report of: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum**

**Subject: DRAFT FINAL REPORT – PUBLIC CONVENIENCE  
PROVISION IN HARTLEPOOL**

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To present the draft findings of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum in relation to the Public Convenience Provision Scrutiny Referral.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Cabinet at its meeting on the 12 April 2006 was asked to consider options and proposals for the development of a policy for the provision of public conveniences in Hartlepool. Prior to making a decision Cabinet referred consideration of the various options and proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Function, with a prescribed timescale for submission of a formal response by September 2006.
- 2.2 Subsequently, at a meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum held on the 12 July 2006, the Overall Aim and Terms of Reference and Timetable for the undertaking of the Scrutiny referral were agreed, as outlined in paragraphs 4 and 5 of this report.

### **3. SETTING THE SCENE**

- 3.1 The provision of public conveniences by Local Authorities is one of the longest established discretionary (non statutory) municipal services in England and Wales.
- 3.2 With most public conveniences in towns and cities between 50 and 100 years old rising maintenance costs have become a real issue for Local Authorities. This coupled with poor hygiene, vandalism, drug abuse or other inappropriate behaviour has resulted in a reduction in the overall number of public conveniences from 10,000 ten years ago to in the region of 5,500 today.

- 3.3 Over the years Hartlepool has experienced the similar maintenance, budget and anti-social behaviour issues as other Local Authorities. Budget restrictions in Hartlepool have on a regular basis resulted in the provision of funding that is insufficient to ensure the maintenance of buildings and equipment to an appropriate standard. The subsequent deterioration of buildings and equipment, coupled with ever-increasing vandalism, has resulted in a situation where this year's maintenance budget is insufficient to meet maintenance costs.
- 3.4 The shortfall in the maintenance budget and the poor condition of conveniences led to an examination of how the service is provided and how this might change in the future. Whilst in the past public conveniences have been provided without the benefit of a sustainable operation or maintenance policy the benefits of the formulation of such a policy are now clear in terms of the effective operation of the service and levels of future provision. With this in mind, options and proposals have been developed to form the basis of a policy for the future and consideration of these options and proposals forms the basis of the scrutiny referral.
- 3.5 Details of the options and proposals referred by Cabinet to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum are outlined in **Appendix A**.

#### **4. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION**

- 4.1 The overall aim of the Scrutiny investigation was to examine public convenience provision in Hartlepool and express, within the prescribed timescale for the referral, a view on the options and proposals presented to Cabinet for the formulation of a sustainable operation and maintenance policy.

#### **5. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION**

- 5.1 The Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny investigation were as outlined below :-
- (a) To express a view on the options and proposals outlined in the report considered by Cabinet on the 12 April 2006;
  - (b) To look at where public conveniences are needed across the town to enable Cabinet to make an informed decision; and
  - (c) To identify the estimated cost of replacing all public conveniences with new facilities along with the cost of bringing existing conveniences up to an acceptable standard to enable a comparison to be made by Cabinet; in time for the 2007/08 budget setting process.

- 5.2 To assist with the formulation of a response to the Cabinet Referral, additional Terms of Reference were agreed as follows:-
- (d) To gain an understanding of Government policy in relation to the provision of public conveniences and the position nationally;
  - (e) To gain an understanding public convenience provision in Hartlepool, i.e. demand, condition, location and costs;
  - (f) To examine the condition and location of public conveniences in Hartlepool and compare;
  - (g) To compare Hartlepool's service provision with that of another Local Authority and where examples of good practice exist examine how they could be used to improve provision in Hartlepool;
  - (h) To seek the views of residents and representatives from Parish Councils, Residents Associations and the Access Group on issues including:
    - (i) The quality of existing provision;
    - (ii) Suggestions for how they would like to see it improve in the future; and
    - (iii) Where public conveniences are needed across the town.
  - (i) To consider public health, safety and equality issues relevant to the provision of public conveniences, including the impact of the Disability Discrimination Act.

## **6. MEMBERSHIP OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

- 6.1 The membership of the Scrutiny Forum was as detailed below:-

Councillors S Allison, Brash, Clouth, R Cook, Cranney, Gibbon, Hall, Henery, Lilley, Rayner, Rogan and D Waller.

Resident Representative: Alan Lloyd and Linda Shields.

## **7. METHODS OF INVESTIGATION**

- 7.1 Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum met formally from 12 July 2006 to 9 August 2006 to discuss and receive evidence relating to this investigation. A detailed record of the issues raised during these meetings is available from the Council's Democratic Services.

