

Overview

The 2025/26 Local Government Finance Settlement remained a one-year arrangement, with the government reaffirming its intention to introduce multi-year settlements from 2026/27. While the government has reiterated its commitment to implementing multi-year settlements beginning in 2026/27, the government launched a consultation on local authority funding reform, aiming to implement a new funding methodology from 2026/27. This reform seeks to update the outdated funding formulas, which have not been revised since 2013/14, to better reflect current service demands and resource distribution. However, no legislative framework has yet been published to provide assurance or clarity on future funding models.

For local authorities like North Norfolk District Council, the absence of a multi-year financial framework hampers medium to long-term financial planning, investment in services, and strategic workforce management.

In February 2025, the government announced that Norfolk and Suffolk would be part of the devolution priority programme, aiming to reorganise the existing two-tier local government structure into unitary authorities. This restructuring could lead to the abolition of district councils, including NNDC, and the establishment of new governance arrangements

The highest risks are all ones where, among other factors, having sufficient funding in place is critical to reducing the level of risk. These include delivery of Net Zero targets, and the delivery of the Domestic Food Waste Collection.

The Corporate Leadership Team propose the inclusion CR043 - Introduction of Domestic Food Waste Collection. The introduction of mandatory weekly food waste collections, as required under the amended Environment Act 2021 and aligned with the Simpler Recycling reforms, presents a corporate risk to North Norfolk District Council. The primary risk stems from the potential non-delivery of this statutory service by the government-mandated deadline of April 2026. This risk is heightened by external pressures on national supply chains, including potential delays in the procurement of specialist collection vehicles and food waste receptacles, as well as ongoing uncertainties regarding depot capacity and infrastructure readiness. If the Council's waste collection contractor, is unable to implement the new service in time, NNDC would face non-compliance with legal obligations, exposing the authority to regulatory consequences and public criticism.

Recommendations

Corporate risks to be removed from the register

CR 032 – Fakenham Roundabout

Corporate risks recommended for addition to the register

CR 043 - Introduction of Domestic Food Waste Collection

Risk Matrix

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--------|
| 5 | | | | | |
| 4 | | CR 035 | CR 008 CR 042 | CR 015 CR 034 CR 043 | |
| 3 | | CR 009 CR 037 | CR 001 CR 002 CR 013 CR 025 CR 028 CR 036 CR 039 | | CR 010 |
| 2 | CR 038 | CR 029 CR 030 CR 040 | CR 024 CR 026 | CR 041 | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| Impact | | | | | |
| Likelihood | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk Name: CR 001 Deteriorating/ underused property assets

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Opportunity: 3 Increasing the rates of occupation on all council's commercial properties | Deteriorating/ underused property assets. | 4 x 3 = 12 | Business cases for commercialisation of assets to deliver future income and efficiencies. | 3 x 3 = 9 | Production, approval and implementation of the Asset Management Plan | 2 x 2 = 4 | The Asset Management Plan is going through an internal consultation process – this is hoped to be concluded within the next Month. | Daniel King |
| | Lack of funding to repair and maintain assets and increased maintenance costs. | | Adequate budget provision both from revenue and capital to support R&M works and capital investment. | | | | | |
| | Loss of revenue / legal liability/ not achieving value for money /reputational risk/ capital commitment. | | Asset Condition Surveys. | | | | An internal audit was completed in May 2025 on Commercial Estates with the audit opinion being reasonable assurance | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary - A Financial, Secondary - H Reputational | | Compliance policies in place and up to date. | | | | | |
| | | | Compliance works undertaken in a timely fashion. | | | | | |
| | | | Adequate staff or appropriately qualified external contractor support | | | | | |

Risk Name:

