



Agenda

Cabinet Member for City Services

Time and Date

11.00 am on Monday, 10th October, 2016

Place

Committee Rooms 2 and 3 - Council House

Public Business

1. **Apologies**
2. **Declarations of Interests**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 8)
 - (a) To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 26th September, 2016
 - (b) Matters Arising
4. **Revised Burial and Cremation Fees and Charges for 2016-17** (Pages 9 - 20)

Report of the Executive Director of Place
5. **Outstanding Issues** (Pages 21 - 24)

Report of the Executive Director of Resources
6. **Any other items of Public Business**

Any other items of public business which the Cabinet Member decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved

Private Business

Nil

Chris West, Executive Director, Resources, Council House Coventry

Friday, 30 September 2016

Note: The person to contact about the agenda and documents for this meeting is Liz Knight / Michelle Salmon, Governance Services Officers Tel: 024 7683 3072 / 3065, liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk / michelle.salmon@coventry.gov.uk

Membership: Councillors J Innes and R Lakha (Deputy Cabinet Member)

By invitation Councillors M Hammon (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Please note: a hearing loop is available in the committee rooms

If you require a British Sign Language interpreter for this meeting
OR if you would like this information in another format or
language please contact us.

Liz Knight / Michelle Salmon, Governance Services Officers
Tel: 024 7683 3072 / 3065, liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk /
michelle.salmon@coventry.gov.uk

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Member for City Services held at 11.00 am on
Monday, 15 August 2016

Present:

Members: Councillor J Innes (Cabinet Member)
Councillor M Hammon (Shadow Cabinet Member)

Other Members: Councillors J Birdi, M Lapsa and J McNicholas

Employees:

C Archer, Place Directorate
P Beesley, Place Directorate
T Cowley, Place Directorate
L Knight, Resources Directorate
S McGinty, Resources Directorate
K Seager, Place Directorate
M Wilkinson, Place Directorate

Apologies: Councillor R Lakha (Deputy Cabinet Member)

Public Business

9. Declarations of Interests

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

10. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 25th July 2016 were agreed and signed as a true record.

There were no matters arising.

11. Removal of Vegetation and Associated Raised Bed Structures at Honeyfield Road (outside numbers 6 & 11) and Edmund Road (outside numbers 4 & 28)

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning a petition, bearing 32 signatures, requesting that the City Council removed the planted bushes and the associated raised bed structures outside 6 and 11 Honeyfield Road and 4 and 28 Edmund Road. The petition was submitted by Councillor Birdi who attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the petitioners. The petition organiser was also invited but was unable to attend.

The report indicated that the petitioners were requesting the removal of the bushes and raised bed structures as they were an 'eye sore' for the area and for visitors to the nearby Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple. The planters were showing signs of deterioration and there were safety concerns due to overhanging thorny vegetation and an environmental concern due to litter and possible vermin infestation. Reference was made to the recent programmed vegetation maintenance visits and to the site visit following the receipt of the petition.

It was recommended that the existing planters, vegetation and surrounding bollards be removed at all four locations. In addition the existing footway would need to be excavated and resurfaced with a tarmac finish. The anticipated cost of the work was approximately £9,000 and would be funded from a future highway capital maintenance programme, which was subject to approval by Cabinet. It was proposed to undertake a consultation exercise to ensure that local residents and Ward Councillors were in support of this proposal.

Councillor Birdi expressed support for the proposal requesting that the programme of works be brought forward to an earlier date.

RESOLVED that:

(1) Agreement be given to establish via consultation with local Ward Councillors and the occupiers of the properties where the raised beds are located on the recommended option before their removal as it is not clear from petition signatures if this has been done prior to submission. This will confirm if there is a local community consensus for the work to be carried out.

(2) Following consultation and with majority consensus, approval be given for the removal of all shrubs, raised bed structures, stone bollards and surrounding slab footway in the four specific locations detailed in the report and replacement with tarmac footway and new bollards. This work is for inclusion in the 2017/18 maintenance programme of work, subject to Cabinet's approval of the Capital Highway Maintenance budget at their meeting in March, 2017.