7.2 A brief summary of the methods of investigation are outlined below:-

- (a) Detailed Officer reports supplemented by verbal evidence;
- (b) Verbal evidence from the Authority's Elected Mayor;
- (c) Examination of good practice within, and experience gained by, other neighbouring Local Authorities in relation to the provision of public conveniences;
- (d) A site visit to a selection of public conveniences within Hartlepool on 20 July 2006;
- (e) Presentation from the Head of Street Scene Services, Scarborough Borough Council on 8 August 2006;
- (f) The views of local residents and representatives from interested groups (Hartlepool Carers, Hartlepool Access Group and Hartlepool's 50+ Forum); and
- (g) Feedback from each of Hartlepool's Neighbourhood Consultative Forums on the proposals and their wishes for future of public convenience provision in the town.

## FINDINGS

### 8. GOVERNMENT POLICY IN RELATION TO THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

- 8.1 Evidence presented to the Forum confirmed that there was no statutory requirement for Local Authorities to provide public conveniences and that the Government did not see the introduction of legislation to require the provision of public conveniences as the way forward.
- 8.2 The need for the development of a national strategy and the negative effect which a lack of provision, and poor maintenance, can have on tourism is, however, recognised. A national strategy for public convenience provision is subsequently being developed by Government and the need to look at how provision could be increased through alternative measures highlighted. Such alternative measure the possible introduction of charging, the involvement of the private sector (by increasing access to commercial premises) and the inclusion of public toilets in planning applications.
- 8.3 In the absence of legislation specifically relating to the provision of conveniences there are, however, pieces of legislation that Local Authorities need to consider in providing the service. These are:-
- 8.4 **The Disability Discrimination Act 1995.** The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 required that the Council makes the public conveniences it provides accessible. Where this does not occur the Council will in the future leave its self open to challenge.

8.5 **The Public Health Act 1936.** The Public Health Act merely gives the Local Authority the power to provide public conveniences. This Act also applies to Parish Councils.

8.6 Consideration is given to the implications of these pieces of legislation later within this report.

## 9. PUBLIC CONVENIENCE PROVISION IN HARTLEPOOL

9.1 There are currently seventeen public conveniences provided by the Council, the condition, location and age of which vary greatly. In addition to these facilities public conveniences are also provided across the town in premises including public houses, shops and cafes. There is, however, no formal agreement at this time to allow access to these facilities for those not entering as customers. The Council also has no control over the quality of provision and cannot require the provision of disabled facilities. These are issues which the Forum felt should be pursued.

9.2 As with other Local Authorities rising maintenance costs, budget restraints, anti-social behaviour and vandalism have resulted in the closure of conveniences in Hartlepool over recent years. In order to enable the Forum to realistically assess the level and condition of conveniences in Hartlepool visits were undertaken to the following sites on 20 July 2006:-

- (i) Thorpe Street;
- (ii) Pilot Pier;
- (iii) The Lighthouse;
- (iv) Ward Jackson Park;
- (v) Stockton Street;
- (vi) Seaton Baths; and
- (vii) The Clock Tower.

9.3 Examples of the conditions observed are shown in detail below along with a summary of the comments made:-

a) **Thorpe Street and Pilot Pier** – Support was expressed for the closure of the facilities in view of their poor condition and the inability to update the buildings to meet Disability Discrimination Act standards.



An illustration of the deteriorating condition of the Thorpe Street facility.

b) **Disabled facilities** - Members highlighted problems with disabled access at some sites and the inability for some facilities to be adapted to improve access.

Some of the towns better disabled facilities (Lighthouse - Heugh Battery).



The absence of disabled facilities/access at the Pilot Pier facility.

c) **Partnership working** – The Forum discussed the value of partnership working and suggested that this should be looked into in relation to the Seaton Baths site, and the adjacent Wine Bar development, the proposed facility on the old Rocket House site.

Conditions at the former Seaton Baths site.



d) **Ward Jackson Park and the Clock Tower** – The contentious nature of the proposals for the demolition of the Ward Jackson Park convenience and closure of the Clock Tower site were acknowledged. It was, however, felt that demolition of the Ward Jackson Park public convenience would be justified in view of its poor condition and the inability to bring the building up to Disability Discrimination Act standards. It was also felt in relation to the Clock Tower facility that although it is not a bad facility the cost of improving and maintaining the building would be too great to continue its use as a public convenience.



