Committee(s):	Date(s):		Item no.
Projects Sub Committee	25 <sup>th</sup> Februa	ry 2014	
Subject: Outcome Report - Gateway 7 Public Convenience Project (appr Installation of paddle gates at two install four Urilift urinals at identifie the City	locations and	Non-Pul	olic
Report of: Report of the Director of the Built	Environment	For Dec	ision
<b>NOT FOR</b>			
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Par	rt I of Schedule 12A 1972.	_	_
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Paragraphic streat in the form of project at locations across the City identifies the behaviour in the form of street unite Street, Watling Street, Cornhill an	rt I of Schedule 12A 1972. Summary troduction of chargi niences and the inst fied as suffering from nation. These location	of the Loo ng at Tow allation of n high leve	er Hill and four Urilift urinals

additional project cost of £63,003 which can be met from the Directors local risk and authorise the closure of the project.

# <u>Overview</u>

PHES Committee agreed at the September 2009 meeting to the introduction of hi-tech 'pop up' urinals that disappear, by remote control, beneath the ground when not in use and the introduction of charging at Tower Hill and Paternoster Square public conveniences. The installation of Urilift Style toilets would seek to address the problem of street urination associated with the City's night time economy. When not needed they would be housed below the ground hence reducing their impact upon the street scene. Section 87 of the Public Health Act 1936 enables the City to provide sanitary
conveniences (which include urinals) in proper and

	convenient situations, provided that the consent of the
	highway authority is obtained where such conveniences are to be located in or under a highway for which the City is not highway authority.
	In 2008/9 the usage of Tower Hill and Paternoster Square toilets is approximately 1.9 million uses per annum. With the introduction of a 50p charge, as agreed by PHES Committee in January 2009, private sector research suggests up to a 60% reduction in usage may be expected. Nevertheless the predicted annual income was still expected to be around £380,000
2. Project Scope and	Urilifts
Exclusions	Four locations were identified as suffering from significant anti-social behaviour in the form of street urination resulting from the growth In the night time economy across the City, the sites were:
	Charterhouse Street, Bishopsgate, Watling Street and Cornhill.
	Introduction of charging and barrier installations were based on usage figures, Tower Hill and Paternoster Square were two facilities with the greatest user numbers. Other locations were not within the scope of this project but may be considered at a later date.
3. Link to Strategic Aims	• To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors, with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes.
	• To provide valued services to London and the nation.
4. Within which category does the project fit	Invest to save
5. What is the priority of the	Advisable/ Essential
project?	The longer term viability of the public convenience service was at risk unless steps are taken to reduce the net costs of the service.
6. Resources Expended	$\pounds485,503$ – This sum includes additional project costs of $\pounds63,003$ due to complex technical installation difficulties with the Urilift at Charterhouse Street.

### Outturn Assessment

7. Assessment of project	Barrier Installations
against Success Criteria	The modelling used to estimate number of users at Tower Hill and Paternoster Square was based on experience elsewhere in London. A 60% reduction in usage was assumed and this has proved a reasonably accurate assumption. These numbers gave a basis to estimate the annual income from the introduction of a 50p charge. The estimated income was £380k and the actual income is averaging around £370k.
	As with the introduction of any charging, we received a small number of complaints. These were always responded to, detailing that whilst other authorities are closing these types of facilities the City is trying to continue to provide public conveniences in what are challenging financial times for public finances. As time has passed generally it has been accepted and we now receive 'minimal' complaints.
	Urilift installations
	The units have proven to be generally reliable, although one or two suffered from some teething issues, (electrical faults), soon after installation. These were investigated and repaired relatively quickly by the supplier and as they have 'settled in' breakdowns appear to be infrequent. The units are of robust construction and have not suffered any damage or vandalism.
	The usage of the units is varied across each location and the unique 'open design' is something of a cultural change for many people. To enable the capture of usage data, web based system counters were fitted to each unit, which record the number of users. This provides information that demonstrates the need for these units in the locations identified and also gives justification for the investment. It can be seen from the usage figures below that these units are being used relatively well by night-time users.
	The total usage figure for 2013 was 8381.
	Watling Street - 3319; Bishopsgate - 2271; Cornhill - 2288; Charterhouse Street (3 months only) – 503.
	These are all sites that previously experienced incidents of street urination. We will be monitoring usage as people become more comfortable with these new style facilities.

