

Business Case

Title of business case	Toilet Review/Investment Programme		CPO ref:
Author of business case	Anthony French		
Sponsor of business case	Joel Carré		
Sub-board [delete as appropriate]	Place		
Approvals [A business case must be approved by a HoS if the HoS is not the project sponsor]	Head of Service	Joel Carré	
	Date HoS approved	DD/MM/YY	
	BT Board [CPO to complete]	DD/MM/YY	

Revision history

Version	Revision Date [DD/MM/YY]	Status	Summary of changes	Author
1.0	28/10/20	Draft	First issue for BSR	Anthony French
2.0	07/01/21	Draft	Revised	Anthony French

Document distribution (separate to the QAG group)

Revision of issue [28/10/20]	Name	Job title	Reason for distribution

1. Executive summary

This item links to the savings bid proposal following the development of a Public Toilet Policy and based on and officer review of toilet provisio (Cambridge City Council Public Conveniences Post COVID -19 management proposals May 2020). This item seeks investment in existing poorly rated facilities and the re-purposing of some facilities that can be adapt to commercial or community use therefore generating an annual income. The investment could be made from S106 maintenance contributions (if the business case is valid and present an opportunity to make a return on the investment (The use of S106 is not yet fully understood or agreed)). The Officer report May 2020 to facilitate bid examined;

- Anticipated levels of use/ demand
- Pre-Covid cleaning costs and adaptations required to ensure Social Distancing regulations are achieved
- Anticipated repair costs to maintain fabric to reasonable standard based on recent figures from pre-Covid maintenance spend
- Anticipated longer term required capital investment in facility in next 1-5 years on a refurbishment or rebuild basis
- Proximity of alternative available public toilet/commercial premises open to public for those identified for closure
- Indicative view on the re-use toilet property for alternative commercial/ community use – and what that might be

Objectives and deliverables

Ref Start from 1	Objective List each of the objectives?	Deliverable(s) What will be the deliverable(s) in order to meet the objective?	Measure Which Corporate Objective, KPI or measure/s will be used to track when the benefit will be realised?	Baseline performance What is the actual performance against the measure, as of today?	Target What is the future targeted performance against the measure?
1	To adequately fund a refurbishment/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual site bids agreed and funding secured 	Delivering quality services within financial constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage numbers/footfall Strategic location of blocks Level of complaints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in complaints

	rebuild programme at toilet blocks which have not had capital investment for many years and have year on year increased maintenance costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full appraisal of works required for refurbishment by procurement process • Designs complete and procured where rebuilt • Contracts let • Build complete • Facilities improved 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High ongoing maintenance costs • Ensure COVID social distancing regs are met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in annual maintenance • Social Distancing regs achieved
2	To allow a sum to fund the re-purposing/decommissioning of 6 toilet blocks as agreed with Executive Councillor. Saving generated by removal of cleaning, maintenance and utility costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full appraisal of works required for refurbishment by procurement process • Adaptions procured and delivered • Buildings repurposed, reused commercially or by community • Savings/income realised 	Delivering quality services within financial constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usage numbers/footfall • Strategic location of blocks • Level of complaints • High ongoing maintenance costs • Cleaning/utility costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreased maintenance, utility, and clean costs • Income generated

2. Business justification

There has been no substantial capital investment in the toilet asset portfolio between 2012 and 2020 and subsequently the worst rated and identified during a report externally commissioned in 2012 have declined further. The portfolio as of 2020 costs the council around £600k per annum to manage and just over half this is in relation to cleaning costs with prominent central sites having permanent/part time attendance and outer lying sites having mobile cleaning visits varying between 2-4 per day. In 2017 as part of the Streets and Open Spaces 600k service plan reduction the cleaning frequencies have been revised, saving approximately 50k.

Officers have long stated that in order to make significant savings the best approach would be to de-commission some of the blocks which were in poor state of repair and had low usage. In considering which alternative options in the locality were at the forefront of appraisal. In March 2020 the entire portfolio was closed following the nationwide lockdown as a result of COVID-19 and this dynamic introduced concerns around social Distancing in some of the facilities and how this might be achieved going forwards. During this period officers were able to undertake a full appraisal of the asset and subsequently make recommendation of a trial (on low use/social distance footing) not re-open the blocks at

- Silver Street (primarily owing to Social Distancing not being practicable) *
- Park Street (owing to poor condition and alternative public facilities at Jesus Green and Quayside) *
- Arbury Court (owing to low usage data)
- Barnwell Road (owing to low usage)
- Kings Hedges Recreation Ground (owing to low usage/Social Distancing difficulties)
- Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground (owing to low usage)

*Both sites also have live projects attached – Park Street Car Park to close permanently, Silver Street with a capital project in feasibility stage.