12. Objection to Proposed Closure of Part of Cox Street Car Park

The Cabinet Member for City Services considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning an objection that had been received to the proposals for the part closure of Cox Street car park. The objector was invited to the meeting for the consideration of this item but did not attend.

The report indicated that Cabinet, at their meeting on 9th February 2016 (their minute 113/15 referred) and Council on 23rd February 2016 (their minute 125/15 referred), approved the partial disposal of the surface car park for the development of up to 1000 bed student housing.

Following the selection of the preferred developer, the formal closure procedure commenced with public notices inviting written objections to the part closure. One objection was received on concerns about the loss of parking spaces and the impact this might have on those using the swimming pool and leisure centre in Fairfax Street. Although accepting there may be other car parks nearby, the objector's main concern was whether people would be prepared to make the additional walk especially on dark nights.

It was recognised that the reduction of spaces at Cox Street would cause disruption to the existing users of the car park. 144 spaces were being retained on site in Cox Street car park with the anticipated nearest exit from the retained car park increasing the walk to the swimming pool and leisure centre facility by

approximately 100 metres. The car park under the ring road was lit and the route from the car park to the entrance of the swimming pool, which was on the public highway, was also lit.

There were two other public car parks which are within close proximity of the swimming pool and leisure centre at Lower Ford Street and Grove Street and these would remain accessible by the public throughout the construction phase of the development. These car parks had the greatest spare capacity at evenings and weekends.

As part of the finished development, the developer had committed to provide circa 170 spaces under the building which would be made available to the public. These spaces would be available at the same parking charge rate as the Council run car parks nearby. This commitment had been legally secured by way of a development agreement.

Councillor Hammon, Shadow Member raised a concern about the impact of the part closure of the car park for visitors to the nearby Britannia hotel. It was agreed that officers would liaise with the hotel regarding the closure and recommend that the hotel keep their visitors updated about the development.

Due to the timescale for dealing with this matter and in accordance with Paragraph 19 of the City Council's Constitution, Councillor J McNicholas, the nominee of the Chair of Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, attended the meeting for the consideration of this matter and agreed the need for urgency such that call-in arrangements would not apply. The reason for the urgency being that, to enable the first phase of the development to open for the academic year commencing September 2017, a planning application needed to be submitted in early September 2016 for consideration at Planning Committee on 29th September 2016. If the application was not submitted in time then the programme of works would be delayed and the timescales for opening would not be achievable.

RESOLVED that, after due consideration of the objection:

1) The objection be rejected and the car park closure procedure and the development be allowed to continue.

2) The objector be informed in writing of the Cabinet Member decision.

3) Officers be requested to speak to the representatives of the Britannia Hotel informing them of the part closure of Cox Street Car Park.

13. Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions

The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Executive Director of Place concerning objections that had been received to a Traffic Regulation Order advertised on 30th June, 2016 relating to proposed waiting restrictions and amendments to existing waiting restrictions in Bablake, Binley and Willenhall, Earlsdon, Foleshill, Longford, Upper Stoke, Westwood, Whoberley and Woodlands Wards of the City. A total of 37 objections were received, 2 of which were subsequently withdrawn by the objectors. In addition, 1 request for an extension to proposed double yellow lines and 4 letters supporting proposals were received. A

summary of proposed restrictions, objections and responses were set out in an appendix to the report.

All the respondents were invited to the meeting. Apologies had been submitted by Councillor Bigham, Mr and Mrs Douglas, Mr G Graham, Miss T Hill, Sharon Knowles and Claire Southan. Councillor Lapsa, a Westwood Ward Councillor, attended the meeting on behalf of an objector and requested additional information in respect of the restrictions for the Tile Hill area. It was clarified that a residents parking scheme due to Tile Hill Station commuter parking problems had been consulted on and surveys undertaken however there had been a less than 15% response rate. It was intended to consult with residents via a Street News since a 60% agreement rate was required.

The officer informed of a further objection that had been received in respect of the restrictions for the Tile Hill area. This meant that 38, not 37 objections had been received in total, of which 3 related to the Tile Hill area proposals. The issues raised were highlighted, and the officers advised that these issues did not change the recommendation to approve that these waiting restrictions were installed as advertised.

