



Cherwell
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE



Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council

Equality Impact Assessment

Public Conveniences Savings Proposals

January 2021

Contents

Section 1: Summary details.....	3
Section 2: Detail of proposal.....	5
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics.....	7
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts	9
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts	10
Section 3: Review	11

Section 1: Summary details

Directorate and Service Area	Communities – Environmental Services
What is being assessed (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).	Public Conveniences Cost Saving Proposal
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	An existing function – increasing the charge for public toilets from 10p to 20p across all sites in the District.
Summary of assessment Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).	<p>Access to safe toilet and washing facilities are important to all residents but particularly impact on those with certain protected characteristics who may need access more frequently or urgently. This access is through a variety of public and private provision including in the provision provided by Cherwell District Council in these town centres.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to introduce a standardised charge of 20p across all public conveniences Cherwell. A current charge of 10p applies at five locations across Banbury and Kidlington, a 20p charge is already in place at sites in Bicester. The charge will be payable either by cash or contactless payment except for those using a RADAR key to use disabled toilet facilities.</p> <p>The proposal is being considered due to the severe pressure on financial resources which the Council faces in 2021/22 but recognising that there will be a need to maintain these facilities, particularly for more vulnerable people. There is not expected to be any negative impacts associated with implementing this charge. Disabled facilities will be unaffected as entry is gained from the RADAR key scheme which will not be subject to a charge.</p>
Completed By	Ed Potter
Authorised By	Ed Potter

Date of Assessment	8 January 2021
---------------------------	----------------

Section 2: Detail of proposal

<p>Context / Background</p> <p>Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.</p>	<p>Charging for the use of public conveniences in Bicester already exists at the cost of 20p, this proposal suggests the replication of that charge for facilities in Banbury and Kidlington to offset running costs. This change will affect facilities in Banbury & Kidlington. Disabled facilities are unaffected as access is gained from the RADAR scheme.</p> <p>The facilities at Claremont in Bicester has a Changing Places facility which provides toilet facilities for the most disabled children & adults with a shower, bed, hoist as well as toilet facilities. In Banbury similar facilities exist in the Castle Quay shopping centre. These facilities are relatively new (Bicester – May 2020) and should make it easier and are well equipped for those with reduced mobility. Entry to the facility is gained from the RADAR key scheme which will not be subject to a charge.</p>
<p>Proposals</p> <p>Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.</p>	<p>This proposal will introduce a 20p charge on all cubicles. This will increase income and help offset some of the overall operating costs. The charge is either by cash or contactless payment.</p> <p>A 20p charge was introduced during 20/21 in Bicester – no complaints have been received</p> <p>A 10p charge has been in place in Banbury and Kidlington since the mid 90s – hence charging is not a change in policy.</p>
<p>Evidence / Intelligence</p> <p>List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact on different individuals, communities</p>	<p>Each of the five facilities have around 1000-1500 users per week.</p> <p>Ensuring that these units remain viable has positive impact on the community overall and a disproportionate impact on certain sections of the community such as the upper age groups, those with certain disabilities and those who are pregnant or caring for young children.</p> <p>Keeping the units open but increasing the charge to 20p as has been implemented in Bicester is likely to have no direct equalities impact as the charge remain affordable, there are easy ways to pay, including contactless, and those using the RADAR scheme for accessing disabled facilities are exempt from charges.</p> <p>Feedback from the public consultation process as part of the Cherwell budget setting process and consultation feedback will be taken into consideration as change are made.</p>

<p>or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.</p>	<p>Changes in the town centre with the closure of several retail units means that the number of alternative facilities has reduced. This means that these five facilities (two in Banbury, two in Bicester and one in Kidlington) may well be more important to the community.</p>
<p>Alternatives considered / rejected</p> <p>Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.</p>	<p>The alternative option considered would have been the closure of public conveniences in Banbury and Kidlington. It was felt that the increase in fees was preferable as it means that the public conveniences can be maintained for the benefit of the community and some of the costs offset by the fee increase whereas closing the facilities would have had greater negative equalities impacts.</p>

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics

Protected Characteristic	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Older people may be more likely users of public conveniences.	The increased charge means that we are able to keep these facilities open for use and those who use a RADAR key will continue to use the service without charge	Street Cleansing Manager	
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	People with certain types of disabilities may have greater need to access public convinces, particularly those which are adapted for those with reduced mobility.	A RADAR key system that is not subject to charging will be used at all facilities.	Street Cleansing Manager	
Gender Reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	We will continue to ensure that public conveniences are as safe as possible for the community to use, including those undergoing gender reassignment		Street Cleansing Manager	
Marriage & Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	

Pregnancy & Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This group may have greater need to access public conveniences	The increased charge means that we are able to keep these facilities open for use	Street Cleansing Manager	
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Rural communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Armed Forces	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Areas of deprivation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Those living with deprivation may be more impacted by the charge. However, charges will remain at an affordable level.		Street Cleansing Manager	

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts

Additional Wider Impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Other Council Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	
Social Value ¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None		Street Cleansing Manager	

¹ If the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 applies to this proposal, please summarise here how you have considered how the contract might improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the relevant area

Section 3: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

Review Date	September 2020
Person Responsible for Review	Brendan Bodger
Authorised By	Ed Potter