CR 002 Flooding, erosion and loss of assets and delivery of services

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Greener: Coast: 3 Continuing our programme of investment in coastal and resort infrastructure and amenities, building on the progress made in recent years | Lack of ability to maintain coast defences and / or to support local coastal adaption needs. | 5 x 5 = 25 | Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | 3 x 3 = 9 | 10-year capital programme | 3 x 3 = 9 | The main constructions works Balfour Beatty have been completed however Timber Groyne repairs still to be completed. | Tamzen Pope |
| | Lack of Government funding | | Net Zero 2030 Strategy and Climate Action Plan. | | | | Urgent health and safety repairs to assets are being undertaken. Non urgent repairs are being included in the ongoing repairs and maintenance programme. | |
| | Inability to adapt to climate change - increased coastal erosion and flooding | | Shoreline Management Plan (SMP). | | | | Ongoing cliff slips and asset deterioration is being investigated and assessed and plans of action being considered. | |
| | Primary – E Strategic, Secondary - F Environmental and Social | | Repairs & Maintenance Programme. | | | | | |
| | | | Procurement practices. | | | | | |
| | | | Health & Safety checking and monitoring. | | | | | |
| | | | DEFRA funding of capital schemes. | | | | | |
| | | | Coastal Monitoring including the use of drones. | | | | | |
| | | | Control of coastal management schemes through procurement and regular checking. | | | | | |
| | | | Coastal Partnership East set up. | | | | | |
| | | | Environment Forum. | | | | | |
| | | | Health and Safety repairs as needed | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 008 Loss of Information

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 4 Ensuring that strong governance is at the heart of all we do | Council: Effective & Efficient: 4 Ensuring that strong governance is at the heart of all we do | 4 x 5 = 20 | PSN Code of Connection compliance. | 3 x 4 = 12 | Self-Assessment as part of cyber assessment framework (CAF)is being undertaken by the IT manager | 3 x 3 = 9 | Cyber security training provided for all staff. The risk is now deemed moderate and is well managed by the IT team and the Data Protection Team, taking reasonable steps to guard against and mitigate this risk. | Cara Jordan |
| | Loss of information assets. | | ICT Strategy. | → | | | IT Security Policy recently updated, and all staff required to sign that they have read and understood it. | |
| | Operational disruption, impact on customers. | | IT Security Policies. | | | | The Council has recently obtained an external IT service review which considers governance issues and recommendations which has been reviewed by CLT and recommendation within that review have been actioned where appropriate, including the appointment of a strategic IT Manager. | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary – H Reputational | | Implement data security protocols. | | | | | |
| | | | IT Monitoring. | | | | | |
| | | | Data Protection training. | | | | | |
| | | | Regular audits of IT security arrangements. | | | | | |
| | | | Regular 3rd party data protection and integrity testing. | | | | | |
| | | | Information Risk Policy and Role Description. | | | | | |
| | | | GDPR compliance Framework. | | | | | |
| | | | Certificated Security Professional Training | | | | | |
| | | | Cyber security training | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 009 Poor Procurement

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 4 Ensuring that strong governance is at the heart of all we do | Inadequate procurements | 4 x 3 = 12 | Procurement Strategy. | 2 x 3 = 6 | Implement new Procurement Act 2023 – implementation date 24 February 2025. | 2 x 2 = 4 | An audit of procurement has been carried out and recommendations implemented. New procurement act 2023 went live on 24/02/2025. The new act has not yet been fully implemented at NNDC. Due to additional workload and resource required to fully implement the new act NNDC is actively exploring alternative ways the procurement service can be delivered. Currently additional support is being provided by neighbouring authorities to ensure compliance with the new act. | Daniel King |
| | Procurement policies and procedures not followed or not fit for purpose. | | Procurement Framework. | → | Ensure compliant and effective procurement service | | | |
| | Poor Procurement - poor value for money, poor strategic and operational outcomes, legal challenge, loss of public confidence, lack of transparency | | Joint procurement protocol and opportunities for joint/ shared procurement with other authorities. | | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary – H Reputational | | Advice for external suppliers. Procurement responsibility assigned. Publish updated and complete contracts register. | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 013 Emergency Event

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Statutory obligation | These events could include those that affect the Council and its resources or an event that affects the wider district. | 3 x 4 = 12 | Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | 3 x 3 = 9 | Review of strategic level response guidance, training and exercises.- review due to be completed spring 2025 | 3 x 2 = 6 | Service managers have completed the business impact analysis and updated all business continuity plans during 2024. | Alison Sayer |
| | Any Internal or external event that has a significant impact on the Council. | | Budget Process / Budget Monitoring. | | | | | |
| | The ability of the Council to deliver services is reduced. | | Project management framework. | | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety), H Reputational | | Emergency Response & Recovery Planning. | | | | | |
| | | | Business Continuity Planning. | | | | | |
| | | | Services' Business Continuity Plans (BCP). | | | | | |
| | | | Corporate Business Continuity key role training. | | | | | |
| | | | Corporate Policies and Procedures. | | | | | |
| | | | Employment Policies. | | | | | |
| | | | Forward adverse weather guidance. | | | | | |
| | | | Emergency Response Plan | | | | | |
| | | | EH out of hours duty officer | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 015 Medium Term Financial Plan