During the trial which has now been active for 6 months (April-September) officers have received one complaint about Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground. Upon review and in response, this block was re-opened given that the alternative at Cherry Hinton Village Centre was unavailable.

To close the above facilities on a permanent basis would generate an approximate saving of £90-120k PA on cleaning, utilities, and ongoing maintenance requirements. Currently the cleaning of the portfolio costs £325k per annum.

Silver Street is included in the saving at present as there is no opportunity to adapt this facilities entrance/exit to ensure it meets Social Distancing regulations. This could be reviewed at a later date should the capital project proceed and this issue is designed out in the longer term.

In proposing permanent closure there is the opportunity to look at re-use on a number of levels ranging from local community spaces/projects through to re-letting commercially cost estimated at

The report also appraised the remaining portfolio and gave capital investment estimates in respect of refurbishment or rebuild at the following locations;

- Cherry Hinton Hall - £75k refurb – to refurb existing Ladies and gents plus an additional accessible unit
- Chesterton Recreation Ground - £150k full rebuild – demolish existing and renew (to provide 3 gender specific & 1 accessible unit).
- Chesterton Road - £10k– to make improvements internally
- Coleridge Recreation Ground - £50k refurb – to improve access to Gents and refurb + ladies and disabled refurb (roof was renewed in 2018)
- Drummer Street - £250-300k full rebuild – demolish existing and renew (to provide 6 gender specific & 2 accessible units)

- Gonville Place - £5k – cosmetic makeover on external aspect required
- Jesus Green - £25k - to further improve following refurb in 2017
- Romsey Rec - £10k - to re-open a vandalised cubicle

Total of £625k.

3. Benefits

Object ive Ref (from above)	Benefit List the benefits that a project deliverable will generate. E.g. quality of service, process improvement, risk reduction, revenue increase, strategic fit	Measure Which Corporate Objective, KPI or measure/s will be used to track when the benefit will be realised?	Baseline performance What is the actual performance against the measure, as of today?	Target What is the targeted performance against the measure?	Date When will the target be achieved?	Owner Who is responsible for the delivery of the benefit
1	Reconfigure service offer	Transforming how we will deliver services	Improvement in facilities available and reduction of maintenance liabilities	User experience and decrease in time spent internally and externally on maintenance repair work.	31/03/22	S&OS Asset team
2	Revenue increase through re-purposing	Transforming how we will deliver services	Income generation from current position of cost	Letting of one or more of the to close from alternative commercial use	31/03/22	S&OS Asset Team
3	Community facilities through re-purposing	Transforming how we will deliver services	Offer use of blocks not commercially viable for let for community initiatives	Community group using one or more of closed blocks	31/02/22	SOS Asset/Community Engagement Team

4.1 Commercial benefits (income)

Description of income	20/21	21/22	22/23 £s	23/24 £s	Comments
-----------------------	-------	-------	-------------	-------------	----------

Re-purposing of Kings Hedges toilet block to commercial let – office space	0	0	25-35k	25-35k	Estimated and subject to let at Kings Hedges Rec
--	---	---	--------	--------	--

4. Costs and resources

5.1 Costs / funding and resources

	2020/21 £s	2021/22 £s	2022/23 £s	2023/24 £s	Annual ongoing	Source of funding [add cost centres]
Capital costs (list below, per item)						
E.g. Building/contractor works		25k	225k	270k		Capital reserves
E.g. professional/consultant fees		25k	50k	30k		Capital reserves
E.g. people/resources (add here the people who will be involved, mark cost as zero if internal/not cost associated)		0	0			Capital reserves
Total capital	0	50000	275000	300000	0	
Revenue costs (list below, per item)						
Building cleaning cost savings		-90000	-90000	-90000	-90000	Savings from not cleaning closed blocks
Total revenue	0	-90000	-90000	-90000	-90000	
Capital income / funding (list below, per item)						
Let of commercial unit		25000	25000	25000		Based on let of Kings Hedges toilet asset after re-purposing

Total income/funding	0	25000	25000	25000	25000	
Existing budget provision	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Revenue implications	0	0	0	-90000	-90000	
Difference between total spend and change in revenue costs	0	0	0	-90000	-90000	
Comments for each financial year						Saving will continue onward

5.2 Investment appraisal of cost against the benefits

Whilst there is a significant capital outlay these is seen as essential in order for the toilet assets to offer more up to day innovations geared towards environmentally friendly sustainable utility use. Newer facilities also demand a less intensive cleaning regime and there are potentially savings in this respect. At present the portfolio commands the equivalent of one FTE to deal with small standard day to day repairs but also there has been significant external requirements, most recently a facility cost 30k to address a sewer issue, this equating to one year entire budget allocation. It is therefore anticipated that Initial outlays will be recuperated across a longer-term period of 10 years as there will be significant decreases in maintenance requirement, cleaning and in energy/water savings alone.

