## **Draft Scoping Document**

Name of Review/Project:

Cemetery service

## Terms of reference:

To clarify statutory and discretionary responsibilities for a district council in providing a burials service.

To clarify the scope of the current service including facilities, management arrangements, burial statistics, plots available, costs etc.

To examine the potential for new sites.

To explore options and attendant financial implications for service delivery

To make policy recommendations.

Please provide details of relevant Corporate Plan Themes and Priorities:

Value for Money

Key Issues and Aim(s) of the Review

Issues

Plots running out in Gresley cemetery Identifying community need Maximising income

## **Aims**

Understand current service delivery and current need. Explore alternative delivery or service improvements Agree policy for future.

Reduce costs

Why should the review take place now?

Plots running out in Gresley cemetery, so forward strategy required.

Pressure on Council resources means it is timely to review existing service, it's income and costs and check it offers value for money and meets Council

| objectives and obligations.   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   |  |  |  |
| Potential outcome/s   |  |  |  |
| Future policy identified  |  |  |  |
| Improved revenue position   |  |  |  |
| What will not be included: N/A  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Risks:  |  |  |  |
| Reduced service in urban core and consequent adverse public reaction. Increased capital and or revenue costs  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Members undertaking the Review (if a sub-group is to be used):  |  |  |  |
| Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Possible co-options:  |  |  |  |
| None requested  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Which policy committee(s) does it relate to?  |  |  |  |
| Housing and Community Sorvices  |  |  |  |
| Housing and Community Services Finance and Management   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Key stakeholders/ consultees:   |  |  |  |
| Cemetery team (Rita McGoldrick, Joanne Abbassi)   |  |  |  |
| Service users   |  |  |  |
| Grounds maintenance service   |  |  |  |
| Funeral directors   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
| Potential contributors and research required:   |  |  |  |
| Neighbouring authorities  |  |  |  |
| Service monitoring info   |  |  |  |
| Public opinion and views  |  |  |  |
| Potential visits: Existing sites  |  |  |  |
| The second second second is a second |  |  |  |

|  | If Council owned land is unavailable then should it be decided new sites are needed there will be purchase, set up and ongoing costs to consider. |                |  |  |
|--|---|----------------|--|--|
|  |   |                |  |  |
|  | Officer support required:   |                |  |  |
|  | M Roseburgh<br>Rita McGoldrick<br>Joanne Abbassi  |                |  |  |
|  | Steve Sheppard  |                |  |  |
|  | <u> </u>  |                |  |  |
|  | Period for Review:  |                |  |  |
|  | Start date:   | June 11th 2012 |  |  |
|  | Approximate meeting dates:  |                |  |  |
|  | Proposed completion date:   |                |  |  |
|  | Report date(s) to committees:   |                |  |  |
|  |   |                |  |  |
|  |   |                |  |  |
|  | Publicity (e.g. of recommendations)   |                |  |  |
|  |   |                |  |  |

Date Scoping Document Completed: June 6th 2012

The review may unearth potential savings or opportunities for income

generation or conversely identify requirement for investment.

Are there any Budgetary Implications?