

Risk Supporting Statement: SR11

Risk Owner: Director of Open Spaces / City Surveyor

Risk	Major flooding caused as a result of pond or reservoir failures Links to: Strategic Aim SA3 and Key Policy Priority KPP4	Gross Risk	R
		Likelihood	Impact
		3	5

Detail	<p>The City is responsible for a number of water bodies, some of which are classified as “Large Raised Reservoirs” under the provisions of the Reservoirs Act 1975 and Flood & Water Management Act 2010. “Large Raised Reservoirs” currently this refers to those raised bodies of water with a capacity of more than 25,000m3. It is anticipated that this will be reduced to 10,000m3 when the provisions of the 2010 Act are fully brought into force. Those reservoirs where there is a risk to life in the event of breach, the EA can define them as “high risk” – currently 3 on Hampstead and two at Epping Eagle Pond and Highams Park but not Wanstead. It is anticipated that the full enactment of the 2010 Act will result in more of the City’s raised water bodies being categorised as “high risk” – particularly those in cascade. 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). Epping Forest dams are already subject to a section 10 notice of improvement issued by the panel engineer and works are planned to commence on site in April 2014.</p>
---------------	--

<p><u>Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Insufficient warning given of flooding * Inadequate response to dam overtopping * Sensitivities of the local community regarding the natural aspect of the Heath 	<p><u>Controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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. (City Surveyor/Director of Open Spaces) * Emergency Action Plan for on-site and off site response is in place with Camden and Waltham Forest (City Surveyor/Director of Open Spaces) * The City continues to undertake extensive consultation with local stakeholders about why these public safety projects are required. (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) <p>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 and reservoirs that is opposed by certain Groups/individuals.</p>
--	---

<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 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. with a planed start on site The appointed of contracts for Epping Forrest will take place in January 2014 to allow a start on site in April 2014. (City Surveyor)</p> <p>To be reviewed against each identified project</p>
--	--

<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>The projects to upgrade the pond and reservoir embankments is progressing, but until such time the projects 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. Day to day management of the ponds and the community welfare aspects of this risk lies with the Director of Open Spaces.</p>	<p>Net Risk</p>	<p>R</p>
	<p>Likelihood</p>	<p>Impact</p>
	<p>3</p>	<p>5</p>
	<p>Control Evaluation</p>	
	<p>A</p>	

Guidance Notes

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

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

Ratings	Risk Status	Control Evaluation
R	High risk, requiring constant monitoring and deployment of robust control measures.	Existing controls are not satisfactory
A	Medium risk, requiring at least quarterly monitoring, further mitigation should be considered.	Existing controls require improvement/Mitigating controls identified but not yet implemented fully
G	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.