The cost of introducing the proposed TRO, if approved, would be funded from the Highways Maintenance and Investment Capital Programme budget through the Local Transport Plan.

RESOLVED that, having considered all the objections to the proposed waiting restrictions:

1) The implementation of the restrictions as advertised on Arbury Avenue/Astley Avenue junction, Balliol Road/ Wyke Road/ Wykeley Road junction, Brookside Avenue, Morgans Road, Robin Hood Road/Stretton Avenue, Stretton Avenue/Fawley Road, William McCool Close be approved.

2) The implementation of a reduced length of double yellow lines on Bennetts Road/Herders Way (reduce to 15 metres each side of the junction), on Harvey Close (reduce by 2 metres on southern side of road) and on Rochester Road, western side on Raven Cragg Road (reduce by 1 metre) be approved.

3) Approval be given that the proposed double yellow lines are not installed on Buckingham Rise/Amersham Close & Buckingham Rise/ Chalfont Close.

4) Approval be given for the implementation of the restrictions as advertised on Ebro Crescent, but not, initially, to install the trip rail barrier on the roundabout and to monitor the effect of the changes.

5) Approval be given that the double yellow lines on Hurst Road are not removed.

6) The reduction in double yellow lines as advertised in the Arden Street Area, apart from Myrtle Grove, where the proposed double yellow lines are to be reduced (installed on the southern side of the road only) be approved.

7) The installation of the waiting restrictions as proposed in the Tile Hill area be approved; but not to consider an extension to the double yellow lines on Station Avenue at this time but to monitor the situation.

8) Approval be given that the proposed Traffic Regulation order is made operational.

14. Petitions Determined by Letter and Petitions Deferred Pending Further Investigations

The Cabinet Member for City Services considered a report of the Executive Director of Place that provided a summary of the recent petitions received that had been determined by letter, or where decisions had been deferred pending further investigations and holding letters had been circulated. Details of the individual petitions were set out in an appendix attached to the report and included target dates for action. The report was submitted for monitoring and transparency purposes.

The report indicated that each petition had been dealt with on an individual basis, with the Cabinet Member considering advice from officers on appropriate action to respond to the petitioners' request. Attention was drawn to the fact that if it had been decided to respond to the petition without formal consideration at a Cabinet Member meeting, both the relevant Councillor/ petition organiser could still request that their petition be the subject of a Cabinet Member report.

Members were informed that where holding letters had been sent, this was because further investigation work was required. Once matters had been investigated either a follow up letter would be sent or a report submitted to a future a Cabinet Member meeting. Members expressed support for this new process for dealing with petitions.

RESOLVED that the actions being taken by officers as detailed in the appendix to the report, in response to the petitions received, be endorsed.

15. Outstanding Issues

The Cabinet Member noted a report of the Executive Director of Resources that contained a list of outstanding issues and summarised the current position in respect of each item.

In respect of item 1 headed 'City Centre Maintenance Contract' Councillor Hammon, Shadow Cabinet Member expressed concerns relating to the state of the ringroad that was looking 'tired' and to the number of weeds along the side of the road. The officers undertook to investigate.

16. Any other items of Public Business

There were no other items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 11.40 am)

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Member for City Services

10th October 2016

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member for City Services - Councillor Innes

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Executive Director, Place

Ward(s) affected:

All

Title:

Revised Burial & Cremation Fees and Charges 2016/17

Is this a key decision?

No

Executive Summary:

This report seeks approval for an increase in Burial and Cremation Fees and Charges from 1st November 2016, to support on-going provision of cremation, burial and funeral services to Coventry residents over the medium term. No further increase will then be proposed until 1st January 2018. After which fees and charges will be increased on 1st January each year for the next 3 years. The fees and charges will be increased in line with the West Midlands benchmarking group average, and the report seeks to delegate these further increases to the Assistant Director for Streetscene and Regulatory Services in consultation with Place Directorate finance manager.

This increase in burial fees is required to support the capital costs to undertake the extension of the burial grounds, support the continued maintenance required to maintain cremators and mercury abatement equipment at Canley Crematorium. In addition this increase will allow the City Council to reduce the fee for children's burials and cremations to zero.

