

**Appendix 1**

Public Consultation

As part of the consultation exercise undertaken in 2023 to inform the development of the Toilet Strategy, a total of five responses were received. This represented a limited evidence base on which to draw conclusions regarding local need and user expectations.

Should options for the future of the Broadgate public toilets facility be progressed, a more comprehensive and targeted public consultation exercise should be undertaken.

Public toilet provision in other Nottinghamshire Districts

District	Provision
Ashfield DC	No information available.
Bassetlaw DC	4 locations across the Borough
Broxtowe BC	4 locations, 5 public toilets. (2 x Beeston, 1 x Stapleford, 1 x Kimberley, 1 x Eastwood
Gedling BC	1 location. Town centre toilets closed due to 'lewd' behaviour.
Mansfield DC	Charges 20p per visit to use facilities
Newark and Sherwood DC	4 Locations across the Borough
Rushcliffe BC	4 Locations across the Borough

Table 1: Public toilet provision across Nottinghamshire.

Usage figures

There is no reliable or consistent footfall data available for the Broadgate toilet facility, as there are no physical counting mechanisms in place. This is currently being explored, in conjunction with ICT Services, to identify potential options for implementing a suitable counting system. It is intended that this data can be captured and developed further to inform a future report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Options for Consideration

A number of potential options are available for the future of Broadgate public toilets. These are presented for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

**Option 1:** Retain the facility in its current form.

This option would involve continuing to operate the Broadgate toilets as a standalone public convenience without any significant changes to the current service model. The primary advantage of this approach is that it maintains an established provision in the Broadgate area and avoids any immediate reduction in access. However, this option does not address the ongoing and escalating issues associated with anti-social behaviour, vandalism, and health and safety risks. In addition, it would require continued revenue expenditure, estimated at £20,000 per annum, with limited ability to improve service quality or value for money.

**Option 2:** Close the Broadgate toilets.

Closure of the facility would remove the ongoing operational and maintenance burden associated with the site. This would deliver a direct financial saving and eliminate the risks posed to staff and users linked to anti-social behaviour and vandalism. However, this option would result in a reduction in public toilet provision in the Broadgate area and may have adverse impacts on accessibility, particularly for those who rely on nearby facilities. While alternative provision exists in Beeston Square, this may not fully meet the needs of users in this locality.

**Option 3:** Introduce charging at the facility

Under this option, a pay-to-use model would be introduced, requiring users to make a payment per visit. This approach has the potential to offset a proportion of operational costs and may act as a deterrent to some forms of anti-social behaviour.

However, there are a number of practical, financial, and equality considerations associated with implementation. If the existing doors and frames are compatible, it is estimated that card payment systems would cost approximately £4,000 per door. Where replacement doors and frames are required, costs could increase to £6,000 per door, with further additional costs if external posts are necessary to mount equipment. Each door would also require an associated payment processing system, typically contracted externally at an estimated cost of £15 per unit per month.

In practice, a cashless (card-only) system is likely to be required, as coin-operated systems would necessitate regular cash collection, creating additional security and operational demands.

Consideration must also be given to accessibility requirements. The accessible (disabled) toilet would need to remain free of charge to ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010, particularly in relation to users with urgent medical needs. Access would therefore need to remain via RADAR key. However, it is recognised that RADAR keys are widely available and easily obtained, which has contributed to ongoing misuse of these facilities.

Overall, while this option may provide some income generation and control over access, it is unlikely to fully recover operating costs and does not fully mitigate the existing challenges associated with misuse and vandalism.

**Option 4: Develop a Community Toilet Scheme**

This option would involve working in partnership with local businesses and organisations to provide public access to toilet facilities, supported by a modest financial contribution from the Council. The key advantages of this model include reduced operational costs compared to maintaining a standalone facility, improved oversight and natural surveillance within existing premises, and potentially higher standards of cleanliness and safety. Evidence from other local authorities suggests that such schemes can be cost-effective and well-received. However, successful implementation would depend on securing willing partners, ensuring equitable coverage, and maintaining consistent standards through monitoring and agreements.

**Option 5: Alternative or hybrid approach (to be explored)**

A hybrid approach could combine elements of the above options, such as retaining limited provision at Broadgate while piloting a Community Toilet Scheme, or repurposing the existing building for alternative use. This option provides flexibility and allows for a phased transition, enabling the Council to test new delivery models while maintaining some level of provision. However, this approach may still incur partial costs and require careful management to avoid duplication of provision or confusion for users.