**10. WHERE PUBLIC CONVENIENCES ARE NEEDED ACROSS THE TOWN?**

- 10.1 During the evidence gathering process it was highlighted that the management of the public convenience service is currently undertaken without a defined policy against which the need or location of conveniences is assessed. In considering options for the provision of conveniences there was a need to consider the possible provision of fewer, better quality, conveniences in more carefully selected locations including for example tourist areas and parks.
- 10.2 It is recognised that in order for Hartlepool to be promoted as a tourist attraction there is a need to provide facilities in tourist areas. These include Seaton, the Headland and the Marina. In relation to facilities on the Marina improved signage is needed to direct visitor towards conveniences in the Maritime Experience and in the longer term a study needed to assess the most appropriate locations before any new facilities are provided.
- 10.3 In terms of the provision of public conveniences in Parks, the Forum appreciated the level of feeling in support of the existing Ward Jackson facility. In consideration of the proposal for the closure and demolition of the facility the Forum concluded that this would be the appropriate course of action with the proviso that the opening hours of the café on the site be extended to mirror the opening hours of the Park.
- 10.4 Regarding the proposals for the conveniences in the Burn Valley the Forum also felt that the demolition of the Upper Burn Valley convenience was justified. There were, however, concerns regarding the level of provision in the park and it was suggested that this needed to be given further consideration.

**11. ESTABLISHMENT OF ESTIMATED COSTS OF REPLACING ALL PUBLIC CONVENIENCES WITH NEW FACILITIES AND BRINGING EXISTING CONVENIENCES UP TO AN ACCEPTABLE STANDARD.**

- 11.1 The Forum was advised that it would cost approximately £500,000 to bring existing public conveniences up to an acceptable standard and approximately £4 million to replace all conveniences with new facilities. The Forum noted these figures and gave full consideration to the proposals for the provision of conveniences as suggested to Cabinet.
- 11.2 In relation to the cost of the proposals upon which the Forum is being asked to comment it is suggested that the prudential borrowing arrangement should be continued in the future to assist in funding public convenience provision in the longer term. It is also suggested that any savings identified from the revenue budget as a result of changes to public convenience provision be utilised to contribute to future provision.

## 12. COMPARISON OF HARTLEPOOL'S PUBLIC CONVENIENCE PROVISION WITH THAT OF ANOTHER LOCAL AUTHORITY.

- 12.1 In order to gain an understanding of the level and type of provision of other Local Authorities a comparison was undertaken against the other Tees Valley Local Authorities (Middlesbrough, Stockton, Darlington and Redcar and Cleveland). A presentation was also received from a Scarborough Borough Council representative on his Authority's experiences in providing public conveniences as a coastal tourist resort.
- 12.2 **Tees Valley Comparison** - The comparison (**Appendix B** refers) showed that the number of conveniences provided had reduced year on year and that improvements to the quality of facilities has in most cases been funded through a capital bid. In most cases facilities were provided with no partnership working or funding, with the exception of Middlesbrough Council which relies on the provision of facilities by shops and other such facilities.
- 12.3 Whilst attendants appear to be the option that most authorities see as the best deterrent against anti-social behaviour and vandalism the cost associated with their employment means that only two out of the four remaining Tees Valley authorities provide them, and only on a part time basis in a limited number of locations. Other options utilised to address anti-social behaviour problems include the development of a close working relationship with the Police and Community Wardens and the use of anti-vandal finishes such as stainless steel.
- 12.4 **Scarborough Borough Council Comparison** - In terms of a Local Authority with similar tourism issues and past experience of reducing the number of convenience the presentation from Scarborough Borough Council provided the Forum with a good comparison. During the course of discussion it became apparent that Hartlepool could learn from Scarborough's experience in terms of:
- (a) The use of attendants and charging arrangements, although facilities were still heavily subsidised;
  - (b) The intention that all of their conveniences comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act within the next five years;
  - (c) The provision of the opportunity for Parish Councils to take over the provision of facilities in instances where the Council cannot continue to do so and the use of other forms of partnership i.e. sponsorship;
  - (d) Efforts made to encourage commercial sector involvement in the provision of conveniences. Although there has been little success at this as of yet;
  - (e) A requirement as part of the planning process for the provision of access and facilities; and

- (f) The use of small annex facilities, one or two cubicles, attached to larger public conveniences that can be left open when the main facility closes.