In addition the changes to fees return Coventry to the mid-point for fees and charges within the benchmarking group, this is in-line with the City Councils charging policy.

It should be noted that Coventry currently has the lowest fee level amongst its benchmarking group and this is because there was no increase in fees and charges for 2015/16. And only a minimal increase of 5.7% was applied 1st February 2016.

Recommendations:

The Cabinet Member is asked to:

- a) Approve the proposed increase to burial fees with effect from 1 November 2016, as detailed in this report.
- b) Approve the proposed increase to cremation fees with effect from 1st November 2016, as detailed in this report.
- c) Approve the proposed removal of children's burial and cremation fees with immediate effect, for children who are resident in Coventry.
- d) Approve additional fees from 1st November 2016 to achieve full cost recovery for services which are currently supplied free of charge or at a subsidised rate.
- e) Approve that an increase in fees and charges is applied from 1st January 2018, and on the 1st January for the subsequent three years in line with the West Midlands Benchmarking Group average, and that the communication and implementation of these increases is delegated to the Assistant Director for Streetscene and Regulatory services in consultation with the finance manager for the Place directorate. (Benchmarking exercise will be completed and a briefing note sent to the cabinet member on the % uplift to be applied).

List of Appendices included:

Appendix 1: Benchmarking Comparator Adult Burials
Appendix 2: Benchmarking Comparator Adult Cremations
Appendix 3: Benchmarking Comparator Children's services
Appendix 4(a & b): Additional fees for extra services supplied
Appendix 5: List of Fees and Charges Table

Other useful background papers:

Equality impact assessment – 2016/17 Bereavement Fees and Charges

Has it or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No

Has it, or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title:**Revised Burial & Cremation Fees and Charges 2016/17****1. Background**

- 1.1 There are three distinct areas within Bereavement Service where charges are applied to service users; these are Cremations, Burials and Memorials.
- 1.2 There was no increase made to Bereavement Services fees and charges at the beginning of 2015/16. However, a blanket increase of 5.7% was implemented from February 2016, and a further increase is recommended from 1st November 2016.
- 1.3 As part of the Commercialisation and Income Maximisation Review, the charging policy for the Council was reviewed. The revised policy approved by the Cabinet Member 'Strategic Finance and Resources' at his meeting on 29th July 2013 confirmed that all charges should be at least full cost recovery and in line with benchmarking against other providers.
- 1.4 The recommendations in this report are based on the application of this policy to the charges for burial and cremation services.
- 1.5 The benchmarking exercise shows that Coventry Bereavement Services has the lowest charges across the region. The proposed increase will raise the fees and charges in line with other local authorities. (See appendix 5 for current and proposed table of charges)
- 1.6 Due to there being no price increase for burials and cremations for 2015/16, cremations had a shortfall against budget of £60k (3.9%).
- 1.7 Additional income created will assist with the overall continued maintenance of the six cemeteries and one crematoria administered by Coventry City Council. This will include reinstatement of road surfaces in London Road and Canley cemeteries. Providing additional drainage solutions to the existing sections of Lentons Lane Cemetery, and contribute towards the new extension at Lentons Lane Cemetery in preparation for burial activity in the future.

2 Options considered and recommended proposal

To increase fees and charges in line with the City Council's policy, and approve a mechanism for increases over the following three years starting on 1st January 2018 – ***recommended***

- 2.2 Burial costs can be covered under two main headings, interment fees and Exclusive Right of Burial (EROB) fees. When comparing full adult burial fees, Coventry's fees are the 7th lowest in our regional group (out of 8) and 26% less than the average fees. By increasing the adult fees and charges by 39% overall this will place Coventry in 3rd place regarding the current benchmarking group, 10% above the average.
- 2.3 Adult cremation fees when compared to the benchmarking group are positioned 13th (out of 14). An increase of 15% to £737 would place Coventry 6th within the current table, 6% above the benchmarking average.
- 2.4 Children's EROB when compared to the benchmarking group are positioned 6th (out of 8). It is proposed to remove all fees for children's EROB, for those children resident in Coventry (see appendix 3). For children's cremations Coventry is currently the most extensive in the

benchmarking group, again it is proposed to remove all fees for children's cremations for those children resident in Coventry at the time of death.

