

# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

Friday 28 April 2023

At 10.00 am

At the Emergency Planning Annex,  
Stockton Police Station, Bishop Street,  
Stockton-On-Tees, Cleveland, TS18 1SY

MEMBERS: EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE:-

Hartlepool Borough Council: Councillor Tom Cassidy  
Middlesbrough Borough Council: Councillor Eric Palano  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council: Councillor Cliff Foggo  
Stockton Borough Council: Councillor Mike Smith

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
3. **MINUTES**

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2022 (previously published and circulated)

4. **ITEMS FOR DECISION**

- 4.1 Activity Report – *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*
- 4.2 The UK Government Resilience Framework – *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*
- 4.3 Financial Management Update Report – *Director of Resources and Development and Chief Emergency Planning Officer*

5. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION**

- 5.1 Community Resilience Workshop 29th November 2022 and future direction of Community Resilience – *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*
- 5.2 Incident Report (5th November 2022 – 1st March 2023) – *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**



# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

## MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

**22 NOVEMBER 2022**

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am at the Emergency Planning Annex,  
Stockton Police Station.

### **Present:**

Councillor: Councillor Mike Smith (Stockton Borough Council) (In the Chair)

Councillors: Councillor Eric Palano (Middlesbrough Borough Council)  
Councillor Cliff Foggo (Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council)

Officers: Stuart Marshall, Chief Emergency Planning Officer  
Jon Hepworth, Group Accountant (Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)  
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

### **10. Apologies for Absence**

Councillor Tom Cassidy (Hartlepool Borough Council).

### **11. Declarations of interest by Members**

None.

### **12. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2022**

Received.

### **13. Financial Management Update Report** *(Director of Resources and Development and Chief Emergency Planning Officer)*

#### **Purpose of report**

To provide details of the forecast outturn for the financial year ending 31st March, 2023 based on the position as at 31st October' 2022.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee**

The Group Accountant reported that on the main Emergency Planning Budget there was now an overspend of £5000 due mainly to the higher than anticipated pay award for 2022/23. This would be funded from reserves this year. The pay award pressure was indicative of the current high levels

of inflation, which increase the operating costs of the service and, therefore, the amount of income required to balance the budget. The report for next quarter would include a proposed budget for the next financial year and recommendations that address how these inflationary pressures may be funded.

In relation to the Local resilience Forum (LRF) there was a favourable variance of £52,000 anticipated. This was largely due to a combination of vacant posts and delays in appointing staff funded by central government grant. This expenditure would be re-phased to 2023/23 which would extend the lifetime of the scheme.

### **Decision**

That the latest forecast outturn for 2022/23 be noted.

## **14. Activity Report** (*Chief Emergency Planning Officer*)

### **Purpose of report**

To assist members of the EPJC in overseeing the performance and effectiveness of the Emergency Planning Unit and its value to the four unitary authorities.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee**

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer reported a summary of the progress made against the Unit's action plan highlighting some of the significant work completed over recent months. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer particularly highlighted the Team's involvement in: -

- Ongoing work in the delivery of external COMAH and REPPIR duties;
- The partner workshop held on community resilience engaging a range of agencies with a view to improving evidence against the resilient standards.
- Contribution to the recent NE Cyber innovation event held the Riverside Stadium in Middlesbrough.
- Development of scenarios for the FloodEx event on 22 November which would involve local authorities all along the east coast from Scotland to East Anglia.
- A review of four local authority websites emergency information for local residents.
- The holding of a REPPIR Level 2 Exercise and the subsequent Hydra Report.

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer reported that following the successful recruitment of four new staff, the Unit now had a full complement of 12 staff. This addition has only been possible as a result of grant funding from the Government.

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer also reported activity around the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) which included: -

- The provision of a range of training opportunities for multi-agency responders from generic strategic response to specialist applications;
- A codified 'stand up' protocol for adverse weather incidents which would mean authorities and agencies being put on standby in amber weather warning situations and then only stood down should the weather not prove particularly troubling. This was a response to the lessons learned around Storm Arwen;
- Ensured linkages between key community resilience groups and the LRF;
- A Cyber awareness briefing from NE WARP, National Cyber Security Agency and North East Regional Organised Crime Unit.
- Provision of a training and exercise bid process for the North East, reducing duplication and increasing joint working.

The Chair questioned how the changes in senior officer positions in Councils had impacted upon emergency planning and the training requirements. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer indicated that there had been some increased demand for strategic command training. The key was to ensure the people designated as responders in a local authority were comfortable with the kinds of decision making emergency situations could require. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer added that there was additional training still ongoing through the LRF as things returned to normal after the Covid pandemic.

A Member referred to the two 2Excel Aviation aircraft now based at Teesside Airport which were operated by Oil Spill Response Limited. The two aircraft were designed to spray oil dispersant in the event of major oil spills. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer reported that locally, we are well placed with PD Ports locally being a Tier 2 Responder (one of only 2 ports in the country with such accreditation). Any use of aircraft / dispersants would be considered by a number of agencies including the Marine Management Organisation and HM Coastguard. The two aircraft were more likely to respond to major spills out at sea anywhere around the world to assist in stopping oil spills reaching the shoreline.