### **13. THE VIEWS OF RESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM RELEVANT GROUPS INCLUDING PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND EQUALITY ISSUES.**

13.1 During the course of the Forum's investigation residents and representatives from Hartlepool Carers, Hartlepool Access Group and the 50+ Forum participated in discussions and expressed their views in relation to the quality of existing provision and how/where they would like to see provision in the future, as summarised below:-

- (a) Concern was expressed regarding current condition of public conveniences in Hartlepool and indeed the whole of the country. Particular attention was drawn to the failure of the majority of public conveniences in Hartlepool to meet the requirements of the Disabled Discrimination Act and the longer implications of the Authority in that it could be challenged in the future if it should fail to provide the appropriate facilities. Attention was also drawn to the absence of any form of facilities to assist those who care for disabled adults and it was suggested that the introduction of lifting facilities in conveniences to assist carers should be looked into.
- (b) Representative from the various groups highlighted the importance of dignity for all and emphasised the role appropriate public convenience provision could have in providing this. The Forum was also advised that representatives from the 50+ Forum had indicated that they would prefer to pay for the use of conveniences if they could be guaranteed clean and safe facilities.
- (c) Request were also put forward for the full involvement of the Hartlepool Access Group and the Councils Access Officer in proposals for improvements to, of installation of, disabled facilities and the need to provide over and above the minimum requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act in terms of size and layout of facilities.
- (d) The views of residents were also fed back to the Forum via the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums on 14, 15 and 16 June 2006 and the Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 9, 10 and 11 August 2006. Comments made included support for the retention of the Ward Jackson Park and Clock Tower facilities, the need to explore partnership working through the use of facilities in commercial premises, planning requirements and the provision of disabled facilities.

### **14. CONCLUSIONS**

14.1 In considering the Cabinet referral it was found that in addition to budgetary issues there was a real concern regarding the level and condition of public conveniences. The Forum was of the view that:-

- (a) That whilst there is no statutory requirement for the provision of public conveniences they should continue to be provided by the Local Authority. Careful consideration would, however, be necessary in the future in terms of the location of facilities;
- (b) That the Council should look at innovative ways of delivering the service with higher quality facilities. The Forum supported the closure where necessary of some older, less accessible, facilities to make this possible;
- (c) That the closure of some older facilities is justified in terms of their condition and inability to update/improve to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (d) That the provision of public conveniences should be focused within tourist areas and that a policy should be developed to formalise arrangements for the identification of locations in the future;
- (e) That there is a need for the development of a policy for the future to ensure that all public conveniences provided by Hartlepool Borough Council comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (f) That Parish Councils should be given the opportunity to take over the provision of public conveniences for which closure is the proposed course of action, with a requirement that they meet the conditions of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (g) That alternative ways of ensuring public convenience provision should be explored. i.e. partnership working with local shops and businesses;
- (h) That there should be a requirement as part of the planning process (Section 106 Agreements) for the provision of, or provision of access to, public conveniences that meet the conditions of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (i) That the use of small 'annex' facilities which can be attached to larger public conveniences and left open when the main facility closes be explored (para. 12.4 (a) refers);
- (j) That the location of public conveniences, and their opening times, be better advertised, in particular with improved signage on the Marina;
- (k) That the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act must be fully considered and the implications/effect of proposed closures on the elderly, disabled and children taken into serious consideration; and
- (l) That the prudential borrowing arrangement proposed be continued in the future to assist in funding public convenience provision in the longer term and that any savings identified from the revenue budget as a result of changes to public convenience provision be reinvested in the service.

## 15. RECOMMENDATIONS

15.1 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations.

15.2 That in relation to each of the options and proposals put forward as part of the Cabinet Referral (as outlined in the report considered by Cabinet on the 12 April 2006) the Forum:-

(a) Supports the proposals for the:-

- (i) Closure of the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Rocket House facilities and their securing with aesthetic materials;
- (ii) Building of a new facility adjacent to the old Rocket House site and closure of the Clock Tower site;
- (iii) Undertaking of only essential maintenance to Clock Tower facility to keep them functioning until the new facilities are up and running;
- (iv) Refurbishment and upgrade the Lighthouse (Heugh Battery) facilities;
- (v) Undertaking of no work to the Albert Street facility;
- (vi) Taking no action in respect of the Seaton Park facilities other than essential maintenance;
- (vii) Demolition and making good of the site at the Ward Jackson Park facilities. The toilets at the café to be made available to all public during the opening hours of the park;
- (viii) Maintenance and improvements to the facilities at Rossmere Park;
- (ix) Demolition and making good the site in the Upper Burn Valley, with the development of a policy for the provision of public conveniences in the Burn Valley to be looked into;
- (x) Maintenance of the Lower Burn Valley facility;
- (xi) Introduction of adequate heating, together with routine and planned maintenance to the Stranton Cemetery main facility;
- (xii) Maintenance of existing facilities at West View Cemetery; and
- (xiii) Demolition of the Hartlepool Maritime Experience facility and the marketing of the site with any revenue to be reinvested for the improvement of public convenience provision.