- 2.5 Post cremation Memorialisation and permit application fees should be increased by 13% (It is not possible to supply comparison charges for post cremation memorialisation due to authorities all supplying different products. The permit fees should be increased in line with any increase % applied for all other memorialisation).
- 2.6 Apply fees and charges against services currently supplied which currently do not recover their full cost (see appendix 4a & 4b).
- 2.7 To approve the increase of fees and charges to be applied on the 1st January each year for the next three years commencing on 1st January 2018 in line with the West Midlands Benchmarking Group average. (Benchmarking exercise will be completed and a briefing note sent to the cabinet member on the % uplift to be applied).
- 2.8 To help improve the efficiency of the cremator operation and to increase the availability of the cremation slots, this report also considers a range of additional services and changes to the associated charges. These areas are as follows:
 - **Surcharge for Saturday cremations** – the City Council currently levy the same charge for cremations Monday – Saturday. However, this charge does not represent the additional cost of providing cremation outside of the normal working week (Monday – Friday). All other authorities apply either a percentage surcharge or an additional fee for adult Saturday cremations. It is proposed that the City Council introduce a 50% surcharge for cremations which take place on a Saturday. This would increase the standard cremation fee from £737 to £1106. Full details of surcharge fees levied by benchmarked authorities are provided in appendix 4a.
- 2.9 Additional service charges – as part of the benchmarking exercise it is clear that other Authorities levy charges for a number of additional services which the City Council provides without further charge, these include:
 - Retention of ashes in the crematorium
 - Scattering of own ashes in the Gardens of Remembrance
 - Late cancellation fee for the chapel
 - Provision of temporary markers for new graves
 - Excessive late arrival for service or excessive over run of a service
- 2.10 To bring the City Council in line with its benchmarked authorities it is proposed to introduce a charge for each of the above services. Details of the proposed charges and those currently levied by benchmarked authorities are given in appendix 4b.
- 2.11 To not increase fees and charges in line with the Council's policy – **not recommended**.
- 2.12 The City Council policy is clear that fees and charges should be set to recover the full cost of providing a service as well as being at the mid-point of the most appropriate benchmarked data. Therefore to not increase fees and charges would be a direct deviation from this policy.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1 Coventry Bereavement Services has consulted with its regional group to compare burial prices for adult interments and cremations (See Appendices).

- 3.2 Bereavement Services continues to consult Funeral Directors on a regular basis in meetings and through a regular newsletter. Further communication with Funeral Directors will take place prior to the implementation of the proposed fees and any significant issues will be reported to the Cabinet Member prior to implementation.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1 It is proposed to apply the above increase in fees from 1st November 2016, except for removal of Children's burial and cremation fees, it is proposed that this would be with immediate effect.

5. Comments from the Executive Director, Resources

5.1 Financial Implications

The full list of fees and charges for 2016 is shown at appendix 5. This increase in fees is based on benchmarking undertaken with the nearest geographical neighbours (appendices 1,2 & 3).

5.2 Legal implications

The Local Authorities Cemeteries Order 1977 made under the Local Government Act 1972 provides a power for burial authorities to charge such fees as they think proper for or in relation to burials in Cemeteries provided by the authority. Furthermore a similar power is given under the Cremation Act 1902 in relation to cremations provided for in the authority's Crematoria.

While other charging powers exist which the City Council could utilise, the proposed charges are either for burials or cremations or are reasonably related to burials and so are within the scope of 1977 Order.

6. Other implications

6.1 How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's key objectives / corporate priorities (corporate plan/scorecard) / organisational blueprint / LAA (or Coventry SCS)?

The fee increase detailed in this report will contribute to the continuing of burial and cremation provision in the City over the medium term.

6.2 How is risk being managed?

Risk will be managed in accordance with the City Council's risk management process.

6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?

If fees were not increased funding to provide future bereavement services provision would need to be found from the Council's wider budget, reducing the Council's ability to invest in other frontline services.