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 1 Managing our finances and contracts robustly to ensure best value for money | Reduced funding to fund current service levels and produce a balanced budget. Use of reserves is not sustainable strategy to bridge income/ expenditure. | 4 x 5 = 20 | Reporting - New legislation and consultation. | 4 x 4 = 16 | | 3 x 3 = 9 | Balanced budget was approved in full council February 2025. Proposed savings were also approved and will be subject to in year monitoring. Finance team are actively monitoring the upcoming changes in funding for 2026/2027. There will be likely additional savings/income generating ideas needed for 2026/2027 to balance the budget, discussions are underway regarding this. | Daniel King |
| | Forecast funding reductions and shift to local financing from business rates, council tax and hew homes bonus. | | Policy Work. | | | | | |
| | Funding gaps in the medium to long term. | | Lobbying Central Government. | | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety). | | Medium Term Financial Strategy. Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | → | | | | |
| | | | Budget Process / Budget Monitoring. | | | | | |
| | | | Monitoring impact of the business rates retention. | | | | | |
| | | | Annual review of the Council's reserves. | | | | | |
| | | | Timely agreement of the annual Localised Council Tax Support Scheme. | | | | | |
| | | | Balanced budget agreed. | | | | | |
| | | | Growth forecasting models. Business cases for commercialisation of assets to deliver future income and efficiencies. Annual review of fees and charges. Monitoring of savings and additional income. | | | | | |

Risk Name:

CR 024 People Resources

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 5 Creating a culture that empowers and fosters an ambitious, motivated workforce | Failure to retain and recruit adequately trained and experienced staff | 3 x 4 = 12 | Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | 3 x 2 = 6 | Workforce and Development People Strategy has been drafted and will be approved in early 2025. A Learning and Development Strategy is being developed alongside. The aim of this strategy will be to retain current employees. | | People and Workforce Development Strategy is current at final draft stage to be submitted through the committee process in the next couple of months. New Ways of Working (Agile Working Policy Policy) has been updated but yet to be approved and launched. | Susan Sidell |
| | Employment market conditions. | | Review Pay Policy. | | Agile Working Policy | | Impacts may be felt moving forward following the announcement pre Christmas 2024 of Local Government Reorganisation and Devolution, further information maybe available in respect of this from September onwards. | |
| | Negative impact on corporate plan, business transformation, performance and delivery. | | Review relocation policy. | → | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety) | | Employee Referral Scheme. | | | | | |
| | | | Market Pay Review report. | | | | | |
| | | | Apprenticeship programme. | | | | | |
| | | | Check-in process. HR 006 New Ways of Working - Policy Creation. Updated Recruitment Guidelines for Hiring Managers and Employees. Additional information and guidance to support employees when applying for roles at NNDC. | | | | | |

Risk Name:

CR 025 Contract Failure

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|--|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 1 Managing our finances and contracts robustly to ensure best value for money | The Council has a number of contracts for service delivery. | 4 x 4 = 16 | Procurement Strategy. | 3 x 3 = 9 | | 2 x 2 = 4 | Contract Management structures are in place and regular contract management meetings and processes take place to ensure that contracts are running effectively and identify any issues which may give rise to concern. No areas of concern have been identified at this time. | Steve Hems |
| | Failure of a contractor | | Procurement Framework. | | | | | |
| | Increased costs and operational disruption. | | Joint procurement protocol and opportunities for joint/shared procurement with other authorities. | → | | | | |
| | Primary – D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety), Secondary – H Reputational | | Advice for external suppliers. Procurement Officer post established. | | | | | |

Risk Name:

CR 026 Impact of Economic fluctuations on the North Norfolk economy

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Economy: Thriving Business: 2 Providing support to allow rural businesses to thrive, recognising that many of our larger employers operate outside of our main towns | Inability of the local economy to adapt to the fluctuations. | 3 x 2 = 6 | HS 003 - Monitor the need for temporary accommodation and ensure suitable provision. | 3 x 2 = 6 | | | We completed UKSPF and REPF programmes, which brought significant opportunities for local growth. Our programme for the transitional year of UKSPF and REPF has been agreed and a new approach to business engagement has been established, which enables us to better understand business sentiment. There appears to be considerable local resilience, investment potential and optimism, however the national and global context is uncertain. | Robert Young |
| | Fluctuations in the Local, National and Global economies. | | Medium Term Financial Strategy. | | | | | |
| | Local Economic position- impact on NNDR, revenue streams, higher demand for services, business failure, increased unemployment, and deprivation. National Economic position - central government funding challenges. Global Economic position - potential negative impact on council investments resulting in reduced income. | | Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | → | | | | |
| | 4. Primary – C Credit and counterparty, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety) | | Treasury Management Strategy. | | | | | |
| | | | Fund Management advice from Arlingclose. | | | | | |
| | | | Business Survey. | | | | | |
| | | | Operation of the Council Tax Hardship Fund. | | | | | |
| | | | Economic Growth Team maintain contact with key businesses to monitor issues and provide support. | | | | | |
| | | | Economic Growth Strategy – adopted early 2024. | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 028 Governance failures

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient: 4 Ensuring that strong governance is at the heart of all we do | Lack of governance, inadequate implementation and enforcement of governance. | 3 x 4 = 12 | Corporate Planning / Service Planning. | 3 x 3 = 9 | Evaluate Improvement and assurance framework self-assessment from the LGA as a potential replacement for the Self-assessment assurance statements process. | 2 x 2 = 4 | See associated risk actions for more detail. | Cara Jordan |
| | Ignorance or non-observance of the Council's agreed governance protocols | | Clear robust corporate governance framework. Monitoring Officer actions to ensure governance risk is minimised. | ↑ | Ensuring there are sufficient staff for S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer Recruitment of new Director for Resources and S151 Officer | | | |
| | Poor or illegal decision making | | | | | | | |
| | Primary – F Environmental and Social, Secondary - H Reputational | | Section 151 Officer actions to ensure governance risk is minimised. Constitution/Standing Orders/Scheme of Delegations. Committee report templates. Member/ Officer Protocol. Operation of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Annual Governance Statement supported by assurance framework. Operation of Standards Committee. Annual Monitoring Officer Report. Head of Internal Audit assurance. Audit programme. Operation of Constitution Working Party. Annual Assurance Statements. Annual Audit Report. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 029 Poor reputation of the Council in the Community

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Effective & Efficient | <p>The Council is perceived as inefficient, unresponsive to local need and/ or not transparent.</p> <p>Related to the Council's dealings, interests and performance, and the impact of adverse outcomes.</p> <p>The Council's reputation is adversely affected, and public confidence reduced.</p> <p>Primary – H Reputational, Secondary - E Strategic.</p> | 4 x 3 = 12 | <p>Develop and Implement a Communications Strategy.</p> <p>Clear robust corporate governance framework.</p> <p>3.1.2 Review and refine our Customer Strategy.</p> <p>Training including FOI training.</p> <p>Dedicated PR & Communications Team</p> <p>Local Code of Corporate Governance</p> <p>Updating complaint handling process to match the Local Government Ombudsman code of practice. – completed this quarter and due to be implemented shortly.</p> <p>Performance and Productivity Oversight Board is reviewing complaint response performance - completed this quarter</p> | 2 x 2 = 4 | <p>Review the Customer Service Strategy</p> <p>Revise the Constitution.</p> <p>Complaint handling guide</p> <p>Complaint response letters templates guide and templates developed and being shared with managers before implementation.</p> <p>Further training activity in relevant areas.</p> <p>A new complaint handling software solution is being developed through C3.</p> | 2 x 2 = 4 | <p>The Council undertakes regular activity to highlight the work it does to support individuals and communities.</p> <p>Performance Management is in place against the Corporate Plan and Annual Action Plan and this is reported quarterly to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny.</p> <p>The Performance and Productivity Oversight Board meets regularly to monitor the compliance across a range of performance areas. A robust compliments and complaints procedure is in place and monitoring is in place. The Council has a risk management framework and corporate risks are reviewed by CLT or a regular basis. There is a comprehensive programme of internal audit with the implementation of recommendations monitored by the Performance and Productivity Oversight Board and the Governance Risk and Audit Committee.</p> | Steve Hems |

