Wednesday 1 December 2021

10.00 am

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

A limited number of members of the public will be able to attend the meeting with spaces being available on a first come, first served basis. Those wishing to attend the meeting should phone (01429) 523568 or (01429) 523019 by midday on Tuesday 30 November and name and address details will be taken for NHS Test and Trace purposes.

You should not attend the meeting if you are required to self-isolate of are displaying any COVID-19 symptoms such as (a high temperature, new and persistent cough, or a loss of/change in sense of taste or smell), even if these symptoms are mild. If you, or anyone you live with, have one or more of these symptoms you should follow the NHS guidance on testing.

MEMBERS: EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE:-

Hartlepool Borough Council: Councillor Cameron Stokell.

Middlesbrough Borough Council: Councillor Eric Palano.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council: Councillor Julie Craig.

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 10 September 2021 (previously published and circulated).



4. ITEMS FOR DECISION / INFORMATION

- 4.1 Financial Management Update Report *Director of Resources and Development and Chief Emergency Planning Officer*
- 4.2 Activity Report Chief Emergency Planning Officer
- 4.3 Key themes in the response to the call for evidence *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*
- 4.4 Incident Report (14th August 12th November 2021) *Chief Emergency Planning Officer*

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday 2 March 2022 commencing at 10.00 am at Emergency Planning Annex, Stockton Police Station







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 October, 2021 for current financial year ending 31st March, 2022.

2. FORECAST OUTTURN

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

Table 1 – 2021/22 Forecast as at 31st October, 2021

	Budget	Latest Forecast	Projected Outturn Variance Adverse/ (Favourable)
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Main Emergency Planning Budget			
Direct Costs - Employees	324	316	(8)
Direct Costs - Other	107	108	1
Income	(431)	(431)	(7)
Net Position Before Use of Reserves	0	(7)	(7)
Transfer To/(From) Reserves	0	7	7
Net Position After Use of Reserves	0	0	0

2.2 The main reasons for the overall favourable variance are savings in pension scheme contributions as a result of employees opting out.

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

Table 2 - 2021/22 LRF Forecast as at 31st October, 2021

	Budget	Latest Forecast £'000	Projected Outturn Variance Adverse/ (Favourable)
Direct Costs - Employees	76	76	0
Direct Costs – Other	177	77	(100)
Income	(45)	(43)	2
Pilot Grant	(208)	(208)	0)
Net Position Before Use of Reserves	0	(98)	(98)
Carry forward grant funding to 2022/23	0	98	98
Net Position After Use of Reserves	0	0	0

- 2.4 The budget includes the LRF Pilot Funding grant of £208,000, which is a Section 31 non ring fenced grant awarded by the MHCLG 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 reflects the expectation that a £100,000 of the grant will be spent in the next financial year and therefore transferred into an earmarked reserve at year end.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 To note the latest financial forecast for 2021/22.

4. BACKGROUND PAPERS

4.1 None.

4.2 CONTACT OFFICER

Stuart Marshall Chief Emergency Planning officer Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit Tel 01642 301515

Email: stuart.marshall@hartlepool.gov.uk

Chris Little
Director of Resources and Development

Tel: 01429 523003

Email: chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk

1st December 2021



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 September the CEPU undertakes an annual action plan identifying key areas of work to be undertaken in 2021-22 by CEPU.
- 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 emergencies¹ revised and re-issued 2018, whilst non-statutory they are critical to resilience.
- 3.4 A summary of progress made against the action plan presented at the previous meeting is outlined below. Work is progressing despite the ongoing support to the Covid response, with a number of key areas (22) of work now complete.