- (b) Disagrees with the proposed course of action for the former Seaton Baths site and recommends that the facility be improved in terms of its general condition and more specifically its disabled access externally and disabled facilities;
  - (c) Agrees that all Council owned buildings should provide, wherever possible, toilet facilities for the public and that town centre landlords and other businesses need to be encouraged to make their facilities available to the public during normal, and extended opening hours.
- 15.3 In addition to providing recommendations as outlined above the Forum also recommends to Cabinet:-
- (d) That a policy be established for the future provision of public conveniences requiring that:-
    - (i) The location of public conveniences in Hartlepool be concentrated in tourist areas, i.e. the Headland, Seaton and the Marina;
    - (ii) That all public conveniences provided by Hartlepool Borough Council comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act and where this is not possible facilities be closure and/or replaced;
  - (e) That the location of public conveniences, and their opening times, be better advertised, in particular with improved signage on the Marina giving directions to the conveniences in Hartlepool Maritime Experience;
  - (f) That in relation to future provision on the Marina a study be undertaken to assess the most appropriate locations before any new facilities are provided;
  - (g) That options for the provision of public conveniences in the Burn Valley be explored further;
  - (h) That the feasibility of the provision of facilities through partnership working and the identification of resources through sponsorship funding, advertising in facilities, and charging be explored;
  - (i) That any capital receipts that may result from the disposal of a public convenience be re-invested for improvements to the service;
  - (j) That the Hartlepool Access Group and the Councils Access Officer be fully involved in proposals for the adaptation/improvement of older, and building of new, facilities to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act;
  - (m) That as part of the Civic Centre Refurbishments Programme the feasibility of the installation of a hoist for disabled adults within the Civic Centre's public conveniences be explored;

- (n) That there be a requirement as part of the planning process (Section 106 Agreements) for the provision of, or access to, public conveniences that meet the conditions of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (o) That Parish Councils should be given the opportunity to take over the provision of public conveniences for which closure is the proposed course of action, with a requirement that they meet the conditions of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- (p) That the use of small ‘annex’ facilities which can be attached to larger public conveniences and left open when the main facility closes be explored (para. 12.4 (a) refers);
- (q) That where public conveniences are closed and not demolished alternative uses for the buildings be explored;
- (r) That the Council should look at innovative ways of delivering the service with higher quality facilities. The Forum supported the closure where necessary of some older, less accessible, facilities to make this possible; and
- (s) That the prudential borrowing arrangement proposed be continued in the future to assist in funding public convenience provision in the longer term and that any savings identified from the revenue budget as a result of changes to public convenience provision be reinvested in the service.

## **16. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- 16.1 The Forum is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of our investigation. We would like to place on record our appreciation, in particular of the willingness and co-operation we have received from the below named:-

### Hartlepool Borough Council:

Stuart Drummond, Elected Mayor and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Housing and Liveability

Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services

Colin Ogden, Waste Management Manager

Albert Cope, Environment Manager

### External Representatives:

Barry Scott, Head of Street Scene Services, Scarborough Borough Council

Mary Diver, Hartlepool Carers

Mrs Remmer, Hartlepool Access Group

Joan Scrafton, 50+ Forum

Phil Lee, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council  
Sylvia Hague, Darlington Borough Council

Robert Clough, Stockton Borough Council

Julie Hoff, South Tyneside Council

**COUNCILLOR GERA RD HALL  
CHAIR OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

August 2006

**Contact Officer:-** Joan Wilkins – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523339  
Email: [joan.wilkins@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:joan.wilkins@hartlepool.gov.uk)