### **Decision**

That the report be noted.

## **15. LRF Pilot Projects Update** (*Chief Emergency Planning Officer*)

### **Purpose of report**

For information, awareness and assurance.

**Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee**

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer reported that the government's funding of LRF's that aimed to increase capability and capacity was likely to have some longer term consequences in terms of the expectations placed on LRFs in major incidents as could be seen from the involvement of the local LRF Chair in the Manchester Bombing Inquiry.

As well as specific projects within the LRF to build capacity, there had also been increased capacity within the EPU as it provided support to the LRF. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer gave an update on the various projects being undertaken by the LRF. In regards to training it was indicated that a new online training platform was being explored for those involved in emergency situations, though this would be in addition to and not replace practical exercises.

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer also highlighted that officers were reviewing the establishment of a small grants scheme for community resilience building with local community groups from within the LRF grant funding.

**Decision**

That the pilot funding and proposed / ongoing activities be noted and that further reports on the utilisation of the funding be reported to future meetings.

**16. Incident Report - (25th June 2022 – 4th November 2022) (Chief Emergency Planning Officer)****Purpose of report**

For information and assurance.

**Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee**

The Chief Emergency Planning Officer submitted a report outlining the incidents reported and responded to by the Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit (CEPU). The report covered the period between the 25th June and 4th November 2022.

**Decision**

That the report be noted.

**17. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent**

None.

The meeting concluded at 11.00 am.

**H MARTIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 1 DECEMBER 2022**

# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

28 April 2023



**Report of:** Chief Emergency Planning Officer

**Subject:** Activity Report

---

## 1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

- 1.1. For consideration and approval by the Emergency Planning Joint Committee (EPJC).

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 To assist members of the EPJC in overseeing the performance and effectiveness of the Emergency Planning Unit and its value to the four unitary authorities.

## 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As reported and presented at the meeting in March the CEPU undertakes an annual action plan identifying key areas of work to be undertaken in 2022-23 by CEPU.
- 3.2 A number of actions relate directly to the statutory functions placed upon the authorities by the relevant legislation (including the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, Control of Major Accident Hazard Regulations 2015, Radiation Emergency Preparedness Public Information Regulations 2019 and Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996).
- 3.3 Where non-statutory duties are included they are based upon guidance such as that associated with the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and the good practice contained in the SOLACE guidance on emergencies<sup>1</sup> revised and re-issued 2018, whilst non-statutory they are critical to resilience.
- 3.4 A summary of progress made against the Unit's new action plan is outlined below.

---

1

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/759744/181116\\_LA\\_preparedness\\_guide\\_for\\_cx\\_v6.10\\_004\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/759744/181116_LA_preparedness_guide_for_cx_v6.10_004_.pdf)

Table 1: Progress against CEPU action plan in period

As of 01/03/2023	Complete	Ongoing	Yet to start	Redundant	Grand Total
CEPU Internal Functions	6	2	2		10
Community Resilience including the voluntary sector		3			3
Event Support	2	2			4
Financial Control	3				3
Industrial Emergency Planning	15	1	3		19
ITC / Cyber planning	1				1
Local authority resilience	31	1		1	33
Plans and procedures	1	6			7
Risk Assessment	3	1			4
Support, review and development of the LRF	9	3	1		13
Training and exercising	18	5	2	2	27
Warn and inform	8		1		9
Grand Total (Previous EPJC report)	34	30	69		133
Grand Total (Current EPJC report)	97	24	9	3	133

### 3.5 Significant areas of work completed in period include:

- Rest centre exercise held in January with voluntary sector (British Red Cross and Raynet)
- A number of Major Incident Plans have been reviewed.
- A full audit of emergency plans has been undertaken
- Internal functions including Health and Safety assessments have been reviewed and all staff briefed on the risks assessments
- Checks of equipment at key locations including rest centre materials
- Provision of training including log keeping, internal strategic commanders and Independent Safety Advisory Group

### 3.6 One area that is likely to be carried into the 23/24 workplan is the training of Elected Members. Each borough undertakes this role differently as per agreement with Democratic Services, following elections in May there will be a number of new members requiring familiarisation with Civil Contingencies.

### 3.7 As previously reported the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) received the proposed annual action plan for 2022 – 23 at its meeting in May and this was adopted, an outline is provided below by thematic area. The action plan is being delivered by the 18 multi-agency working groups.



