

**Risk Supporting Statement: SR11**

**Risk Owner: Director of Open Spaces / City Surveyor**

<b>Risk</b>	Major flooding caused as a result of pond embankment failure at Hampstead Heath.	<b>Gross Risk</b>	<b>R</b>
	<b>Links to: Strategic Aim SA3 and Key Policy Priority KPP4</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Impact</b>
		3	5
<b>Detail</b>	<p>If there were to be failure of the pond embankments during a major storm, and no warning was given, the number of lives at risk on the Hampstead chain would be in the region of 400 and on the Highgate chain would be around 1000. This would also result in inundation and damage to local properties, roads and the railway lines towards Kings Cross. Detailed analysis has identified that dam crests are not currently able to cope with the level of overtopping expected to occur as a result of such a storm, increasing the risk of erosion and dam failure. The City of London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2012 with new surface water modelling identified 4 areas of risk in the City from upstream run-off (including Hampstead Heath).</p>		
<b>Issues</b>		<b>Controls</b>	
* Insufficient warning given of flooding		* Telemetry system installed and managed by the City Surveyor as an integral part of the on-site Emergency Action Plan for reservoir dam incidents enabling early warning where pre-determined water levels at key ponds in both the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds are breached. Successful testing of this with the emergency plan and Hampstead staff has happened. <b>(City Surveyor/Director of Open Spaces)</b>	
* Inadequate response to dam overtopping		* Emergency Action Plan for on-site response is in place and Camden have an off-site plan in place Liaison with Camden Council's emergency planners is on going, to work through issues raised by Emergency Services and to appraise them of revisions to our work plan as it develops. <b>(City Surveyor/Director of Open Spaces)</b>	

\* Sensitivities of the local community regarding the natural aspect of the Heath

\* The City continues to undertake extensive consultation with local stakeholders about why this public safety project is required. The established Ponds Project Stakeholder Group continues to meet regularly to enable key groups to contribute to the detailed design of the scheme working with the Strategic Landscape Architect appointed to champion the landscape. Both the statutory Consultative and Management Committees have met regularly to develop their understanding of the project and responded to documents provided by the design team. **(City Surveyor)**  
\* When the preferred design options are developed, wider public consultation may produce new issues, not yet anticipated by the Project Board **(Director of Open Spaces)**  
There remains a potential risk for Judicial Review. This is most likely to arise in relation to the City's need to adhere to current Guidance that sets standards for dams that is opposed by certain Groups/individuals.

<p>* Non delivery of project to upgrade pond embankments (includes slippage from agreed timetable and budget)</p> <p>* Responsibilities and implications for adjacent landowners</p>	<p>* The City Surveyor's Department has appointed a specialist consultants (Atkins) to undertake a review of the current risk of flooding based on storm predictions and based upon that assessment they are preparing a number of options to mitigate this risk for consideration by the CoL. The final agreed option will form the basis of a planning application planned for June 2014. The revised programme of activities and actions have been agreed by members and supported by the independent Panel Engineer which will allow formal consultation with the public and stakeholders with intent of submitting a formal planning application by June 2014 and subject to consents, site works to commence early 2015. Project approved by CoL and progressing to Gateway 5 <b>(City Surveyor)</b></p> <p>* Discussion with adjacent landowners has commenced, regarding their liabilities and seeking to clarify responsibilities. A report will be presented, once negotiations have progressed. . <b>(City Surveyor)</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The project to upgrade the pond embankments is progressing, but until such time that this project is completed (2015/16) there remains a risk if the dams are breached the water normally stored in the ponds will also be released and combine with the flood water – very quickly and in a completely uncontrolled way – with risk to life and property downstream. Responsibility for the delivery of this project rests with the City Surveyor and in relation to the City's reputation, day to day management of the ponds and the community welfare aspects of this risk lies with the Director of Open Spaces.</p>	<p><b>Net Risk</b></p>	<p><b>R</b></p>
	<p><b>Likelihood</b></p>	<p><b>Impact</b></p>
	<p>3</p>	<p>5</p>
	<p><b>Control Evaluation</b></p>	
	<p><b>A</b></p>	

## Guidance Notes

The following notes have been prepared to assist users of this document.

<b>Risk Register Headings</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Risk No.</b>	Unique reference for the risk.
<b>Risk Details</b>	Description of the risk.
<b>Gross Risk</b>	Assessment of the risk before taking into account any existing mitigating controls, Likelihood and Impact having been assessed against the risk assessment framework.
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Officer responsible for the overall management of specific risks
<b>Control Owner</b>	Officer responsible for coordinating the activity to control the risk
<b>Existing Controls</b>	Controls in place to mitigate the risk.
<b>Net Risk</b>	Assessment of the risk having taken into account the mitigating controls in place.
<b>Risk Status &amp; Direction</b>	Overall status of Red, Amber or Green calculated in accordance with the assessment of Likelihood and Impact, having applied the risk assessment matrix.
<b>Planned Action</b>	Details of further action required to mitigate the risk to an acceptable level.
<b>Control Evaluation</b>	An assessment of the adequacy of controls in place

<b>Ratings</b>	<b>Risk Status</b>	<b>Control Evaluation</b>
<b>R</b>	High risk, requiring constant monitoring and deployment of robust control measures.	Existing controls are not satisfactory
<b>A</b>	Medium risk, requiring at least quarterly monitoring, further mitigation should be considered.	Existing controls require improvement/Mitigating controls identified but not yet implemented fully
<b>G</b>	Low risk, less frequent monitoring, consideration may be given to applying less stringent control measures for efficiency gains.	Robust mitigating controls are in place with positive assurance as to their effectiveness

## Guidance Notes

## Guidance Notes

Likelihood Scores	Description
1 Rare	Robust mitigating controls in place, the risk may occur only in exceptional circumstances, (e.g. not likely to occur within a 10 year period or no more than once across the current portfolio of projects).
2 Unlikely	Adequate mitigating controls in place, the risk may occur in remote circumstances (e.g. risk may occur once within a 7-10 year period or once across a range of similar projects).
3 Possible	Reasonable mitigating controls in place, but may still require improvement. External factors may result in an inability to influence likelihood of occurrence (e.g. risk event could occur at least once over a 4-6 year period or several times across the current portfolio of projects).
4 Likely	Mitigating controls are inadequate to prevent risk from occurring, the risk may have occurred in the past (e.g. risk event could occur at least once over a 2-3 year period or several times across a range of similar projects).
5 Almost Certain	Mitigating controls do not exist or are wholly ineffective to prevent risk from occurring. The risk has occurred recently or on multiple past occasions (e.g. risk event will occur at least once per year or within a project life cycle).

Impact Scores	Description
1 Insignificant	An event where the impact can be easily absorbed without management effort.
2 Minor	Impact can be readily absorbed although some management input or diversion of resources from other activities may be required. The event would not delay or adversely affect a key operation or core business activity.
3 Moderate	An event where the impact cannot be managed under normal operating conditions, requiring some additional resource or Senior Management input or creating a minor delay to an operation or core business activity.
4 Major	Major event or serious problem requiring substantial management/Chief Officer effort and resources to rectify. Would adversely affect or significantly delay an operation and/or core business activity or result in failure to capitalise on a business opportunity.
5 Catastrophic	Critical issue causing severe disruption to the City of London, requiring almost total attention of the Leadership Team/Court of Common Council and significant effort to rectify. An operation or core business activity would not be able to go ahead if this risk materialised.