Risk Name:

CR 030 Sheringham Leisure Centre

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|--|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Communities: Culture: 1 Championing North Norfolk as a place where residents and visitors can enjoy inclusive cultural opportunities and healthy leisure and sports activities | Failure of contractor or issue with the construction sector, consents not given. | 2 x 2 = 4 | Operation of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. | 2 x 2 = 4 | | 2 x 2 = 4 | This Risk has been closed and the ongoing snagging list of work continues to be worked on by the council | Steve Hems |
| | Building facility did not go ahead. | | Project management & reporting procedures - Sheringham Leisure Centre. | | | | | |
| | Facility not delivered. | | | → | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary - H Reputational | | | | | | | |

Risk Name:

CR 032 Fakenham new roundabout - Delivery of highway infrastructure (roundabout) on A148

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|--|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Housing: Housing Need: 1 Supporting the delivery of more affordable housing, utilising partnership and external funding wherever possible | Funding not available / timing of works. | 3 x 3 = 9 | Emerging Local Plan. | 2 x 2 = 4 | | 2 x 2 = 4 | This project was previously with Martyn Fulcher as lead officer and now has Rob Young's name against it, but I think this should probably be Russell Williams as a "planning Infrastructure project" – either way the project is complete as of this week – ie the roundabout has been constructed and opened to traffic this week (before the Late Spring Bank Holiday and main tourist season) and therefore should probably be shown in this edition of the Corporate Risk Register as Complete and therefore removed from future versions of the Register. | Steve Blatch |
| | Rising construction and materials costs. | | | | | | | |
| | Failure to deliver a new roundabout at Fakenham, necessary to unlock housing growth. | | | ↓ | | | | |
| | Primary – I Projects, Secondary - H Reputational | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | I will pick up with Kathryn Brown whether it is necessary for the District Council to make any payments to or grant claims from the County Council and prepare any project completion paperwork for the project which secured grant funding from the Norfolk Business Rates Pool and Norfolk Infrastructure Fund programmes – but believe this to be an administrative issue rather than something which needs to be recorded as a project or corporate risk. | |

Risk Name: CR 034 Not achieving the Net Zero 2030 target

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Greener: Net Zero: 1 Continuing our own annual emissions reductions to reach Net Zero by 2030 | Not delivering the Climate Action Plan or parts of it. Current Climate Action Plan will not achieve net zero target. Contractors unable to deliver services with net zero carbon.. All Council input not achieved. Failing to secure contracts that do not result in net zero. | 5 x 4 = 20 | Delivering NZSAP and considering the formation of a decarbonisation board. | 4 x 4 = 16 | Additional investment in renewable generation and or other offsetting initiatives. | 3 x 4 = 12 | Solar panels have been installed at Victory Leisure Centre using external grant funding. The trial of EV pool cars took place from May to December 2024 and the carbon saving impact will be evaluated. | Robert Young |
| | Inaction/ inability to reduce Not achieving net zero by 2030. Impact on the reputation of the Council. Financial impact - needing to offset emissions. | | Formal review of NZSAP every two years. Update and adapt the plan to meet the net zero target. Continual monitoring of the delivery of the NZSAP as a major project through the project board. | | Introduce climate impact assessment tool. | | Climate emergency staff forum group set up, with the aim of effecting behaviour change. A grant has been awarded towards decarbonising Fakenham Sports Centre as part of the FLASH (Fakenham Leisure and Sports Hub) project. | |
| | Primary – E Strategic, Secondary – F Environmental and Social and H Reputational | | Quarterly monitoring delivery through the Performance Management Framework. Opportunities to offset from general operations and developments. Ensure net zero considerations are at the forefront of all Council decision making. | ↑ | | | Monitoring of the Carbon footprint continues in an increasingly accurate manner and the Net Zero Strategy and Action Plan is being revised, however new sources of emissions are likely to arise (e.g. food waste collection) which will impact upon the ability to reach the 2030 target. | |
| | | | Decarbonisation board meeting regularly. Ensure all staff and Members are carbon aware - training programme delivered. | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 035 Failure to achieve adoption of the current draft Local Plan