Table 2: Progress against the LRF action plan 2022 - 23

	Ongoing	Yet to Start	Complete	Redundant	Grand Total
Assurance	7	4	25	6	42
Awareness and Engagement	7		12		19
Capability	5		5		10
Governance	2	1	4		7
Information sharing	2	1	2		5
Learning from incidents and exercises	2	1	9	1	13
MAIP	4				4
National Power Outage	2		2		4
Risk assessment		1	5		6
Training and competence	4	1	24	3	32
Update protocols / plans	6	3	7	1	17
<b>Grand Total (previous EPJC report)</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Grand Total (current EPJC report)</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>159</b>

- 3.8 Key elements and activities delivered so far in addition to those previously reported include:
- Virtual Briefs to North East partners on emerging technologies including lithium batteries and Human Aspects in emergency planning
  - NE LRF symposium
  - Receipt of commissioned work from Northumbria University and delivery of a workshop on Community Resilience
  - Continued planning on power outages
  - Engagement with the two new Category 2 responders (Met Office and Coal Authority)
  - Briefings from the Integrated Care Board reference their new role / integration with the LRF
  - Delivery and debrief of Flood Ex
  - Multi-agency review of plans and accompanying audit process
- 3.9 Redundant actions – 9 actions have now been identified as redundant these generally consist of exercises that are no longer required / where the expected role of the LRF has been reduced or where proposed work has been superseded or is a duplication of other workstreams.
- 3.10 In addition a number activities not captured in the action plan are being undertaken by the LRF:
- Development and maintenance of the North East LRF symposium – covering elements inkling the role of the LRF, future role of the Integrated Care Boards, current emergency planning practice and the recommendations from the Manchester Arena Inquiry (Volume 2).

- Review of satellite telecommunications options
- Support for the Hartlepool Tall Ships event
- Coordination meetings relating to adverse weather and industrial action

3.11 Work continues in light of the recommendations from the National Preparedness Commission following the non-statutory review of the Civil Contingencies Act, of the 117 recommendations, following review the LRF has opted to undertake 34 proactively. A summary position is provided below.

Chapter	Complete	Ongoing	Yet to start	Grand Total
Chapter 3: What is Resilience and a Truly Resilient Nation?	1	3		4
Chapter 4: Involving the Whole of Society	4	5		9
Chapter 5: Duties: Risk Assessment		1	1	2
Chapter 6: Other Duties	2	5		7
Chapter 7: Structures	1	2	1	4
Chapter 8: The Pursuit of Excellence (1)	1	3		4
Chapter 9: Validation and Assurance	1	3		4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>34</b>

3.12 A symposium was held in Newcastle with representation from the North East LRF community. The day included outlines of the role of the LRF, the future role of the NHS Integrated Care Board, findings of Manchester Arena Inquiry and review of current ways of working. Following discussion a number of recommendations have been identified and will be developed through the LRF Strategic Boards.

#### 4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 That the Chief Emergency Planning Officer continues to provide quarterly updates and additional information as requested by EPJC members.
- 4.2 Should members require further information on any element of the EPU workplan or LRF workplan or wish to discuss activities further please contact the Chief EPO.

#### 5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Failure to understand the role and remit of the role of the Unit may result in the focus being elsewhere resulting in a lack of preparedness or resilience within the authorities.

#### 6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 There are no financial considerations relating to this report.

## **7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The key legislation is the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 which identifies the local authorities as a Category 1 responder, section 10 of the CCA 2004 identifies failure by a person or body identified within the legislation may bring proceedings in the High Court.
- 7.2 Further enforcement may take place in the event of failure to meet the duties identified under industrial legislation including the Control of Major Accident Hazard Regulations (2015), Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996 and Radiation Emergency Preparedness Public Information Regulations 2019.

## **8. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY**

- 8.1 There are no child and family poverty implications relating to this report.

## **9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no equality and diversity considerations relating to this report.

## **10. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no staff considerations relating to this report.

## **11. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

- 11.1 There are no asset management considerations relating to this report.

## **12. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 That members seek involvement and clarification on the CEPU Action Plan where appropriate.
- 12.2 That the CEPO continues to develop the CEPU Annual Action Plan and the EPJC standard report to provide assurance to EPJC members that the key considerations continue to be met and that members are updated at the quarterly EPJC meetings reference any amendments / additional actions.

## **13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 13.1 To ensure that members of the EPJC can effectively obtain assurance that the duties and expectations on the local authorities can be met in the event of an incident.

## **14. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None presented.

**15. CONTACT OFFICER**

Stuart Marshall  
Chief Emergency Planning officer  
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit  
Tel 01642 301515  
Email: [stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk)

# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

28 April 2023



**Report of:** Chief Emergency Planning Officer

**Subject:** The UK Government Resilience Framework

---

## 1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

- 1.1. For consideration and approval by the Emergency Planning Joint Committee (EPJC).

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 To assist members of the EPJC in overseeing the performance and effectiveness of the Emergency Planning Unit and its value to the four unitary authorities.
- 2.2 To highlight the publication of the UK Government Resilience Framework issued 19/12/2022 and to provide EPJC members with an overview of the key future impacts on the LRF. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-uk-government-resilience-framework/the-uk-government-resilience-framework-html#our-action-plan-skills>

## 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The anticipated UK Government Resilience Framework is built on three core principles:

- 3.2
- 1 **A shared understanding of the risks we face is foundational:** it must underpin everything that we do to prepare for and recover from crises;
  - 2 **Prevention rather than cure wherever possible:** resilience-building spans the whole risk cycle so we must focus effort across the cycle, particularly before crises happen;
  - 3 **Resilience is a 'whole of society' endeavour,** so we must be more transparent and empower everyone to make a contribution.
- 3.2 The new framework focuses on how resilience can be built across six key thematic areas:

- **Understanding risk**
- **Responsibilities and accountability**
- **Partnerships**
- **Communities**
- **Investment**
- **Skills**

3.3 It also identifies a number of specific actions built around these key thematic areas for delivery by 2030, this is summarised in Appendix 1. It is noted that there is a desire to integrate resilience into a number of policies not least Levelling Up.