	Whilst it is difficult to quantify the reduction in street urination following the introduction of the units anecdotally the night service have stated that the areas in the locality of the units are not requiring the same level of flushing as they once did prior to installation. The Urilift 'pop up' urinals now provide additional public convenience provision to assist with the servicing of the growing night time economy and helps the City of London Police when undertaking enforcement against street urination. CoLP Officers have issued 47 FPN's for street urination since July 2013 (previously none were issued). The CoLP also direct night time users/ offenders to available facilities and have been issued with toilet maps.
	During consultations on the installation of the units at each location there were some concerns raised about the 'open design' of the units and whether they would attract unwelcome behaviour. In reality, we have received no complaints whatsoever.
8. Programme	Installation of Barriers at Tower Hill – Completed April 2010
	Installation of Barriers at Paternoster Square – Completed April 2010
	Installation of four Urilifts:
	1. Watling Street – Completed March 2011
	<ol> <li>Cornhill – Completed March 2011</li> </ol>
	<ol> <li>Bishopsgate – consultation with local Members resulted in an alternative location being agreed which required additional work/cost to re-design the raised planters to accommodate the unit. Some additional costs were incurred – Completed December 2011</li> </ol>
	Charterhouse Street – following lengthy consultation, a satisfactory location was agreed. The location identified was agreed to be in the loading bay area of the highway and not on the footway, this then required four additional safety retractable bollards to be installed incurring an additional cost. Work was coordinated with the Crossrail construction site adjacent to this location. Some technical issues were encountered once the site was excavated which required immediate resolution due to the impact on the surrounding area, e.g. discrepancies in service drawings resulting in alternative drainage

	be extended were an addi Water main re area for the location was levels being were succes	nnections. The to the neares tional 30m aw equired divertin unit. Re-surfac also complex so varied. The ssfully overco September 201	st functioning vay. In additioning (£10k) to o cing of the high due to the or e engineering come Inst	drains which on, a Thames create a clear ghway at this iginal surface complexities
9. Budget	Description	Approved Budget	Actual Cost	Variance
	Paddle	(Est. cost based at 2009 prices) £155,401	£155,401	0
	Barriers Urilift	£267,099	£330,102	£63,003
	Toilets Total	£422,500	£485,503	£63,003
10.Risk	£63K. Approvathis amount, budget. There is a risk the facilities	ssful installation al is sought to to be met fro to the income where barrie owever, the pa	increase the p om the Directon if people choo ers/ charging	oroject sum by or's local risk ose not to use have been
11.Communications	DBE have pro showing the lo staffed toile Community locations.	duced a fold u ocation of all to ts, Automatio Toilet Schem	bilet provision. c Public C ne members	This includes Conveniences, and Urilift
	people can l	ebsite also has ocate facilities s, staffed, disab	s and it show	ws details of
		ring the world o 'Visit the City'		
12. Benefits achieved to date	by installing b of around £37 the operation	ions where cha parriers have p 0k, this combir of these two oport the cor	produced an a ned income mo facilities an	nnual income ore than funds

	convenience service. The installation of the Urilifts has improved the number of facilities available at a time when the night-time economy is growing in the City along with some of the issues that it brings.
13. Strategy for continued achievement of benefits	Promote and publicise the locations of all public conveniences. We are currently undertaking a service specific survey on the public conveniences to gather users' views on the current provision, quality, locations, availability and customer service, to establish where we can make improvements to the service and understand the service from a user perspective. This will be reported back to Port Health and Environmental Services Committee in the Spring of this year.
	Cleansing Services will ensure that a close working relationship continues with the City of London Police to maintain a joined up approach to tackling street urination anti-social behaviour with provision and enforcement.
14. Outstanding actions	None

# **Review of Team Performance**

15. Governance arrangements	Director of Transportation and Public Realm Project delivery – Assistant Director for Street Scene and Strategy and Waste Planning and Amenities Manager.
16. Key strengths	The project delivery maintained its focus and persevered through some difficult times of consultation to get the project completed.
17. Areas for improvement	This project was initiated before the corporate project management framework was established and so the formal reporting process through Project Vision took some time to be adopted. Future projects will follow the PV process and issues can be formally reported on better.
18. Special recognition	

### Lessons Learnt

19. Key lessons and how they	The corporate project framework has improved the links
will be used and applied	between the key areas responsible for the delivery of
	this project i.e. corporate projects, finance and service/
	project delivery. This has helped with all having a

clearer understanding of progress, issues and costs associated with the delivery of the project.
The introduction of charging was a new concept and required a significant amount of communications and dealing with queries/ concerns in providing reassurances of the need to do this. Whilst the service committee (PHES) were always kept informed, others may have been less so.
Equally, the installation of four 'pop up' urinals (Urilifts) was extremely complex to deliver. This involved identifying four locations where there was a need, i.e. suffering from significant anti-social behaviour in the form of street urination as a result of the growing night-time economy, consulting with Ward Members and local stakeholders, and the technical difficulties in trying to find appropriate locations unobstructed by underground services.
All of the above have had an impact on the time it has taken to complete the project together with some additional costs. Having a better understanding of the project governance process now will ensure that any issues encountered as a project is delivered will be reported back to the project subcommittee and thus any approval required for additional expenditure incurred can be approved in advance of the works taking place by the committee and so avoiding the need for retrospective approval.
With hindsight, it proved to be extremely beneficial to undertake research across the industry where usage figures had already been modelled before and after the introduction of charging. By using an established model the project was able to make a realistic assumption as to what the likely income levels would be for budgeting purposes.

# Contact

Report Author	Doug Wilkinson – Assistant Director Street Scene and Strategy
Email Address	doug.wilkinson@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 4998