

# ITEM 7

## MINUTE EXTRACT

Time began	6.00pm
Time ended	7.50pm

### **COUNCIL CABINET 27 JULY 2010**

Present: Councillor Jennings (Chair)  
Councillors Holmes, Marshall, Poulter Webb and Williams

In attendance Councillor Bayliss, Carr and Jones

This record of decisions was published on 29 July 2010. The key decisions set out in this record will come into force and may be implemented on the expiry of five clear days unless a key decision is called in.

### **42/10 Strategic Decision on the Future of Markeaton Crematorium**

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Strategic Decision on the Future of Markeaton Crematorium. At the beginning of 2010 the proposed capital programme for the Environmental Services Department, now Neighbourhoods, included: "The replacement of cremators at Markeaton Crematorium was required to meet new legislation on emissions by 2012. Total costs were expected at around £1.9m." A number of concerns were raised during scrutiny of the proposals by the Community Commission in January and February 2010. The result was the making of the following recommendation to Council Cabinet: "To recommend this capital scheme of £1.9m only be finalised by Cabinet following the report of the sub-group established by the Community Commission." This was accepted. The report considers three alternative options for Markeaton Crematorium in the context of the Community Commission's recommendations each of which would result in savings against the allocated £1.9 million budget. Two of the options were as set out by the Commission, the third being an officer proposal.

#### **Options Considered**

There were no other options considered.

#### **Decision**

To implement option one to include the installation of two mercury abatement units, and the provision of improved reception and office facilities at Markeaton Crematorium.

## Reasons

1. Each of the options outlined in the report had its own advantages and disadvantages, although each represents a sustainable solution. Option 1 closely matched the recommendations of the Community Commission Sub-Group's report and would result in effective mercury abatement, an improved service for the public and improved DDA compliant office and reception facilities. It should also result in minimum disruption to the service delivery whilst works were in progress. In developing this option consideration had been given to the configuration of the mercury abatement equipment. This concluded in a further recommendation that twin mercury abatement units be fitted. This solution presents both the best technical solution and also provides for a greater level of continuity in the event of equipment failure. Option 2 similarly matches the Sub-Group's recommendations, but would require a larger extension to the building, no improvement to service provision, less suitable office accommodation, greater potential for loss of continuity in the event of equipment failure and a potential close-down time of several months whilst works were in progress. This would result in a substantial loss of income and inconvenience to the public, as cremations would need to be carried out at an alternative crematorium.
2. Option 3 had been presented as an alternative due to its potential environmental and revenue cost benefits, although it did not closely match the Sub-Group's recommendations. It would however, offered additional fuel savings and had a significant impact on the council's carbon emissions.

- Extract ends -