3.4 Appendix 2 provides members with further detail on the framework in relation to proposed future leadership and accountability of LRFs and place making policy. How this would apply to the Cleveland LRF area is uncertain at the current time.

#### **4. PROPOSALS**

4.1 The Chief Emergency Planning Officer (CEPO) continues to provide updates and additional information as requested by EPJC members.

4.2 Should members require further information on any element of how the local arrangements are being impacted by changes in national direction and policy, or wish to discuss the implications further please contact the Chief Emergency Planning Officer.

#### **5. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 Within the framework there is significant potential for change, including the structure and role of the LRF accountability which may impact on the existing structures and means of delivery.

#### **6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 There are no financial considerations relating to this report.

#### **7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The key legislation is the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 which identifies the local authorities as a Category 1 responder, section 10 of the CCA 2004 identifies failure by a person or body identified within the legislation may bring proceedings in the High Court.

#### **8. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY**

8.1 There are no child and family poverty implications relating to this report.

**9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 There are no equality and diversity considerations relating to this report.

**10. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

10.1 There are no staff considerations relating to this report.

**11. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

11.1 There are no asset management considerations relating to this report.

**12. RECOMMENDATIONS**

12.1 That members make themselves aware of the key principles included in the framework.

12.2 Partners consider and raise any concerns or opportunities based on the framework / proposed actions and advise on any action they feel is required.

12.3 Via the EPJC / CEPO further guidance and Government direction is monitored and where appropriate the EPJC engages with the LRF / Councils reference application / development / implementation etc.

**13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

13.1 To ensure that members of the EPJC can effectively obtain assurance that the duties and expectations on the local authorities can be met in the event of an incident.

**14. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None presented.

**15. CONTACT OFFICER**

Stuart Marshall  
Chief Emergency Planning officer  
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit  
Tel 01642 301515  
Email: [stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk)

Appendix 1: HM Government action plan summary from the national resilience framework

	<b>We are already taking action on</b>	<b>By 2025 we will</b>	<b>BY 2030 we will</b>
<b>Risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refreshing the National Security Risk Assessment (NSRA) process, so it will look over a longer timescale, include multiple scenarios, look at chronic risks and interdependencies and use the widest possible range of relevant data and insight alongside external challenge.</li> <li>Creating a new Head of Resilience, to guide best practice, encourage adherence to standards, and set guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify roles and responsibilities in the UK Government for each NSRA risk, to drive activity across the risk lifecycle.</li> <li>Conduct an annual survey of public perceptions of risk, resilience and preparedness.</li> <li>Introduce an Annual Statement to Parliament on civil contingencies risk and the UK Government's performance on resilience.</li> <li>Develop a measurement of socio-economic resilience, including how risks impact across communities and vulnerable groups - to guide and inform decision making on risk and resilience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make the UK Government's communications on risk more relevant and easily accessible.</li> </ul>
<b>Responsibilities and accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening UK Government resilience structures by creating a new resilience function to deliver longer term capability building and risk mitigation to work alongside the UK Government's crisis management infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand the scope and use of standards and assurance in the public sector to support better contingency planning and risk management.</li> <li>Run a pilot across three key pillars of reform to significantly strengthen Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) in England: Leadership, Accountability, and Integration of resilience into the UK's levelling up mission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work across three key pillars of reform to significantly strengthen LRFs in England: Leadership, Accountability, and Integration of resilience into the UK's levelling up mission.</li> </ul>



<b>Partnerships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuing to take international, bilateral and multilateral action and cooperation on risk and resilience. Continuing to use the UK Government's international action to identify and tackle risks before they manifest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grow the UK Government's advisory groups made up of experts, academics and industry experts in order to inform the NSRA. This may include establishing a risk-focused sub-group of the UK Resilience Forum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce standards on resilience across the private sector, where these do not already exist, adjusted to take into account the current landscape, priorities and needs across and between sectors.</li> <li>Provide the wider private sector with better guidance on resilience to support contingency planning and risk management.</li> <li>Build upon existing resilience standards for CNI to create common but flexible resilience standards across CNI, and do more on the assurance of CNI preparedness.</li> <li>Review existing regulatory regimes on resilience to ensure they are fit for purpose. In the highest priority sectors that are not already regulated, and for the highest priority risks, consider enforcing standards through regulation.</li> </ul>
<b>Communities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuing to deepen and strengthen our relationships with the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) in England.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer better guidance from the UK Government to LRFs and local partners in England, created with local responders, the VCS and communities to support them working with vulnerable groups.</li> </ul>	