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Referral – Hartlepool's Public Convenience Provision – Scoping Report presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum held on 12 July 2006.
- (ii) Report of the Director of Neighbourhood Services entitled 'Public Conveniences' to Cabinet on the 12 April 2006.
- (iii) Minute number 230 of Cabinet held on the 12 April 2006.
- (iv) Phil Woolas MP – speech to the 'Public Toilet Provision – The Way Forward' Seminar – 19 July 2006.
- (v) Minutes of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums on the 14 June 2006 (North), 15 June 2006 (Central) and 16 June 2006 (South).
- (vi) Public Conveniences Condition Surveys Report – 2004.
- (vii) Public Conveniences Condition Surveys Report - Rocket House.
- (viii) Parks - Public Conveniences Report
- (ix) Fifth View point 1000 Survey Results – Public Conveniences (2001)
- (x) British Toilet Association News – Spring 2006



- (xi) London Assembly – An Urgent Need – The State of London’s Public Toilets – March 2006
- (xi) Scarborough Borough Council – Cabinet reports (31 January 2005, 22 February 2005, 26 July 2006) – Public Convenience - Improvements
- (xii) Public Health Act 1936
- (xiv) The Disability Discrimination Act 1995

**PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO CABINET****APPENDIX A**

- i) Closure of the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Rocket House facilities.
- ii) Build a new facility adjacent to the old Rocket House site and close the Clock Tower site.
- iii) Carry out only essential maintenance to Clock Tower facility to keep them functioning until the new facilities are up and running.
- iv) Refurbish and upgrade the Lighthouse (Heugh Battery) facilities.
- v) Consider what, if any, maintenance ought to take place to the Albert Street facility or whether it ought to be closed prior to any future land sale.
- vi) Consider the building of a new facility at the former Seaton Baths site, with closure and demolition of the existing facility.
- vii) Take no action in respect of the Seaton Park facilities other than essential maintenance. The new facilities at the Rocket House are in close proximity.
- viii) Demolish and make good the site at the Ward Jackson Park facilities. The toilets at the café to be made available to all public during opening hours. Consider extending the café opening hours to accommodate need.
- ix) Maintain and improve the facilities at Rossmere Park
- x) Demolish and make good the site in the Upper Burn Valley.
- xi) Maintain the Lower Burn Valley facility.
- xii) Introduce adequate heating, together with routine and planned maintenance to the Stranton Cemetery main facility.
- xiii) Maintain existing facilities at West View Cemetery.
- xiv) Consider the options in respect of the Hartlepool Maritime Experience. (Either completely refurbished to make it as anti-vandal proof as possible, closed and marketed or continue with its current limited use).
- xv) That all Council owned buildings should provide, wherever possible, toilet facilities for the public. In addition, town centre landlords need to be encouraged to make their facilities available to the public during normal, now extended, opening hours.

**OVERALL COST OF PROPOSALS**

£565,000 + £30,000 provisional sum, together with:

Hartlepool Maritime Experience options	£15,000 (Capital)
or	£100,000 - £200,000 (Capital)
plus added revenue costs of	£50,000

**TEES VALLEY COMPARISON****APPENDIX B**

	<b>STOCKTON BC</b>	<b>DARLINGTON BC</b>	<b>REDCAR AND CLEVELAND BC</b>	<b>M'BORO BC</b>
i) Number of conveniences. Has the number reduced?	Seven. Has reduced by four over the last ten years, with one new convenience provided.	Seven (One manned and six unmanned). Has reduced by two over recent years.	14 (Up to 2004 reduced - re-opened 2 since 2005 and close another)	None. Relies on Shopping Centres and other such facilities.
ii) Have facilities been improved recently?	Yes with the aid of a Capital bid.	Yes, with the aid of a Capital bid.	Yes, with the aid of a Capital bid.	N/A
iii) Maintenance budget. Is it sufficient to cover maintenance & staffing costs?	Figure not provided. Yes	Figure not provided. Yes.	£9,300. No (always overspent)	N/A
iv) Are any partnership arrangements in place in terms of provision of facilities and funding?	No. All facilities are funded by the Local Authority.	No. All facilities are funded by the Local Authority.	No. Whilst good idea Councils need to look at their own buildings as well as. Need to advertise.	N/A
v) Are attendants employed?	Yes but only the facility in the town centre facility is permanently staffed.	Yes	No.	N/A
vi) Do you charge for the use of any of your conveniences?	Yes Have a coin operated facility.	No.	No.	N/A
vii) What has been the most significant factor in reducing ASB and vandalism?	Use of: - attendants; - a good working relationship with the Police.	Use of: - attendants; - anti vandal finishes i.e. stainless steel; - A good working relationship with the police and Community Wardens.	Use of: - devised notice saying under CCTV (even though not)	N/A