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Statutory obligation | | | | | Work through process to get local plan adopted. | | This risk has been completely reviewed and updated including the name, description, the cause and consequence of the risk. | |
| | Loss of key staff, changes in legislation and political expectations | 5 x 4 = 20 | Effective project management. Ensuring there is a pool of suitably skilled and knowledgeable Planning staff that can be called on to contribute to the Local Plan process. | 2 x 4 = 8 | | 2 x 2 = 4 | Impact has increased as if plan not adopted we would need to restart the plan process to include the 932 housing target. | Russell Williams |
| | Local Plan process being delayed. | | | | | | The likelihood has reduced due to recent communication from inspector that makes it clear the plan is on a path to being found 'sound'. | |
| | Failure to deliver corporate objectives for all themes. | | Member Training. | ↓ | | | | |
| | Primary – D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety), Secondary – E Strategic and H Reputational | | Following the departure of the Planning Policy Manager transitional arrangements have been put in place (Spring 2024) | | | | | |
| | | | Responded to the Planning Inspectors letter. | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 036 Cromer and Mundesley Coastal Management Schemes

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Greener: Coast: 2 Implementing the Cromer and Mundesley Coast Protection Schemes | Additional application made for Cromer. This may not be approved. Costs will increase as a result of delays. Difficulties and delays in receiving consents will have an impact on timescales and costs. | 4 x 5 = 20 | Project risk register and management of risks monitored monthly. | 3 x 3 = 9 | #CALC! | 3 x 3 = 9 | The main constructions works Balfour Beatty have been completed however Timber Groyne repairs still to be completed. | Tamzen Pope |
| | Funding, consents | | Monthly project meetings with contractor. | | | | Submitted a business case to the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee requesting additional funding. A decision was received 25 April 2025 confirming approval. Paper being submitted to obtain these funds. | |
| | Funding – rescope the project, Consents – increased costs and programme delays and subsequent cost revisions leading to funding issues | | Regular risk reduction meetings. | | | | | |
| | Primary – A Financial, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety), H - Reputational, I – Project | | The risk overseen by the project board. | | | | | |
| | | | Retaining the design consultant during the project -implemented in the previous quarter. | | | | | |
| | | | Close liaison with the contractor to identify engineering options has been agreed and is ongoing. A Fisheries Liaison Officer acting as a liaison between the contractor and the local fishermen for rock deliveries which is already showing benefits for the scheme and the fishermen– put in place last quarter. | | | | | |

CR 037 High cost and resource issues from prosecutions, enforcement action and litigation

Risk Name:

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event 2. Cause of risk 3. Consequence of risk happening 4. Risk category 5. Risk appetite | Inherent risk score Likelihood x Impact | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score Likelihood x Impact | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score Likelihood x Impact | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--------------|
| Corporate Plan and statutory duties | Statutory obligation to investigate and apply enforcement action including health and safety, food safety, licensing, environmental protection, planning. Public suing NNDC, Equality Act. Requirement to take costly action in financial and other resource terms 2. Potential overspends not budgeted for. Not being able to carry out statutory and non-statutory functions due to the large call on staff resources. Also a risk if decide not to take enforcement action – risk of Judicial Review and to reputation Primary=A Financial, Secondary=D Operational (including capacity/delivery/resources/health & safety) E Strategic F Environmental and Social G Governance H Reputational | 3 x 4 = 12 | Case decision making process. Apply two stage evidential and public interest tests Enforcement Policy Apply HSE enforcement matrix Liaise with relevant Portfolio Holder Refer to constitution for procedures EH reserve Staff training in understanding and interpreting legislation Regular inspections General reserve maintained at recommended levels. Qualified lawyers and officers under their supervision conduct legal case. | 2 x 3 = 6 | Require resource within the relevant departments to carry out routine visits regarding health and safety and food hygiene so as to have a preventative impact and potentially reduce the need for prosecution at an early stage. | 2 x 2 = 4 | The likelihood score has stayed the same after reviewing known and likely cases that may arise in the next quarter. The Monitoring Officer provided some detail regarding this risk to the Governance Risk and Audit Committee. | Cara Jordan |

Risk Name:

CR 038 Fakenham Leisure and Sports Hub (FLASH) – threat to building within funding window