<b>Investment</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a coordinated and prioritised approach to investment in resilience within the UK Government, informed by a shared understanding of risk.</li> <li>• Consider options for funding models for any future expanded responsibilities and expectations of LRFs in England.</li> <li>• Offer new guidance to community organisations and individual householders, to help those people to make more informed decisions about investing in their own resilience and preparedness.</li> </ul>
<b>Skills</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver a new UK Resilience Academy, built out from the Emergency Planning College, making world class professional training available to all that need it.</li> <li>• Deliver a new training and skills pathway to drive professionalism and support all those pursuing a career in resilience.</li> <li>• Reinvigorate the National Exercising Programme to test plans, structures and skills.</li> </ul>	

## Appendix 2: Extract ref leadership and accountability of LRFs and Place making policy

### Leadership of LRFs in England

As the role and expectations on LRFs have grown to meet the varied challenges of recent years, so too has the role of LRF Chairs. For many years LRFs have been led to great effect by committed senior leaders drawn from a variety of responder organisations, including the Police, Fire Service and Local Authorities. This has typically been as part of a wider role within their organisations that included a range of other duties and responsibilities. The UK Government will work with LRFs and their members to **ensure LRF leaders have the resources, capacity, and capability to sustain this work** as they engage with an ever more challenging risk landscape and drive resilience in their areas.

It is critical to the success of LRFs that senior leaders from the organisations outlined in the CCA and beyond continue to take a key leadership role in the work of LRFs. It is equally vital to ensure that LRF Chairs have the capacity and capability to lead LRFs in delivery of the strengthened roles and responsibilities we are proposing. They will need the time and space to fully embed themselves and their LRFs in wider local structures – including working in close partnership with locally elected democratic leaders and the full range of senior leaders across local government and responder organisations. To best enable this, **the UK Government will work with the sector to pilot evolving the nature of the LRF Chair role, including considering a full time permanent role occupied by an appropriately qualified and experienced individual who will become the Chief Resilience Officer (CRO) for each LRF area.** The LRF CRO should be provided with the resources, support, mandate and levers to bring together the full range of partners to drive and enhance resilience in their areas and we will work with the sector to consider how best we can do this. The LRF CRO will be distinct from the UK Government Head of Resilience role discussed in the Risk chapter, with both having complementary leadership roles across the resilience system.

The UK Government will set clear expectations for LRF Chief Resilience Officers to lead the building of resilience and delivery of resilience activity in their areas and **they will be accountable to executive local democratic leaders.** This will **give these democratic leaders a clear role in ensuring effective delivery of resilience activity, including integrating resilience into wider local delivery** and levelling up.

As set out in the 2022 Post Implementation Review of the CCA<sup>[footnote 24](#)</sup>, at present the fulfilment of the duties of the Act by Category 1 and 2 responders remains fit for purpose. However, we recognise that the evolving risk landscape, and the ambition to strengthen LRFs in England may require future consideration and may necessitate future changes to underpinning legislation and regulatory frameworks.

### Accountability for LRFs in England

**Strengthening the accountability and assurance across LRFs** in England will ensure local leaders have key tools to drive the building of resilience and multi-agency collaboration in their communities. **Clear mechanisms and expectations for accountability between LRF Chief Resilience Officers and executive local democratic leaders** will make LRFs more accountable to the communities that they serve and provide a mechanism for **local communities to hold local leaders to account for driving and delivering resilience.**

To support this, we will consider the best way to develop a means of stronger assurance of LRF collective delivery in England, including auditable frameworks, to set and drive standards and support local places to develop their resilience whilst providing assurance of levels of resilience across the LRF system and England as a whole. We will build the assessment of resilience activity into the inspection and audit regimes of individual responders, working closely with the relevant assurance

and inspection bodies. **Alongside this we will establish clear mechanisms for the assurance of the multi-agency activity at LRF level.** This will give local leaders new information and tools to understand the impact of their work, identify areas for improvement or mitigate risk or vulnerability by targeting resilience activity.

The introduction of new assurance activity will contribute to continuous improvement in emergency management, provide further opportunities to celebrate and share good or best practice and crucially address emerging risk through early mitigation measures or prevention activity. Alongside this it will enable the UK Government to consider the level of support that may be required (before, during or after an emergency) to assist the local level at any stage of the resilience cycle.

### **Integration of Resilience into Local policy and place making in England**

The UK Government needs to build a solid foundation of resilient communities and places, drawing on the full range of national and local levers. This means **placing resilience at the heart of levelling up and wider place making.** This will ensure that all areas can take advantage of the opportunities this affords, tackle key vulnerabilities, and minimise the potential for risks and emergencies to stop areas achieving their full potential. The UK Government will **empower the new LRF CRO and the local elected leaders work across the full range of local policy making and delivery** to make the building and delivery of resilience central to wider place making, including other key policy areas such as Net Zero and Build Back Better.

**Resilience will be included as a key aspect of the regional devolution deals in England** being delivered as a part of levelling up, with local areas taking formal responsibility for building and delivering local resilience. The UK Government will work with areas not preparing a devolution deal **to integrate resilience into wider delivery** including, as appropriate, working with Police, Fire and Crime Commissioners to make resilience the third strand of community safety. Alongside this we will consider the case for making Combined Authorities and Mayoral Combined Authorities Category 1 Responders.