6.4 Equalities / ECA

An impact assessment has been completed for the increase in fees and charges, as the increase in burial fees is greater than that for cremations, the assessments highlights the adverse effect of this decision on communities that favour burial over cremation.

Whilst this impact is note and officers will work with affect communities to communicate these changes effectively, to not increase the fees would leave Coventry as the lowest cost provider in the region, and potential put future burial provision at risk.

In addition, the fee increases in both cremations and burial fees for adults will allow the City Council to reduce the fees for children to zero, helping families at the greatest time of need.

6.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment

Better use of cremation availability, as proposed in section 2 of this report will improve the profile of gas usage, reducing idle time, and therefore improve the carbon performance of the cremation service.

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

None

Report author(s):

Name and job title: Graham Hood, Head of Streetpride and Greenspace

Directorate: Place Directorate

Tel and email contact: 024 7683 2194, graham.hood@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/approver name	Title	Directorate or organisation	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
Cath Crosby	Lead Accountant Business Partner	Place	26 th Sept 16	27 th Sept 16
Wendy Ohandjanian	Equalities and Diversity Officer	Chief Executives	26 th Sept 16	27 th Sept 16
Liz Knight	Committee Services Officer	Resources	26 th Sept 16	27 st Sept 16
Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)				
Sam McGinty	Place Team Leader	Resources	26 th Sept 16	27 Sept 16
Andrew Walster	AD Streetscene and Regulatory Services	Place	26 th Sept 16	27 th Sept 16
Martin Yardley	Executive Director	Place	27 th Sept 16	28 th Sept 16
Julie Fairbrother	Communications	Chief Execs	26 th Sept 16	27 th Sept 16
Cllr Jayne Innes	Cabinet Member for City Services		28 th Sept 16	29 th Sept 16

This report is published on the council's website: www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings

Appendix 1 Comparison of Adult Burial Fees and Charges

The table below compares costs across the regional benchmarking group, the benchmarking was undertaken in May 2016.

Authority Regional Benchmarking Group	Exclusive Right of Burial (EROB) (Current) £	Interment Fee (Current) £	Interment Fee plus Exclusive Right of Burial £	EROB Proposed £	Interment Fee Proposed £	Interment Fee plus Exclusive Right of Burial Proposed £
Wolverhampton	1790	993	2783			
Dudley	1860	903	2763			
Solihull	2000	850	2850			
Sandwell	1684	902	2586			
Birmingham	2160	655	2815			
Walsall	1870	1051	2921			
Oakley Wood	1040	750	1790			
Coventry	1257	790	2047	1885	964	2849
Regional Average	1707	862	2569			
Coventry's fees are below regional average by →	26%	8%	20%	9.% Above	11% Above	10% Above

Appendix 2 Comparison of Adult Cremation Fees and Charges

The table below compares costs across the regional benchmarking group, the benchmarking was undertaken in May 2016.

Authority Regional Benchmarking Group	Adult Cremation Fee £	Adult Cremation Fee Proposed £
Wolverhampton	649	
Dudley	752	
Woodlands (Chelmsley Wood)	690	
West Bromwich	657	
Solihull	690	
Sandwell	657	
B'Ham Sutton/Yardley	685	
B'Ham L/Hill	745	
Birmingham (Perry Barr) Private	810	
Walsall	723	
Oakley Wood	630	
Nuneaton Private	956	
Rugby	775	
Coventry	641	737
Regional Average	719	
Coventry's fees are below regional average by →	11%	2.5% Above

Appendix 3 Comparison of Children's Burial Fees and Charges

The table below compares costs across the regional benchmarking group, the benchmarking was undertaken in May 2016.

