

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

6th June, 2018

Proposition P.2018/31

STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

REPLACEMENT CREMATOR AND EMISSIONS EQUIPMENT

MOTION UNDER ARTICLE 7(1) OF THE REFORM (GUERNSEY) LAW, 1948

Proposed by: Deputy S T Hansmann Rouxel

Seconded by: Deputy E A Yerby

To suspend Rule 24(2)(b) of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the Proposition set out below to be debated.

SURSIS MOTIVÉ

Proposed by: Deputy S T Hansmann Rouxel

Seconded by: Deputy E A Yerby

To sursis the Propositions until such time as the States' Trading Supervisory Board shall have complied with the following directions of the States:

1. To replace the main project aim (currently "*to replace the existing cremator equipment by the Summer of 2019 with a resilient cremation service*") with the following:

"to provide a modern, resilient cremation service (including suitable cremator equipment and accessible facilities), which is capable of meeting the needs of the Bailiwick population over the next 30 to 40 years, and is sensitive to the cultural and social significance of funerals as an end-of-life ritual and an important part of the grieving process."

2. To adopt the following Investment Objectives in place of the Investment Objectives set out in the table in 2.13 of the policy letter (Table 2 under Part B, section 2.4, of the Outline Business Case):

<i>"1. To provide a modern cremation service (including cremator equipment, accessible and culturally-sensitive facilities for mourners, and ancillary facilities)"</i>

which is capable of meeting the needs of Bailiwick residents over the next 30 to 40 years.

2. To provide cremator equipment which is compliant with the Loi relative a la Cremation, 1928, which is capable of providing a bariatric cremation service, and which can process 600 cremations per year for the first 15 years.

3. To replace the existing cremator equipment by the Summer of 2019, or as soon as possible thereafter, in order to minimise risk of a complete failure of service.

4. To deliver a cremation service that promotes operational efficiency; that reduces the risks associated with a single facility in an island location; and that has the capacity to expand or adapt in response to future needs.

5. To provide a cremation facility that can meet the proposed air quality emissions regulations in Guernsey (as considered by the States of Deliberation in February 2017)."

3. To re-run the options evaluation which forms the subject of the Outline Business Case, using the revised Investment Objectives in Proposition 2, and to invite one or more nominated representative(s) of local Funeral Directors and celebrants, and one or more nominated representative(s) of local charities dealing with grief and bereavement, to be part of the group conducting that evaluation.
4. In the event that the preferred option remains Option 1 (Le Foulon), to consult with stakeholders (including disabled people's and older people's representative groups) and include in its recommendations to the States a full plan of measures that will be put in place to mitigate the disadvantages of the site, especially in respect of accessibility. Such plan may include physical adaptations to the site, and/or other appropriate adjustments (such as, e.g., the provision of an on-site shuttle service for mourners).
5. To begin the work of consulting with:
 - a. The Committee for Employment & Social Security and the Policy & Resources Committee on the projected future costs of cremations and the way in which this will be distributed between the States and the individual, including the role and value of the Death Grant; and
 - b. The Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure on potential ecological alternatives to cremation which may be developed alongside the new cremation service, or at the end of the lifespan of the new equipment.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The States debated the replacement of the crematorium in 2001, they recognised that the facilities at the Foulon were poor in terms of access and facilities. (Billet D'état VIII 2001 page 568)

'The existing facilities are perceived to be poor and this has discouraged use in some instances, with families choosing burial instead. In particular, there have been complaints with regard to the limited seating capacity of the chapel. Existing access and parking is poor, particularly for the elderly or infirm. There is a lack of toilet facilities, no adequate covered waiting areas and no suitable area for floral tributes.'

'the Chapel has insufficient seating capacity and the existing facilities need to be upgraded, with additional parking, so as to provide for the reasonable needs of those persons attending funerals.'

The States then agreed to proposals which included:

- new extension to house the cremator
 - the installation of a new cremator to meet modern requirements
 - additional parking for up to six cars adjacent to the chapel especially for the elderly and infirm and up to fifteen cars in a nose to tail formation on the perimeter road
 - conversion of existing furnace room to extend chapel area
 - reconstructed columbarium alcoves
 - a room containing a Book of Remembrance
 - covered waiting areas including a covered way for floral tributes
 - renovation of the existing building
 - provision of toilet facilities
- Importantly, the proposed design will increase seating capacity in the chapel from 50 to 100 persons'

The current accessibility of the Foulon is much improved as a result of these measures as per disabled go assessment (<https://www.disabledgo.com/access-guide/guernsey/foulon-cemetery-and-crematorium>) but is by no means ideal and will be even worse under option 1 (As evidenced in the in the benefits appraisal comparison chart in page 91 of OBC)

Facility	UK Standard	Foulon	St Sampson's Site
185 m from residential buildings	✓	X	x
Level Topography – Easy accessibility	✓	X	✓
On site car parking for 50+ cars	✓	X	✓
Disabled car parking close to Chapel	✓	X	✓
Porte Cochere – Cover for the hearse	✓	X	✓
Reception Room for arriving congregants	✓	X	x
Post service reflection area	✓	X	✓

Chapel with seating for 100+	✓	X	✓
Office facilities	✓	✓	✓
Waiting facilities for Undertakers	✓	X	✓
Specialist music facilities	✓	✓	✓
2 cremators and abatement plant for resilience	✓	✓	✓
Hidden Service Yard	✓	X	✓
Ability to expand in the future	✓	X	✓
Compliance with Disability and Inclusion Strategy	✓	x	✓

The current rationale behind proceeding with Option 1 reverses the decision in 2001 to 'provide for the reasonable needs of those persons attending funerals.'

The Critical Success Factor 3 of the project is that 'The crematorium has improved accessibility for users.' The report highlighted that the Foulon would 'not deliver improved accessibility for users, in fact there will be a reduction in accessibility which will be mitigated to *some degree* if the lower car park is developed.'

The Policy letter has changed the remit of the project and now seeks only to replace the cremator and not provide adequate accessible crematorium facilities which was the intended purpose of commissioning the investigation and short listing the options of other sites. (As the title of the project group suggests '**Crematorium** Development Project Team') If the scope of the project has been downgraded to simply replacement of a cremator, then a cremator could be housed on land that doesn't need to be accessible, however this negates the purpose and ritual of funerals as well as altering the direction of States' policy without consultation with the assembly.

The States should make the decision because this is a change in Policy direction away from providing crematorium facilities to providing a cremator only. The current Policy letter is merely to obtain States' agreement to release funding on their preferred option. In order for the States to make an informed decision the options need to be developed further to take policy into account.

Option 1 needs to have further accessibility mitigation measures costed and included for comparison with Option 2's much improved accessibility.

Option 2 needs to have further refinement of cost and risk mitigation to compare it to Option 1.