The UK Government will encourage and facilitate stronger collaboration between regions and across the four nations to maximise the opportunities for shared learning, insight, and cooperation. Similarities between areas are not just geographical and we will link places, even if they are at opposite ends of the country, to share good practice.

The UK Government will work with LRFs to strengthen data, intelligence and analysis capacity and capability. This will support them to make the best use of data to target activity and measure success as well as being a vital tool in response and recovery. Central to this will be ensuring appropriate sharing of UK Government data and information and building strong links with the National Situation Centre.

# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

28 April, 2023



**Report of:** Director of Resources and Development and Chief  
Emergency Planning Officer

**Subject:** FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide details of the forecast outturn as at 31st January, 2023 for current financial year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2023.
- 1.2 To propose the budget for 2023/24 and contributions to be requested from Councils.

## 2. FORECAST OUTTURN

- 2.1 The latest forecast outturn is a nil variance of s shown in the following table:

**Table 1 – Main Emergency Planning Budget - Forecast Outturn as at 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2023**

	Budget	Latest Forecast	Projected Outturn Variance Adverse/ (Favourable)
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Main Emergency Planning Budget</b>			
Direct Costs - Employees	315	304	(11)
Direct Costs - Other	103	104	1
Income	(418)	(408)	10
<b>Net Position Before Use of Reserves</b>	0	0	0

- 2.2 The favourable variance on pay costs is owing to a redistribution of management costs linked to activity drivers and reflects the greater amount of time spent on LRF and the supervision of 4 new staff funded by the Pilot Grant. This is offset by reduced income from SLA recharges to external bodies i.e. the Cleveland Police and Environment Agency.

- 2.3 The latest position for the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) budget is shown in the following table:

**Table 2 – 2022/23 LRF Forecast as at 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2023**

	£'000	£'000	£'000
Direct Costs - Employees	137	137	0
Direct Costs – Other	115	65	(50)
Income	(44)	(44)	0
Pilot Grant	(208)	(202)	6
<b>Net Position Before Use of Reserves</b>	0	(44)	(44)
Carry forward grant funding to future years	0	44	44
<b>Net Position After Use of Reserves</b>	0	0	0

- 2.4 The budget includes the LRF Pilot Funding grant which was £202,000 and therefore £6,000 less than estimated at the time of setting the budget. This is a Section 31 non-ring-fenced grant awarded by the 'Government Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities' with the following objectives:

- To increase LRF capacity, enabling LRFs to recruit strategic resources to address national and local resilience priorities.
- To build new or enhance LRF capability to address national and local resilience priorities specifically.

- 2.5 The forecast outturn shows a favourable variance of £44,000 which relate mainly to an underspend on non-staffing costs as a result of the scheme becoming fully operational once the 4 posts were filled, This will enable the contributions of partners to be carried forward in a reserve.

### 3. 2022/23 BUDGET

- 3.1 The budget for the Emergency Planning Unit is self-financing and mainly determined by the level of contributions approved by the Local Authority partners and income from fees and recharges. For the 2023/24 the recommended Local Authority contributions are £321,000, which is a 5% increase compared to the previous year. This has required a £21,000 release of reserves to balance the budget.
- 3.2 Staffing costs have also been inflated to reflect the current year pay award exceeding the estimate in addition to an amount to allow for an assumed pay award from April, 2023.
- 3.3 The proposed budget is shown in the following table:

**Table 3: Proposed Main Emergency Planning Budget 2023/24**

2022/23 Budget £'000		2023/24 Budget £'000
	<b>Expenditure</b>	
315	Direct Costs - Employees	344
103	Direct Costs - Other	103
418		447
	<b>Income</b>	
(315)	LA Contributions	(321)
(103)	Other Income	(105)
(418)		(426)
0	<b>Net Position Before Use of Reserves</b>	21
0	Transfer To/(From) Reserves	(21)
0	<b>Net Position After Use of Reserves</b>	0

- 3.4 The proposed LRF Budget is shown in Table 4 below and includes another year of government grant funding, estimated to be £202,000 based on the current years 'Pilot' funding. Contributions from partners have been increased by 5%.

**Table 4: Proposed LRF Budget 2023/24**

2022/23 Budget £'000		2023/24 Budget £'000
137	Direct Costs - Employees	163
115	Direct Costs – Other	86
(44)	Income	(47)
(208)	Grant	(202)
0	<b>Net Budget</b>	0

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 To note the latest outturn forecast for 2022/23.
- 4.2 To approve the 2023/24 budgets for Emergency Planning including the 5% increase in the Contribution from each Council.
- 4.3 To approve the 2023/24 Local Resilience Forum (LRF) budget.

