

**QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM  
PAM NOTCUTT FOR ORAL REPLY**

1. Will the Portfolio Holder give the actual (rather than estimated) running costs for each of the public toilets at Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham in 2013/14 under the following headings?

Cleaning  
Electricity  
Water  
Repairs and maintenance  
NNDR 2013/14

**Reply**

Given Pam Notcutt's representation of the Beckenham Society, the Portfolio Holder focused on providing the following data related to the Beckenham public toilets:

2013/14 Actuals - Beckenham Public Toilets

	£	
Cleansing contract	11,359	
Running costs		
Electricity	4,194	Note1
Water	1,706	
NNDR (2013/14 prices)	1,663	
Property Maintenance costs	985	
	19,907	

The above does not include capital costs.

Note 1 Electrical Heaters are fitted into the Bromley and Beckenham toilets. The information above is accurate in terms of actuals shown in the Accounting System. However due to end of year estimating of Q4 bills the actual electricity consumption in 2013/14 and therefore cost for Beckenham was higher (£4,877). The higher consumption figures have been reflected in revised budgets for 2014/15.

### **Supplementary Question**

Pam Notcutt asked if the Portfolio Holder thought it necessary to know what disaggregated costs were considered essential to achieving savings.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that the main focus of need related to an overall policy of saving some £20k per annum by no longer having to meet operating costs associated with the toilets.

-----

2. What data has been collected by the Council on usage of existing facilities e.g. headcounts and over what period to assess the number of alternative toilets and hours of opening needed?

### **Reply**

Data usage (for all public toilets across the Borough at that time) was last collected by means of counting machines installed in the toilets during March/April 2008.

### **Supplementary Question**

Pam Notcutt suggested that water costs for Beckenham public toilets were significantly higher than water costs for Penge public toilets, indicating a higher level of use for the Beckenham facilities. She also suggested a risk that businesses could limit the provision of facilities, highlighting a reduction in the number of business provided facilities in L B Richmond. She further suggested that it might be necessary for the Council to pay businesses for the provision of additional facilities.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that six locations would be provided at Beckenham for community toilet facilities, suggesting there was no reason why the Beckenham Community Toilet Scheme should not be successful.

-----

3. What attempts has the Council made to secure continued funding for the public toilets e.g. on-site advertising revenue; takeover by a community group or commercial operation; or retention by the Council incorporating an additional on-site use under its current investment scheme in commercial property?

### **Reply**

Several large companies (including four large car dealerships) have been approached regarding sponsorship but have unfortunately declined.

If a commercial or voluntary group comes forward with a viable proposal to retain a publically accessible toilet at this location we will gladly consider their proposal and the business case.

**Supplementary Question**

Pam Notcutt enquired whether other means had been explored for keeping the Beckenham toilet open.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that he would be pleased to see more potential sponsors and interested parties stepping forward e.g. a business or community/voluntary group with funding.

-----