Authority Regional B.marking Group	Exclusive Right of Burial (EROB) Current £	Interment Fee Current £	Interment Fee plus Exclusive Right of Burial Current £	EROB Proposed £	Interment Fee Proposed £	Interment Fee plus Exclusive Right of Burial Proposed £	Cremation Fee Current £	Cremation Fee Proposed £
W/Hampton	Free	175	175				Free	
Dudley	210	180	390				90	
Solihull	300	150	450				160	
Sandwell	836	359	1195				113	
Birmingham	1185	150	1335				120	
Walsall	331	323	654				253	
Oakley Wood	475	128	603				120	
Coventry	239	201	440	0	0	0	319	0
Regional Average	447	208	655	447	208	655	147	

Appendix 4a Additional Fees for Extra Services Supplied

Saturday Surcharge Fees

Benchmarking Examples	Saturday Fees applied for Adult Cremation	% Added	Fee added £	
Sandwell	631	15		
Mortlake	575		325	
Poole	758		652	
Torbay	800		200	
Liverpool	745	50		
Peterborough	745		431	
Rugby	775		475	
Banbury	795		275	
Leicester	750	50		
Coventry	737	NIL	NIL	
Recommendation				
Coventry	737	50%	1106	

Appendix 4b Additional Services

Additional Service Charges

Authority Example	Retention of ashes in crematorium	Scatter in Own ashes in Gardens of Remembrance	Late cancellation fee	Temp. Marker (New Grave)	Late Arrival fines / over run service fines
	£	£	£	£	£
Oakley Wood	20 per mth (after 3 mths)	Nil	Nil	Nil	120 after 10 min. and every 15 min
Solihull	Nil	36	245	Not supplied	245 every 15 min + 385 after 1 hr
Birmingham	60 per mth	45	245	70	315 15 min + 430 after 1 hour
Dudley	Nil	51	Nil	Not supplied	No charge
Walsall	No fees listed	No fees listed	No fees listed	No fees listed	No fees listed
Sandwell	Nil	Nil	Nil	23	287
Wolverhampton	No fees listed	34	No fees listed	No fees listed	No fees listed
Bedford	108 after 1 mth	102			
Mortlake	20 after 1 mth				
Taunton Dean	25 after 1 mth the 29 per mth				
Bournemouth	24 per mth	31			
Poole		50			
Torbay		50 on Saturdays			
Liverpool	37 after 1 mth				
Gloucester		46.50			
Boston	7 after 1 mth	25			
Peterborough	17 after 1 mth				
Leicester	33 after 2 mths				
City of London	25 after 1 mth				
Stoke on Trent		25 on Saturdays			
Coventry	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	158 after 15 min. No further charge
Recommendation					
Coventry	25 after 1 mth	45	135 (chapel fee charge)	25	Late fee applied after every 15 minutes

Appendix 5

Full Table of Current and Proposed Fees and Charges

Service Function	New or Existing Charge	Activity Des.	Basis	Current Charge (last increased Feb. 2016 £)	Proposed Charge	Price Increase	% Increase
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase of Exclusive Right of Burial (Resident)	Per Unit	1,257	1885	628	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase of Exclusive Right of Burial (Non-Resident)	Per Unit	2,514	3771	1257	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase Rights for cremation plot (Resident)	Per Unit	1,151	1726	575	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase Rights for cremation plot (Non-Resident)	Per Unit	2,300	3450	1150	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Pre Purchase of Exclusive Right of Burial (Resident)	Per Unit	1936	2691	755	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Pre Purchase of Exclusive Right of Burial (Non-Resident)	Per Unit	3871	5380	1509	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase Rights for cremation plot (Resident)	Per Unit	1724	2396	672	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Purchase Rights for cremation plot (Non-Resident)	Per Unit	3448	4793	1345	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Interment Fee for Adult (Resident)	Per Unit	790	964	174	22% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Interment Fee for Adult (Non - Resident)	Per Unit	1,673	2042	369	22% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Interment Fee for Cremation Plot (Resident)	Per Unit	268	402	134	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Interment Fee for Cremation Plot (Non-Resident)	Per Unit	536	804	268	50% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Strew on any grave	Per unit	77	107	30	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Cardboard coffin	Per unit	286	398	112	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Use of Canley Chapel for burial service	Per unit	135	188	53	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Search Fee for family history	Per Hour or part	80	111	31	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Exhumation full grave	Per unit	2556	3553	997	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Exhumation – ashes	Per unit	661	919	258	40% Discretionary