## 5. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 5.1 None.

**6. CONTACT OFFICER**

Stuart Marshall  
Chief Emergency Planning officer  
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit  
Tel 01642 301515  
Email: [stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk)

Chris Little  
Director of Resources and Development  
Tel: 01429 523003  
Email: [chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk)



# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

28 April 2023



**Report of:** Chief Emergency Planning Officer

**Subject:** Community Resilience Workshop 29<sup>th</sup> November 2022  
and future direction of community resilience

---

## 1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

- 1.1. For consideration and approval by the Emergency Planning Joint Committee (EPJC).

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 To provide members of the TBG with feedback following the LRF Community Resilience Workshop on 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2022 at the Riverside Stadium, Middlesbrough and to provide an outline of the future Community Resilience focus.
- 2.2 To assist members of the EPJC in overseeing the performance and effectiveness of the Emergency Planning Unit and its value to the four unitary authorities.

## 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The LRF has in line with a number of other LRFs been running a quarterly Community Resilience Group, whilst there are a number of committed members it is clear from the recent very limited attendance that the group isn't fully meeting the needs of the LRF or communities. This is felt in part to be due to the open nature of community resilience – it is not well defined and it can be a struggle for officers to engage with, in addition to this the following issues have also been identified:

- Lack of community representation
- Focus on emergency management / resilience – often not the main focus / priority of the wider community
- Lack of recognition of communities concerns / priorities and needs
- Lack of a single coherent understanding of resilience by groups and partners

- 3.2 In recognition of this the LRF has sought assistance from two academics and the Middlesbrough Voluntary Development Agency (MVDA), agreement was reached to run a workshop building on the research undertaken by Ed Rollason (Northumbria University) on behalf of the LRF.
- 3.3 It was hoped by engaging a wider range of stakeholders and communities via the workshop, and not focusing on the traditional emergencies we would build connections and facilitate collaborations between agencies, organisations and communities and build resilience through those connections, to help facilitate Whole Society Resilience in Cleveland, and the workshop would also raise awareness of the LRF and its role.
- 3.4 The workshop was organised as an attempt to engage various organisations / Voluntary Community Sector (VCS) community groups and agencies in Cleveland area. A targeted and selective approach was implemented to ensure representation from groups not currently engaged with LRF and Community Resilience Group. We wanted to bring a variety of structured VCS groups and community groups and leads to the event. In doing this we hoped some of the attendees from the organisations and VCS groups could be followed up to see if they could be future potential partners and could contribute/collaborate skills and resources to build resilience in their communities.
- 3.5 The aim of the workshop was to identify issues around resilience in the Cleveland area, by encouraging the attendees to discuss and share ideas, learning and their experiences/perspective of their communities.
- 3.6 When planning the agenda for the session it was decided to link Resilience to current issues faced by most communities – in the whole society resilience sense as opposed to a specific risk e.g. flooding or the risk from COMAH (industrial incidents).
- 3.7 The workshop was facilitated by Academics (Prof Neil Denton (Durham) and Dr Ed Rollason (Northumbria University) both practitioner academics working in resilience and the theme linked to current issues which have affected communities and are regarded as high on the agenda (i.e. Post Covid, Cost of Living crisis).
- 3.8 The responses and discussions, generated from the activities in the session were recorded by the attendees onto flipcharts and all responses collected and collated at the end of the session for a thematic analysis.
- 3.9 The key message from both the academics and the attendees was the value for resilience in building networks regardless of initial / primary focus, (backed up by independent research e.g. Fukushima) – simplified the more connections communities have the more resilient the communities become.

***Fostering connections, building and sustaining relationships is the basis of developing community resilience – not the subject which initially draws people together.***

- 3.10 Feedback from the event was mainly positive, and encouraging. The event was well received by attendees as it facilitated connection and discussions amongst attendees from several organisations. It was also encouraging to note, most attendees would like to see more of these events and requested follow up learning/report from this workshop.

#### 4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 Given the event feedback, and the evidence base of the value of building networks and engagement of partners, it is proposed that this style of workshop is offered by the LRF 3 times per year rotating between boroughs. Each session will have a key theme or focus.

The following recommendations have been presented to the LRF:

**Recommendation 1:** Further Community Resilience workshops and events to be supported by the LRF to enable community groups, VCS and agencies to network and develop connections and ways of working together

**Recommendation 2:** As part of the workshops explore ways of proportionality sharing information of the role of LRF and its members and how/what support available to VCS/community groups.

**Recommendation 3:** The future of the LRF Community Resilience Group be considered, potentially becoming a steering group focused around the development of the workshops rather than a standing group and recommendations made to Strategic Board.

**Recommendation 4:** Agencies wishing to get involved contact / establish links to the LRF Community Resilience Officer

#### 5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Within the framework there is significant potential for change, including the structure and role of the LRF, accountability which may impact on the existing structure and means of delivery.

#### 6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 There are no financial considerations relating to this report. Costs relating to this work are covered by the LRF Pilot funding.

#### 7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The key legislation is the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 which identifies the local authorities as a Category 1 responder, section 10 of the CCA 2004 identifies failure by a person or body identified within the legislation may bring proceedings in the High Court.

**8. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY**

8.1 There are no child and family poverty implications relating to this report.

**9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 There are no equality and diversity considerations relating to this report.

