



Belfast City Council

Report to:	Parks and Leisure Committee
Subject:	Replacement of Cremators at Roselawn Crematorium
Date:	11 August 2011
Reporting Officer:	Rose Crozier, Assistant Director of Parks and Leisure
Contact Officer:	Stephen Walker, Principal Parks and Cemeteries Development Manager

1	Relevant Background Information
	<p>The Committee is reminded that at its meeting on the 16th June 2008 it received a report outlining that new legislation would require that UK based crematoria remove mercury emissions from the flue gases of at least 50% of all their cremations. This work is to be completed by the end of 2012. At the meeting the Committee had agreed to remove mercury emissions from 100% of its cremations and recommended that provision be made within the capital programme for this work.</p> <p>In line with decision of the Committee Officers had moved to place the project on the council's capital programme and prepare an appropriate specification and tender documentation. It had been intended to seek tenders in May 2011 to allow sufficient time for procurement and installation.</p> <p>However, a recent operational review by the ICCM into the operation of the crematorium highlighted a number of issues around the time taken for cremations. In order to complete the information a further technical report was commissioned to look at the condition of the cremators.</p> <p>This report concluded that the cremators were not functioning as efficiently or effectively as would be expected. The precise reason could not be determined however, it was concluded that the cremators were nearing the end of their useful life and that it would be imprudent to attach mercury abatement equipment to cremators which would need to be replaced in the short term.</p> <p>Within the context of that report Officers are of the view that the Council should replace the existing cremators in parallel with the installation of mercury abatement equipment. In line with the Council's Gate's process and as required for loan sanction an economic appraisal was</p>

	<p>commissioned to establish the preferred option in regards to replacement. The appraisal considered a range of options:</p> <p>Option 1 – Do nothing Option 2a – Do minimum - Abate two existing cremators Option 2b - Abate all existing cremators Option 3a - Install three new cremators and abate 3 Option 3b - Install two new cremators and abate 2 Option 3c – Install four new cremators and abate 4</p> <p>The Committee is asked to note that while the report from ICCM in respect of the condition of the cremators concluded that the existing four cremators are nearing the end of their useful lives; it did state that they could continue to function for a further several years, albeit with an decreasing level of efficiency.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this position, it is the view of Officers that it would be prudent to replace the existing cremators and incorporate abatement equipment now rather than install abatement equipment on aging cremators which may need to be replaced in the short term. Members are asked to note that if abatement equipment is attached to the existing cremators it could limit the range of manufacturers at some future date owing to issues around compatibility.</p> <p>The Committee is further asked to note that while the guidelines for abatement relate to existing cremators they also state that where replacement cremators are installed they must meet the new standard, i.e. they must be abated. Therefore, in this case it must be 100%, there is no option for a lesser level of abatement.</p>
--	--

2	Key Issues
	<p>The economic appraisal has highlighted a number of points for the Committee to note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the ICCM Report it would not be recommended to abate existing cremators; 2. There are 3 main options: - Provide 2, 3 or 4 new cremators; 3. The EA indicates that given the improved efficiency of the new equipment and the increased capacity it would provide, 4 new cremators are not necessary; 4. The EA indicates that the number of cremations 2 Cremators would be sufficient; however, it further states that the provision of only 2 might compromise the Council in the event of a continued 'organic' growth in the number of cremations each year; the potential to increase the numbers being cremated through increased awareness and understanding of the process; a potential break down in the equipment; an outbreak of flu or pandemic; 5. The EA therefore concludes that the provision of 3 new cremators would be the most cost effective option

	<p>The committee is required to convey its agreement to proceed with the preferred option, to make recommendation to Strategic Policy and Resources to amend the capital programme to incorporate the replacement of the cremators, and to give its delegated authority to seek, evaluate and award the tender to the most economically advantageous submission.</p>
--	--

3	Resource Implications
	<p><u>Financial</u> The Committee is asked to note that provision of £1.55m has been made within the capital programme to abate all four of the existing cremators.</p> <p>The capital cost of the preferred option, to install three new cremators and associated abatement equipment, is estimated to be in the region of £1.8m. This figure was sorted from the current market however it is subject to fluctuation depending on prevailing market conditions at the time of tender.</p> <p>The Committee is also asked to note that if cremators were installed separately at a later date the cost would be approximately £1.55m for the abatement equipment plus in access of £500k for the new cremators, plus installation.</p> <p>The ICCM report indicates the current cremators are burning higher levels of gas therefore replacement will result in significant energy savings.</p> <p><u>Human Resources</u> There are no additional human resource implications.</p> <p><u>Asset and Other Implications</u> The provision of the new cremators will ensure that the Council meets its legislative obligations and will provide a high quality cremation service for the city and the wider region.</p>

4	Equality and Good Relations Considerations
	<p>There are no equality implications.</p>

5	Recommendations
	<p>It is recommended that the Committee adopt the preferred option as outlined above i.e. to install 3 new cremators and associated mercury abatement equipment and to recommend to Strategic Policy and Resources that this be incorporated within the existing capital programme.</p>

	It is also recommended that it be recommended that Committee agree that the director of Property and Projects be given delegated authority to issue, evaluate and award tenders to ensure that work is completed by December 2012.
--	--

6	Decision Tracking
	Officer responsible: Assistant Director of Parks and Leisure To be completed by December 2012

	Key to Abbreviations
	SP&R – Strategic Policy and Resources Committee EA – Economic Appraisal

	Documents Attached
	None