Cemeteries	Existing	New Memorial Permit Fee	Per Unit	251	284	33	13% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Additional Inscription on a memorial permit fee	Per Unit	104	118	14	13% Discretionary
Cemeteries	Existing	Temporary marker – replacement	Per unit	55	76	21	40% Discretionary
Cemeteries	New	Temporary marker (New grave)	Per Unit	N/A	25	N/A	New Fee
Cemeteries	New	Late Arrival/ Over run service	Per unit of 15 minutes	158	158 per 15 minutes	0	New Fee
Cemeteries	New	Late cancellation fee (Chapel Charge)	Per unit	135	188		40% Discretionary New Fee
Crematorium	Existing	Cremation Fee	Per Unit	641	737	96	15% Discretionary
Crematorium	New	Saturday cremation fee	Per unit	737	1106		50% Discretionary New Fee
Crematorium	Existing	Medical referee's fees	Per unit	26	30	4	15% Discretionary
Crematorium	New	Strewing in Gardens of remembrance	Per unit	0	45		New Fee
Crematorium	Existing	Strewing of ashes from elsewhere	Per unit	80	92	12	15% Discretionary
Crematorium	Existing	Provision of urn	Per unit	34	40	6	18% Discretionary
Crematorium	New	Retention of ashes	Per month after 1 month	0	25		New Fee
Crematorium	Existing	Use of Canley Chapel	Per unit	135	188	53	40% Discretionary
Crematorium	Existing	Search Fee – family history	Per hour of part of	80	111	31	40% Discretionary
Crematorium	New	Late Fee / Over run service	Per unit of 15 minutes	158	158 Per 15 minutes	0	New Fee
Crematorium	New	Late cancellation Fee (chapel fee)	Per unit	135	188		40% Discretionary New fee
Memorialisation	Existing	Various Memorial Fees	Per Unit	Various			13% Discretionary

Cabinet Member for City Services

10th October 2016

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member for City Services – Councillor J Innes

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Executive Director of Resources

Ward(s) affected:

None

Title:

Outstanding Issues

Is this a key decision?

No

Executive Summary:

In May 2004 the City Council adopted an Outstanding Minutes System linked to the Forward Plan, to ensure that follow up reports can be monitored and reported to Members. The attached appendix sets out a table detailing the issues on which further reports have been requested by the Cabinet Member for City Services so she is aware of them and can monitor progress.

Recommendations:

The Cabinet Member for City Services is requested to consider the list of outstanding issues and to ask the Member of the Management Board or appropriate officer to explain the current position on those which should have been discharged at this meeting or an earlier meeting.

List of Appendices included:

Table of Outstanding Issues

Other useful background papers:

None

Has it or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No

Has it, or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report author(s):

Name and job title:

Liz Knight / Michelle Salmon
Governance Services Officer

Directorate:

Resources

Tel and email contact:

Tel: 024 7683 3073 / 3065

E-mail: liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk / michelle.salmon@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

This report is published on the council's website: www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings

	Subject	Date for Further Consideration	Responsible Officer	Proposed Amendment to Date for Consideration	Reason for Request to Delay Submission of Report
1	City Centre Maintenance Contract Further report providing an update on the City Centre Review transfer process and seeking approval for future maintenance standards (Minute 55 of Cabinet Member for Public Services refers – 15 th December 2015).	September, 2016	Executive Director of Place Graham Hood	December, 2016	Finalising terms and conditions
2	Residents' Parking Schemes A list of outstanding residents' parking schemes, including Stoke Row, be reviewed and a report to be presented to a future meeting on the outcome of the review (minute 5/14 of Cabinet Member for Public Services refers – 19 th June 2014).	September, 2016	Executive Director of Place Caron Archer	Report on Residents Parking to be submitted to Cabinet on 1 st November, 2016	
3	Petition – Safety Measures on Swan Lane Further report on progress following 12 months of implementation (Minute 75/14 of Cabinet Member for Public Services refers – 19 th January, 2015).	September, 2016	Executive Director of Place Caron Archer	November 2016	Awaiting results from traffic surveys
4	Petition – Longford Road Junction with Oakmoor Road Further report with results of six months monitoring exercise following the implementation of Option 4 (Minute 75/15 of Cabinet Member for Public Services refers – 15 th March, 2016).	To Be Confirmed	Executive Director of Place Caron Archer		

This page is intentionally left blank