

Community Services Risk Register

Ref:	Risk cause and event	Risk consequences	Risk Owner	L	I	RAG	Mitigating actions and responsibility	Status update	On corporate risk register
CS1	Inability to carry out waste collection service in line with the performance management framework. Strike action becoming more common in the industry due to current economic climate	Waste left on the street. Environmental impact. Poor reputation for Council. No alternative for residents.	Head of Environment Simon Mander	3	3	9	<p>A plan has been produced to prioritise the different types of waste collected to ensure any which may impact public health are collected first, if there is not enough staff, or other impact to the service.</p> <p>Process in place for Biffa to provide updates when staff absent levels are likely to impact on service delivery.</p>	<p>Priority of collections has been reviewed and is still fit for purpose.</p> <p>Officers are in regular contact with the Biffa contract manager regarding any staffing issues or any changes which may impact service delivery.</p>	No
CS2	Loss of Goods Vehicle Operating Licence at the depot (due to lack of resilience)	Inability to carry out cess pool services impacting on public health. Reputational impact.	Head of Environment Simon Mander	3	3	9	<p>An external company has carried out an audit and identified areas for improvement.</p> <p>An interim Transport Manager has been appointed.</p>	Risk reviewed and risk decreased.	No

CS3	Delays in monitoring council owned trees and impact of Ash dieback creates greater risk of tree falls	<p>Risk to life if procedures are not followed.</p> <p>Reputation of the Council if there are any injuries or fatalities.</p> <p>Legal implications if Council does not meet statutory obligations under the Civil Contingencies act.</p> <p>Financial implications due to damage to property / persons.</p>	Head of Environment Simon Mander	3	4	12	<p>The Council has a qualified tree officer.</p> <p>The Council has a Tree Management Plan which sets out which sets out the inspection regime according to high, medium, and low criteria depending on where the trees are situated. There is a planned monitoring schedule for site inspections based on their risk score.</p> <p>Actions to take The Council needs to produce woodland management plans and manage the ash dieback removal project.</p>	<p>The Council has struggled with the continuous employment of a Tree Officer, which has led to fewer inspections, resulting in a backlog of inspections. This has been challenging to catch up on.</p> <p>Currently there are 22 high risk sites overdue their inspection. Officers will complete this as soon as is feasibly possible.</p> <p>The planned three yearly HRA tree inspection programme has been delivered.</p> <p>Work to commission woodland management consultants to produce the woodland management for the woodland estate will continue.</p>	Yes
CS4	The Council's ability to respond to a major incident	<p>Reputation of the Council.</p> <p>Legal implications if the Council don't meet statutory obligations under the Civil Contingencies act.</p> <p>Risk to life if procedures are not followed.</p>	Head of Communities Julie Porter	2	4	8	<p>Emergency Plan, Emergency Planning exercises with other LRF members, Business Continuity plans reviewed annually, Attendance at LRF meetings.</p> <p>Review of partner and internal approaches as a result of lessons learned from other authorities events. Senior staff attend regular multi-agency briefings and training.</p>	<p>Partnership working with Surrey CC to assist with training and exercises. Work plan drafted and agreed in Feb 2023. BC exercise carried out in March 2023 with EMT and July 2023 with Key Officer Forum. The Council is looking to carry out rest centre training to increase the number of staff and volunteers trained and look to carry out a rest centre exercise in 23/24 at a Community Centre in the District.</p>	No
CS5	Failure of Freedom Leisure Contract	<p>Loss of leisure facilities in the district and impact on residents' wellbeing</p> <p>Financial implications as two sites are owned by the Council.</p> <p>Reputational risk if Council seen as unsupportive. Increase in complaints to the Council from residents. Negative impact in Partnership working with Health and Community stakeholders</p>	Head of Communities Julie Porter	3	3	9	<p>A review of the current contract and financial position was carried out by an independent consultant. The findings were presented at the Community Services Committee in June 2023. A bid was submitted via Sports England for the Swimming Pool support fund to assist with the financial pressures due to the increase in energy costs. The Council were successful with this bid.</p>	<p>Energy prices have reduced slightly and cost mitigations have taken place on both sites. Regular monthly meetings continue with Freedom Leisure as well as monthly monitoring submitted to Sports England as part of the Swimming Pool support grant monitoring. Tandridge were successful with funding for both de Stafford and Tandridge Leisure. Funds are to be put towards the cost of utilities. A Leisure/Wellbeing strategy is being looked at to be published later in 2024/25 working with in Partnership with Freedom Leisure and Active Surrey. The Government launched Phase 2 of the Swimming Pool Support fund in September 23. Tandridge were not successful with this application for capital funding</p>	Yes

CS6	Failure to meet statutory requirements under the Anti-social behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. To limit the impact on victims and communities	Risk to life if partners don't report effectively. Reputational if policies and procedures are not followed. Financial cost of legal work to evict tenants if early intervention not taken	Head of Communities Julie Porter	2	4	8	Staff and Members have attended ASB training from the Head of ASB at Surrey Police. A project to review policies and procedures was launched in 2022 and will continue over the next financial year to ensure that the Council has robust procedures and reporting processes to meet statutory requirements	Monthly project highlight reports are presented to EMT on the progress of the project. IT requirements for reporting have been scoped and will be incorporated as part of the digital project.	No
CS7	Safeguarding policies and procedures not in place	Failure to fulfil responsibilities in relation to safeguarding could lead to significant harm or death of a child or vulnerable adult and the potential ensuing legal action and reputational damage for the authority. All employees must be aware of the organisation's responsibilities in relation to safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. This means being able to identify signs of concern and knowing when to share information and to report those. Appropriate response needs to be in place in the event of a Domestic Homicide Review or involvement in a Child Safeguarding Practice Review or a Safeguarding Adults Review.	Head of Communities Julie Porter	2	2	4	Policies and procedures for safeguarding in place and reviewed as appropriate - on-line referral forms in place for single point of access (CSPA) and for multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH) to track and follow up on concerns raised - all employees undertake awareness training for safeguarding and part of new employees induction and training undertaken annually - Enhanced level safeguarding training undertaken by relevant staff as identified according to their responsibilities - Annual undertaking of S11 audit from Children's safeguarding Board - Participation in audits of adult safeguarding when requested by Surrey County Council - Representation on the Surrey adult safeguarding Board, the Children's Partnership Executive Group and the Surrey wide safeguarding Children's Business Group DBS checks carried out for all new staff Procedures in place for conducting Domestic Homicide reviews	Added to risk register following audit review. Adult Safeguarding Board Self assessment in progress due to be submitted Sept 2023. New Children's Safeguarding S11 audit to begin in January 2024. All cases reported to the council are reviewed at the quarterly Safeguarding leads meeting.	

Risk matrix

Likelihood	Very Likely	4	4	8	12	16
	Likely	3	3	6	9	12
	Possible	2	2	4	6	8
	Unlikely	1	1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4	
		Low	Medium	High	Very High	
		Impact				