_

Table 1: Progress against CEPU action plan in period

Task Status	Count September	% September	Count November	% November
Yet to start	23	35%	14	21%
Ongoing	32	48%	30	45%
Complete	11	17%	22	33%

Table 2: Overview of CEPU action by area

Activity	Complete	Ongoin	Yet to	Grand
Activity CERL Internal Functions and wave	Complete	g	start	Total
CEPU Internal Functions and ways				_
of working post Covid		2	3	5
Community Resilience including the				
voluntary sector		2	2	4
Event Support	1	4		5
Financial Control	3			3
Industrial Emergency Planning	6	3	3	12
ITC / Cyber planning		1		1
Local authority resilience	2	6	3	11
Plans and procedures	1	2		3
Risk Assessment		3	1	4
Support, review and development of				
the LRF	3	3	1	7
Training and exercising	5	3		8
Warn and inform	1	1	1	3
Grand Total	22	30	14	66

- 3.5 Significant areas of work completed in period include:
 - 1) The refining of major incident plans to adapt learning from the response to Covid, especially with regards to remote management of incidents and incorporation of these new models into procedures.
 - 2) Significant work undertaken to review the current status against the Non-Statutory resilient standards.
 - 3) Review of key learning points and recommendations from exercises, ensuring that actions identified have been implemented and ensuring a robust management system including escalation routes.
- 3.6 Staff continue to work effectively despite the challenges of Covid and ongoing requirement for social distancing impacting on a number of work areas. As previous contingencies are in place to ensure that officers can

attend command centres in person should it be required. Adaptions have included the instigation of greater use of remote technologies to deliver work that was previously undertaken in person. The situation is under constant review and the Unit remains in regular dialogue with statutory bodies to ensure continued compliance with statutory legislation (e.g. that requiring testing under the Control of Major Accident Hazard Legislation).

- 3.7 During period one senior emergency planning officer has accepted a post elsewhere with a national agency, recruitment to fill the vacant post with a suitable qualified and experienced replacement is underway.
- 3.8 The unit continues to support the Local Resilience Forum with key work in period including:
 - 1) Provision of a range of online training events and seminars
 - 2) Facilitating a full review of evidence against the resilient standards
 - 3) The collation of training and exercising needs across the partnership
 - 4) Leading on the development of a new stream of work developing a greater understanding of capability analysis against common consequences from a range of risks
 - 5) Ongoing provision of evidence to the support for both Governmental and independent resilience reviews
 - Development of a community resilience strategy for consideration by LRF Strategic Board
 - 7) Leading on the LRF pilot funding projects
 - 8) Research and implementation of notification and activation systems

4. PROPOSALS

4.1 That the Chief Emergency Planning Officer continues to provide quarterly updates and additional information as requested by EPJC members.

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.
- 5.2 There are a significant number of unknowns outside the control of CEPU / local partners that may impact on delivery (e.g. the ability to undertake face to face training, further waves of Covid, new variants, etc.).

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

1st December, 2021



Report of: Chief Emergency Planning Officer

Subject: Key themes in the response to the call for evidence

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 ongoing dialogue and activities to support the national resilience review being led by HM Government.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 In the paper "Global Britain in a Competitive Age: the Integrated Review of Security, Defence, Development and Foreign Policy" significant attention was payed to the future and changing demands of ensuring the UK is resilient. Subsequently an open call for evidence was made to shape the National Resilience Strategy with the following themes:
 - Risk and Resilience
 - Responsibilities and Accountability
 - Partnerships
 - Community
 - Investment
 - Resilience in an Interconnected World
- The evidence will also feed into the scheduled review of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.
- 3.3 As a LRF a number of discussions were held and evidence submitted, the following section outlines the key themes from the membership. It is

-

¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/global-britain-in-a-competitive-age-the-integrated-review-of-security-defence-development-and-foreign-policy

² https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/national-resilience-strategy-call-for-evidence

- anticipated that feedback will be received in 2022 with both any changes to legislation and a national resilience strategy being produced.
- On release an impact assessment and action plan will be produced in conjunction with the LRF and shared with this committee.

4. KEY THEMES

- 4.1 Recognition of the amount of duplication between the 38 Local Resilience forums and a desire for greater coordination between areas and work strands, including through the use of centrally managed tools and feedback loops.
- 4.2 A greater clarity on the expectation on Local Resilience Forums and appropriate funding model following a significant increase in expectation and utilisation during Covdi19 where there was an expectation on LRFs to act as response body as oppose to the previous purely planning function.
- 4.3 A greater role for challenge and accountability including a desire for greater transparency and potentially structured peer assessments and a common model of providing oversight to elected representatives.
- 4.4 Greater consideration of the critical role that communities and individuals can play in building resilience and the LRF role in facilitating this, supported national structures.
- 4.5 Increased recognition of agencies and organisations not currently identified as Category 1 or 2 responders yet who have a critical role to play in building resilience and responding to incidents.
- 4.6 The need to better understand the relationship between concurrent risks (both chronic and acute) and impacts across increasingly complex systems including just in time delivery models.
- 4.7 The need for increased professional development in the field of resilience drawing on both practitioners and academics, including review of international models of delivery.
- 4.8 The limitations of the current legislation such as the lack of clear responsibility on HM Government, limited ability to prevent, role of the LRF and duties relating to the promotion of business continuity.
- 4.9 The recognition that whilst there is always opportunity to improve, the UK generally has effective doctrine and legislation that has been shown to be flexible and adaptable to a wide range of current and emerging resilience challenges.

5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Failure to have effective legislation and supporting processes suitable for the Cleveland area will be at detriment to the local community, environment and business.
- 5.2 A significant change to legislation and expectation may require restructuring and resourcing of local civil resilience arrangements.

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. Any changes to this legislation may impact on the work of the Local Resilience Forum and member agencies.

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. When further information is received consideration can be undertaken.

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

11.1 There are no asset management considerations relating to this report. When further information is received consideration can be undertaken.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 It is recommended that members of the EPJC note the ongoing review of resilience being undertaken nationally and receive an update report on the implications of any changes in due course.

13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

13.1 To ensure that members of the EPJC are aware of the potential changes at a national level due to the review of legislation and call for evidence and the potential for implications at a local level.

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

1st December, 2021



Report of: Chief Emergency Planning Officer

Subject: INCIDENT REPORT

(14th August – 12th November 2021)

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 between the 14th August 12th November 2021.

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.
- An outline of incidents that staff have been involved in or notified of are contained in **Appendix 1**.

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.
- 5.2 It is worthy of note that the ongoing response to Covid, and the associated risks of transmission, complicate a number existing protocols (e.g. evacuation and temporary accommodation), but that measures have been taken to amend guidance and plans to accommodate these risks.

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

Appendix 1 Incidents of note 14th August – 12th November 2021

Date	Borough	Exact Location	Type of Incident	Additional Information
27/08/2021	Stockton-On-Tees	Bon Lea Industrial Estate	Fire	No notification to CEPU
25/09/2021	Stockton-On-Tees	A689 between Billingham and Wolveston Roundabouts	RTC	Spillage of non-hazardous agricultural product from Tanker, product did not escape to drains and posed no public health risk.
27/09/2021	All Boroughs	Fuel disruption	Potentially disruptive event	Following reported shortages of fuel, an increase in public demand saw a significant increase of activity at forecourts. Fortunately the Cleveland area was less impacted by elsewhere with only a limited period of disruption / concern.
05/10/2021	Hartlepool	Hartlepool Power Sation	Fire	Fire on lift motor, resolved quickly no impact / declaration
05/10/2021	Redcar & Cleveland	River Tees	Pollution	Leak of oil from land based source to Tees
27/10/2021	All Boroughs	North Sea Coast	Unclassified	Reports of significant numbers of dead crustaceans washed up on the coast line, no LRF action undertaken once assurance reference coordination by other agencies confirmed.
07/11/2021	Hartlepool	Station Lane TS25 5DR	Fire	20 Property's on Billsdale Road evacuated following concern of cylinder impacted by fire.