**Notes from the Consultation Meeting 29th October 2015 regarding The Public Toilets and options to move forward the H4H project**

Cllr P Mander opened the meeting, explaining the reasons for the meeting and an explanation of history of the H4H project and fundraising to date. The village is being asked to consider a Public Works Loan, backed by the government, to fund the project. PWL are fixed rate which is dependent upon the size of the loan and length of repayment. If the village supports this option, fully costed tenders are required before any loan can be applied for.

Q: Is this about the toilets? Has it been considered to move them to the car park?

A: It was discussed. It’s not HPC land, DDC are not interested in doing it. There would be a loss of revenue from car parking. The advantage of being in the centre is proximity to shops and bus stop.

Q: Is HPC making a recommendation?

A: HPC will do what the village wants to do

A personal view – we will never get money so cheap elsewhere, and will have to do something with the toilets eventually

Q: Is it fair to say it’s a no brainer?

A: We see lots of people using the toilets, coaches pull up & 52 people use them.

The running costs given by DDC were £10k.

HPC now own the property as a charitable company. The current building is deteriorating, it’s dark, smelly, and difficult to call a building that we can be proud of. The project also includes a new bus shelter where the bus can be seen from. Potential to approach local businesses to contribute to set up / running costs. H4H have done a wondrous job, it would be good to see it come to fruition.

HPC receive letters complaining & the response was that the responsibility lay with DDC, this is not the case now.

Four years ago the village wanted to keep the toilets. If the feedback is for option 2, then we can get definitive costs. Under Public Works Loans Board requirements we have to come back to the village with actual costs to get your final approval.

Q: Is there a danger of urbanising the village? The script is biased to option 2. Would they be free or pay for entry?

A: At the present time there is no plan to charge for entry

Q: Why?

A: The preference is not to charge, we prefer the donation route. We don't think the project is urbanisation, the toilets there benefit the village, children use on way to/from school.

Q: Most places people visit where there are high quality facilities they pay on entry.

A: At the present time not charging is the view taken.

Comment: People do knock on the Methodist Chapel door and ask to use the facilities, I'd prefer to keep free to use.

Comment: Charging is not as simple as you'd think. It needs to be managed, with a process to collect the money

Q: I’m not clear about the link with H4H. If the toilets don't happen, what happens to the money raised?

A: We can't continue H4H’s plans for the centre of the village without the toilet development. All previous consultation has shown that people want the toilets. The project is very integrated. We won't get the space otherwise

Q: If funding is raised for the toilets will the rest of H4H go ahead.

A: The biggest cost is the toilets, the other part is landscaping & that budget will vary. The toilets have to happen first. H4H can still apply for grants for landscaping, Veolia funding could be available if the project is up and running

Q: Can we rely on the designers to make it an asset to the village without making urbanisation?

Comment: it has to be the whole scheme, no point in doing half a job, all done, all finished. Monies for the toilets, H4H complete the job.

Q: If the existing toilets cost £10k to run what would new ones cost?

A: We are expecting substantial savings. Easy to maintain, easy to clean. The design needs to reduce the costs. Lights are on permanently at the minute, use motion sensor lights, charitable ownership saves £1k per year in rates.

Comment: If there are substantial savings then that could go towards the cost of the loan.

A: We believe costs will be greatly reduced.

Comment: Regarding the wording, Option 2 is the more important decision therefore you need all the information. It wasn't designed to push people towards Option 2.

Comment: It’s good to hear that you have thought things through, but I still feel that it may urbanise the village. I've overheard comments that the village is dead in the evenings.

Comment: The new plan looks good, it doesn't look urban. I've always thought that the village should have a centre, a village green is central to a village, you don't have that in towns. It’s not urbanisation. The loan sounds like a brilliant idea, but if you get the loan does that remove some of the fundraising effort?

Comment: Look at it a different way, the precept for Hathersage is £55; Tideswell, £65, Hathersage is very low for all we've got, It’s very good value of you add on the loan.

Comment: Regarding urbanisation, the 1st scheme involved hard landscape with York Stone which may then be an urbanisation view

Comment: York stone is not "Derbyshire."

Comment: The revised scheme has grass. Take the existing building down and replace with grass, not urbanisation to provide high specification toilets.

Comment: A green in the middle of the village is an excellent idea.

Comment: HPC now owns the land going up to the Crofts so there is an opportunity to do some landscaping.

There may be an opportunity to involve the Horticultural Society, get volunteers involved

Q: What about the lovely lilac trees?

A: We’re not saying we’re going to chop trees down. It’s a chance to incorporate the Crofts more into the village. The trees on the left would go as part of the new building

Q: Does the total cost include interest and repayment?

A: Yes, there’s nothing to pay at the end. It’s a public loan not a commercial loan.

Q: If we can get substantial grants will it go into the pot or the project.

A: If some money is donated for H4H it will go to that project not another one.

Q: If this money is for toilets can we do the rest later, use locals?

A: We can't use volunteers for the toilets, not under the terms of the loan.

Comment: I always felt that the scheme should be paid for other than by a loan. We need to be aware it is capital expenditure. If that’s the way we’re going to do it then the loan needs to be cast iron. It’s a shame H4H are unable to raise the money. The toilets are the main part of the project, they are a 60's disaster. If it’s the will of the village then the project goes ahead. Everyone needs to understand what’s involved

Comment from H4H. Trying to raise money for public toilets has been the most unglamorous hard work ever. No one wants anything to do with public toilets, that’s why we are in this position & discussing the opportunity to apply for a loan.

Fundraising for the landscaping and village green is much more positive. Veolia are very keen on this.

Q: Presumably this is complicated by the fact that we’ve got to do something with the toilets eventually?

A: Yes, we've still got the problem.

A charity box outside for donations could be quite a good way to raise funds.

Hope Construction have offered support during the interim knock down and re- build.

There have been lots of discussions at HPC.

It is usual to find that if a project has actually got a start date businesses are more likely to donate

Comment: Referring back to the skate park and the lottery money request, we needed to have every detail, no matter how small, available to present to them, otherwise they wouldn't have given the money

Cllr Mander summed up: - We can't go any further without agreement from the community to go and get quotes and agree the details. Once they are obtained we will come back for approval to ask for a loan.

If the feedback is positive we can move on to the next stage.

We have to show we have consulted with the village at every stage

Comment: There is another meeting going on in the village, those attending have asked that I give their positive feedback for this project.

Completed forms are to be handed to any councillor, at the pool office, or through Cllr Mander’s letterbox.

The meeting closed at 8:25 pm.

Attendees : 45

Forms received to date (3/11/15)

Option 1 2

Option 2 56