**10. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

10.1 There are no staff considerations relating to this report.

**11. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

11.1 There are no asset management considerations relating to this report.

**12. RECOMMENDATIONS**

12.1 That members make themselves aware of the work being undertaken on developing community resilience and consider engagement with the workshops and the identification of key themes and attendees.

**13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

13.1 To ensure that members of the EPJC can effectively obtain assurance that the duties and expectations on the local authorities can be met in the event of an incident.

13.2 To ensure that members are sighted on the change of direction and the rationale for widening the scope of community resilience activity.

**14. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None presented.

**15. CONTACT OFFICER**

Stuart Marshall  
Chief Emergency Planning officer  
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit  
Tel 01642 301515  
Email: [stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk)

# EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

28 April, 2023



**Report of:** Chief Emergency Planning Officer

**Subject:** INCIDENT REPORT  
(5<sup>th</sup> November 2022 – 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023)

---

## 1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

For information and assurance.

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 To assist members of the Emergency Planning Joint Committee (EPJC) in overseeing the performance and effectiveness of the Emergency Planning Unit and its value to the four unitary authorities.
- 2.2 To inform members of the EPJC of the incidents reported and responded to by the Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit (CEPU). The report covers the period from 5<sup>th</sup> November 2022 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 CEPU provides both a 24 hour point of contact for partners requesting assistance, and for the provision of tactical advice to the four local authorities.
- 3.2 There are a number of mechanisms in place to ensure that CEPU are made aware of incidents both in and out of normal office hours, these include protocols with the emergency services and early warning systems with industry and agencies for example warnings from the Met Office, Environment Agency and communications chains with local industry.
- 3.3 Appendix 1 lists the incidents that staff have been involved in or notified of.
- 3.4 A number of these incidents have been followed up with multi-agency debriefs the learning from which is shared with agencies and where appropriate actioned via the Local Resilience Forum / agencies internal procedures. On occasion lessons are shared nationally on the Joint Organisational Learning platform.

**4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 Members familiarise themselves with the range of incidents that have occurred with a view to seeking additional detail if required.

**5. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Failure to respond appropriately may result in impacts on the social, economic and environmental welfare of the community.

**6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 There are no financial considerations relating to this report.

**7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The key legislation is the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 which identifies the local authorities as a Category 1 responder, section 10 of the CCA 2004 identifies failure by a person or body identified within the legislation may bring proceedings in the High Court.
- 7.2 In addition a number of actions relate to the Control of Major Accident Hazard Regulations 2015, Radiation Emergency Preparedness Public Information Regulations 2019 and Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996. All of the above place statutory duties upon the local authority, failure to provide to an adequate level resulting in possible enforcement.

**8. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY**

- 8.1 There are no child and family poverty implications relating to this report.

**9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no equality and diversity considerations relating to this report.

**10. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no staff considerations relating to this report.

**11. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

- 11.1 There are no asset management considerations relating to this report.

**12. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 It is recommended that members of the EPJC note the areas of work undertaken and seek further clarification as appropriate from the Chief Emergency Planning Officer.

**13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 13.1 To ensure that members of the EPJC can effectively obtain assurance that the duties and expectations on the local authorities can be met in the event of an incident.

**14. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No Background papers.

**15. CONTACT OFFICER**

Stuart Marshall  
Chief Emergency Planning Officer  
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit  
Tel 01642 301515  
Email: [stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk)

**Appendix 1 Incidents of note 5<sup>th</sup> November 2022 – 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023**

Date	Borough	Location	Type of incident	Additional Information
06/11/2022	Middlesbrough	Linthorpe Road	Fire	Fire in Sheltered accommodation
24/11/2022	Hartlepool	Venator	On site incident	Onsite arrangements activated, external services alerted.
24/11/2022	Redcar & Cleveland	Wilton	Industrial	Boiler explosion Wilton
29/11/2022	Redcar & Cleveland	Moordale Court, Fabian Road	Flooding	Flooding in flat 10 leading to severe flooding in communal areas which resulted in power having to be isolated
30/11/2022	Middlesbrough	Ormesby High Street	Flooding	Mechanical damage to major water pipe junction leaving to severe flooding of the carriageway and nearby bungalows. Later also realised that water was knocked off to a large number of properties
12/12/2022	Redcar & Cleveland	Care Home low farm drive	Fire	Fire in residential flats / rooms two evacuated
17/12/2022	Stockton-On-Tees	Roseberry Road, Billingham,	RTC Structure	Car crashed into flat request structural engineer unable to source
11/01/2023	Hartlepool	Power Station	Fire	Fire in reactor hall
16/01/2023	Stockton-On-Tees	Preston Farm Industrial Estate	Toxic release	Ammonia leak at tanker depot
18/01/2023	Middlesbrough	Northgate Road	Flooding	Internal flooding (burst pipe) to one property
23/01/2023	Redcar & Cleveland	Cleveland Street Liverton Mines	RTC Structure	RTC causing damage to gas pipe (potential evacuation 100 properties, not required following assessment).
24/01/2023	Redcar & Cleveland	Scot Street Redcar	RTC Structure	RTC causing damage to house