5.3 VAT implications

None identified at drafting

5. Timescales

Highest priority (poorest condition sites) work appraised	Summer 21
Advice on Permissions and consents if required (rebuids)	Autumn 21
Basic designs complete	Autumn 21
Seek market offers for design and build of wholesale redevelopments or	Winter 21

Procure small refurbishment works
 Permissions and consents achieved for rebuilds
 Works to all sites 2021/2022/2023 on rolling programme

Winter 21
 Spring 22
 onward

6. Procurement

Council/Partner	Procurement route [Tender/OJEU/ Framework/contract]	Who is doing evaluation [Name(s) for each partner]	Cost per partner [Add columns for financial years]	Comments
City				
Hunts				
SCDC				
3C Shared Services				

7. Findings from feasibility study / options appraisal

During an externally commission report in 2012 entitled – “Community and Convenience” it was reported that;

- Of Cambridge City Council's twenty public toilets, six have been rated as excellent, and a further five as good. Five, however, have been rated poor or very poor, using our standard assessment form.
- Some of the city's toilets are not only in poor condition but also have a reputation for anti-social activity, that discourages people from using them.
- It was stated that major investment was required to avoid negative public relations going forward
- A Community Toilet Scheme was suggested – this has subsequently been investigated by officers and there is little appetite from local businesses to join this
- It was recognised that some of the facilities managed were very close to possible alternative City Council owned assets – for example Community Centres and therefore made suggestion that major investments in such toilets in poor condition was possibly not justifiable

Officer report May 2020 as a result of COVID-19 closures also summarised that the situation had provided the option to re-appraise the situation for all blocks, fundamentally to look at the new dynamic of Social Distancing implications should a facility reopen but also accounting wider than just this factor by examining current condition, footfall, expenditure and income cost as well as providing indicative estimates on capital refurbishment/re-build options. It concluded that the portfolio could be reduced by 25% which will in turn save the authority around £90k in cleaning costs and also release the burden on resource and finance for maintenance – the budget out turns for 2018/19 and 2019/20 show overspend on the toilet portfolio. There are other costs which will be saved, not outlined, for example water supply/disposal, this extending beyond financial savings to environmental. In making savings there is the possibility of re-purposing in some of the the key assets and effectively recuperating this capital investment over a 10 year period.

The combination of the 2012 report, adoption of the Public Convenience Service in 2015 by SOS Asset Team, maintenance burden and then COVID 19 prompted this budget bid

8. Risks and issues

9.1. Key Risks

Risk description	Impact	Treatment/controls
Failure to achieve permissions and consents	One or more schemes cannot progress in agreed form without considerable rework or modifications	Early scoping and feasibility reports, to identify potential difficulties before making a firm commitment to progress the Project
Public resistance to permanent closures	COVID-19 has provided a justifiable reason for close of facilities but there is a potential of resistance to permeant closures	Ensure that nearby alternative provision is available to counteract resistance

9.2. Key Issues

Issue description	Impact	Action
None identified at this stage		

9. Equalities impact (EQIA)

To be completed separately as part of the BSR round. This report will be updated once this EQIA is complete.

10. Environmental impact (climate change rating)

This Project is currently rated as Low + – Medium + (it will depend on the design of the final scheme and how much climate change adaptations can be incorporated). Water and electric consumption considerably reduced by re-purposing. More efficient/new technologies introduced in rebuilds/refurbs. e flushing mechanisms using minimal water, energy efficient lighting solutions etc

11. Data Protection impact (DPIA)

No data will be collected for this Project

12. Confidentiality of the business case

There are no confidentiality constraints with this report.

13. Assessment by the Quality Assurance Group (QAG)

Members of the QAG group will complete this section.

[QAG members - add comments, including 'no comment' as appropriate and your name and date]

Audit		Viewed by:	Date:
Climate / Equality / Strategy		Viewed by:	Date:
Communications		Viewed by:	Date:
Democratic Services		Viewed by:	Date:

Finance		Viewed by:	Date:
HR		Viewed by:	Date:
Information Management (GDPR)		Viewed by:	Date:
Legal		Viewed by:	Date:
Procurement		Viewed by:	Date:
ICT		Viewed by:	Date:
Risk (finance)		Viewed by:	Date:
S106 / Growth		Viewed by:	Date: