



# INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER AND OFFICER DELEGATED DECISIONS WEDNESDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 2024

Please find enclosed Decision Notice in connection with the following:

## ICMD25 EMERGENCY RESPONSE - WASTE REMOVAL AT FORMER SUPASKIPS SITE, LANCASTER (Pages 2 - 8)

Please note that call-in has been waived on this decision and it may be implemented with immediate effect.

## **Queries regarding these documents**

Please contact Liz Bateson, Democratic Support - email ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk.

Democratic Support, Town Hall, Dalton Square, Lancaster, LA1 1PJ

Published on WEDNESDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 2024



## EXECUTIVE DECISIONS TAKEN BY CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER NOTICE OF DECISION

TITLE OF DECISION: EMERGENCY RESPONSE - WASTE REMOVAL AT FORMER SUPASKIPS SITE,  LANCASTER				
NAME OF DECISION TAKER:	COUNCILLOR PHILLIP BLACK			
POSITION AND RESPONSIBILITY HELD:	LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE, COMMUNITY RESILIENCE AND RECOVERY			
CONTACT OFFICER:	MARK CASSIDY			
TELEPHONE:	01524 582390			
E-MAIL:	mcassidy@lancaster.gov.uk			

#### **Details of Decision:**

To provide a further contribution from the Council's reserves of up to £500,000 to conclude the removal of waste at the SupaSkips site, as part of the continuing emergency response.

#### Reasons for the decision:

Following the fire at the above site on 3 December 2023, Lancaster City Council provided structural engineer, ancillary building demolition, waste testing/removal and site security support via two tranches of financial contribution. The first contribution amounted to £262k, and a second contribution was for £650k, thus totalling £912k.

The contractors have removed approximately 5,000 tonnes of waste to date. 3,000 tonnes of waste remains either within the main building or within the adjacent site compound. This waste requires testing and disposal to prevent further fire risk and associated environmental nuisance during the warmer months (odour).

A contribution from the Environment Agency of £65k has now been received, which will initially assist with more permanent site boundary fencing. However there are no further funds currently being provided from any other partners, including Government, to assist with completing the work. A request for the waiving of Landfill Tax to HMRC has been refused, due to there being no available mechanism to facilitate the City Council's request.

## IS THE DECISION URGENT

#### YES

The decision is considered urgent because Landfill Tax costs will rise nationally from 1 April 2024, and this will further add to the costs of waste disposal.

The work to remove the remaining waste has been estimated, by the contractor, to take 3 weeks. Should the City Council agree to use reserves again to fund the remaining work, then a start on site as early as possible would limit the possibility of work continuing beyond the 1 April date.



Promoting City, Coast & Countryside

I CAN CONFIRM THAT THIS DECISION IS URGENT AS ANY DELAY LIKELY TO BE CAUSED BY THE CALL-IN PROCESS WOULD SERIOUSLY PREJUDICE THE COUNCIL'S OR THE PUBLIC INTERESTS AND THEREFORE IS NOT SUBJECT TO CALL-IN. THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HAS BEEN CONSULTED. I HEREBY AGREE BOTH THAT THE DECISION PROPOSED IS REASONABLE, IN ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES, AND TO IT BEING TREATED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HAS BEEN CONSULTED. I HEREBY AGREE BOTH THAT THE DECISION PROPOSED IS REASONABLE, IN ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES, AND TO IT BEING TREATED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY						
SIGNED:						
Merland						
CHIEF EXECUTIVE						
I confirm that I have taken account of the options proposed by officers, the various implications set out in the report and the comments of the Monitoring and Section 151 Officers and am authorising the decision as set out above.						
SIGNATURE OF DECISION TAKER:	: Cllr Philli	p Black				
DATE:	27.2.24	27.2.24				
THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY DEMOCRATIC SERVICES REF NO. ICMD25						
DATE DECISION 27.2.24		IMPLEMENTATION DATE IMMEDIATE – CALL-IN WAIVED				
DATE DECISION PUBLISHED: 28.2.24						



# Emergency Response – Waste Removal at Former SupaSkips Site, Lancaster

## **Individual Cabinet Member Decision (ICMD)**

## Report of Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
The report considers the options regarding the removal of waste at the former SupaSkips site in Lancaster.				
Key Decision Non-Key D	ecision		Referral from Cabinet Member	
Date of notice of forthcoming key decision	Decision taken under the agreement of the	er Ru e Cha	lle 15 Special Urgency follovair of Overview & Scrutiny.	wing

## **RECOMMENDATIONS OF Councillor Phillip Black**

(1) To provide a further contribution from the City Council's reserves of up to £500,000, to conclude the removal of waste at the above site as part of the continuing emergency response.

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lancaster City Council has been providing direct support and financial assistance in response to the declared major emergency at the former SupaSkips site in Lancaster.
- 1.2 The site caught fire in the early hours of 3 December 2023, and a multi-agency response was immediately established. A Tactical Coordination Group (TCG) and Strategic Coordination Group (SCG) was set up to consider strategy and to address any escalating or changing events. These group meetings took place daily throughout early and mid-December and have been continuing since on a regular basis.
- 1.3 The Group meetings have been successful in terms of agreement of the initial response (to suppress the fire), and in terms of identifying the level of direct intervention necessary to move towards a more aggressive firefighting approach. This intervention involved the demolition of ancillary outbuildings that were obstructing the firefighting effort; the removal of approximately 1,500 tonnes of unburnt waste from the site; and the testing and removal of ignited waste from the site to landfill. In total approximately 5,000 tonnes of waste have been removed to date.
- 1.4 It is via the SCG Group and other more direct forms of dialogue that requests for additional funding from other partners have been sought to assist with mitigating the

financial burden of this incident. With the exception of the Environment Agency (a contribution of £65,000), no other contributions from partners, including Government, have been forthcoming. A request to waive Landfill Tax was rejected by HMRC due to there being no available mechanism for such a waiver. Conversations to seek a contribution to the Council's costs from Government continue at the very highest level. At the time of writing this report no decision from Government has been forthcoming.

## 2.0 The Response of Lancaster City Council

- 2.1 Lancaster City Council has no direct obligation to fund the emergency intervention works. It chose to do so because of the disruptive impacts that the fire was having on local residents and businesses. Without intervention from the City Council, there was a possibility that the fire would have burned continually for 3-6 months. Such a prolonged fire would have had a far greater impact upon business adjacent to the site and may also have necessitated the evacuation of local residents from their houses during the lead-up to the Christmas period.
- 2.2 The City Council initially contributed £262,000 from its reserves to facilitate the first phase of the emergency work. All works were agreed as part of the multi-agency meetings and following direction from Lancashire Fire and Service. A second phase of work costing up to £650,000 was agreed by the City Council later in December. The total committed contribution to date therefore is £912,000.
- 2.3 The City's contribution cannot be under-estimated both in monetary terms and in terms of real-life impact. The plumes of smoke that were causing distress and nuisance to residents and businesses was brought under control quicker; the piles of unburnt waste were removed before they could lead to a further deterioration of living conditions; and the visual and environment impact caused by rotting waste has been alleviated, although not yet eradicated.
- 2.4 Based on the potential of ongoing health risks, the advice to partners at the height of the blaze in December was that if the fire was left to its own course, there was a realistic possibility of the nuisance/hazard escalating into health risks relating to poor air quality for local residents and businesses. Therefore, the SCG was advised to take steps to create access to the seat of the fire which in turn would improve the chances of extinguishing the blaze. This is in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Act.
- 2.5 In practical terms creating access to the seat of the blaze to allow the Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service to quickly extinguish the fire requires removal of the waste from the site. This will avoid deep-seated pockets of heat igniting. With the exception of a smaller contribution from the Environment Agency, the only partner willing to cover the substantial costs of removal and disposal of the waste has been Lancaster City Council.
- 2.6 The Council fundamentally believes that it should not have to continue to foot the bill for safeguarding our local communities from the devastating impacts of the fire at this privately-owned site. Local authority finances are already seriously stretched, and a further contribution would place additional pressure on the authority's budget.
- 2.7 Efforts to seek contributions from Government and other partners will continue.

## 3.0 Community Engagement

- 3.1 Despite the urgency required for this decision (caused by the increase in Landfill Tax due on 1 April 2024), it would still seem to be an appropriate juncture to consult district residents, including the local community, regarding any decision to contribute further to the emergency works.
- 3.2 The Council established a residents' survey was established to gauge public opinion. In addition, a public drop-in event took place at Lancaster Cricket and Sports Club on Thursday 22 February from 1700-1900.
- 3.3 There was no clear definitive view arising from the survey as to which option (see 4.1, below) should be pursued. Those who were of the view that activity should be paused tended to be concerned regarding the financial implications of the decision. Those who considered that the work should be completed referenced the potential for fire risk and odour nuisance. Both groups were concerned that the operator of the site was not financing the waste removal. Those who attended the drop-in event were advised that the Environment Agency continue to pursue two separate prosecutions in respect of the site.

## 4.0 Options and Options Analysis

4.1 In the (current) absence of any significant secured contributions from elsewhere, the decision for the City Council is the same as the one that it faced in December, to either wait for contributions from elsewhere, or to deliver public funding to complete the work.

	Option A: Pause site activity until funding from elsewhere is secured	Option B: Public funding is provided by the City Council (if no other funding contribution is forthcoming)
Advantages	There would be no further financial burden on Lancaster City Council	Removing the remaining waste would also take away any further risk of the fire reoccurring.
Disadvantages	While the blaze is contained for now is likely that pockets of fire will contint to be found and these have the pote escalate further. Other environmentanuisance (odour) will occur in the warmer months.	from other agencies, including the Government, will continue, given the
Risks	Risks of increased fire risk and odou nuisance arising from an unresolved incident. Risk of wider reputational damage irrespective of the financial contribution made to date.	•

## 5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

The preferred option is Option B. There are still approximately 3,000 tonnes of waste remaining at the

site. This waste will require testing before disposal to landfill, and payment of Landfill Tax. The estimated (current) cost is, with a contingency, £500,000.

#### 6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The City Council is, yet again, in an unenviable position caused by the absence of funding from other partners. The preferred option above to intervene again to safeguard the amenity of our local residents and business community is a responsible course of action despite the financial burden it places on the authority.
- 6.2 A decision to contribute *up to* £500,000 does not preclude the continuation of efforts to source other funding to more proportionately share the burden of the costs of removing the waste from the site.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK**

The contribution to fund the remaining waste removal links to the following Council priorities:

- Social use of resources benefitting local communities.
- Community Engagement ensuring that the local community is involved and connected.
- Early intervention focusing on early intervention and involving our communities in project delivery
- Partnership working in partnership with residents and partners (such as Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service) to build a powerful force serving our district.
- Listening and Empathy listening to our communities
- Openness Making responsible decisions which support our ambitions for the district whilst being open, accountable and rooted in evidence.
- Increasing the amount of sustainable energy produced in the district and decreasing the district's energy use.

#### **CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, HR, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

The preferred option would help safeguard the amenity of local residents and businesses and bring the emergency incident to a swifter conclusion.

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Legal services to be consulted on statutory basis for works and possible cost recovery.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As stated in the report, the Council have currently committed £912,000 from unallocated reserves to contribute to the initial stages of building clearance and demolition. Whilst efforts are being made by Members and Officers to reduce this amount via government aid or contributions from other key partners, only one substantial pledge (£65,000) has been received.

Whilst Option A has currently no direct financial implications, the preferred option within this report, Option B requests a further £500,000 (estimated including contingency) to be committed from unallocated reserves. This would inevitably place further pressures on the council's budget. For information the latest projections as considered by Cabinet on 20<sup>th</sup>

February 2024 include the 2023/24 closing balance of the unallocated reserves to be £8.620M which is £3.620M above the minimum recommended level.

## OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Aside from the further financial intervention, there is continued cost in terms of officer time across a number of city council areas including emergency planning, building control, legal, finance, community engagement. However, these teams would continue to be actively involved in this case regardless of the options presented in the report.

## **SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add to those already provided within the financial implications.

## **MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments to add.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS** 

None

Contact Officer: Mark Cassidy Telephone: 01524 582390

E-mail: mcassidy@lancaster.gov.uk