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event 2. Cause of risk 3. Consequence of risk happening 4. Risk category 5. Risk appetite | Inherent risk score Likelihood x Impact | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score Likelihood x Impact | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score Likelihood x Impact | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| Developing our communities - Promote Health, Wellbeing and Independence for all - Working with partners to promote healthy lifestyles and address the health inequalities faced by our communities. | <p>This is a complex project, with a large number of stakeholders and contractors involved</p> <p>Timeline for building the facility is tight. Completion to draw down funding has to be before the end of March 2026.</p> <p>If the project cannot be delivered on time this could lead to reduced funding being drawn down and not all outcomes being achieved.</p> <p>Primary - A Financial, Secondary - D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety) and H - Reputational</p> | 5 x 5 = 25 | <p>Project Management processes</p> <p>Liaison with the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MHCLG)</p> <p>Timeline prepared.</p> <p>Procurement process for consultants, architects, engineers in place.</p> <p>NNDC project team established. External steering group established and monthly meetings taking place. Members of the steering group include NNDC, Everyone Active, local councillors, Fakenham Town Council, MP, Football Foundation, Fakenham Academy.</p> <p>Ensuring decision making follows NNDC protocols.</p> <p>Follow NNDC Procurement Guidance.</p> <p>Procurement Officer support.</p> <p>Risk Management Policy and Framework</p> <p>Project Risk Register – reviewed monthly</p> <p>Review with Director for Resources the NNDC appetite for</p> | 1 x 2 = 2 | | 2 x 2 = 4 | Confirmation received from MHCLG that the deadline for completion of the grant funded works has been extended to March 2027. Contractor estimates remain for completion by October 2026 with high confidence. | Steve Hems |

financial risk relating to this project – risk appetite established.
Reporting regularly to MHCLG.

Risk Name: CR 040 Management Information System – failure to complete development and maintain when in use

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event 2. Cause of risk 3. Consequence of risk happening 4. Risk category 5. Risk appetite | Inherent risk score Likelihood x Impact | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score Likelihood x Impact | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score Likelihood x Impact | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|------------------|
| Strong and responsible - Effective and Efficient - Continuing a service improvement programme to ensure our services are delivered efficiently And ensuring that strong governance is at the heart of all we do | Development of the MIS system is not complete or once complete is unable to be supported and maintained. | 3 x 4 = 12 | Project Management process including regular project team meetings | 2 x 2 = 4 | Training of IT staff to maintain the system | 2 x 2 = 4 | Platform has been rolled out to 75% of required users ahead of 2nd Quarter when full go live is expected with further training booked in. Training on the backend workings of the platform is also taking place to ensure that there are contingency plans for the system if main admin is away. No plans to reduce Microsoft Licences that enable technology. | David Kingfisher |
| | MS Office not maintaining tools used to build the system. Charging system changes to make MS Office use uneconomic. Project not being properly managed to the required timescales. | | Project risk register | | Senior management support | | | |
| | NNDC is without a system to monitor and present performance, action plan and risk reports | | Documentation of functionality | | Thorough testing before implementation | | | |
| | Primary - G Governance, Secondary – E Strategic | | Training for users Training for development and support staff for the system Business cases for commercialisation of assets to deliver future income and efficiencies. | | | | | |

CR 041 - Local Government Reorganisation – threat to organisational capacity

Risk Name:

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|--|--------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Council: Strong and responsible - Effective and Efficient | Capacity issues generated by Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) | 4 x 3 = 12 | Work is being done collaboratively across the seven district councils, easing the burden on individual councils. | 4 x 2 = 8 | Continuation of joint working with other districts. | 4 x 2 = 8 | Six of the seven Norfolk districts (Breckland, Broadland, Great Yarmouth, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Norwich City) are working together to develop a Full Business Case for three new unitary authorities for submission to Government by 26th September – sharing knowledge and resources to progress this important piece of work. Detailed project plan agreed for period June to end September. | Steve Blatch |
| | Whether there is sufficient capacity to address the work that will be involved in preparing for LGR including the necessary governance, the structures and finance alongside other emerging issues e.g. the implementation of a separate food waste collection by March 2026. | | Consultants appointed to deliver options based on common evidence base. | | Member updates | | | |
| | Work will not be able to be progressed with sufficient speed to meet the tight timescales and may impact on the delivery of other work. | | Member briefings and regular committee reports | | Identifying other corporate projects which may need further project management support. | | | |
| | Primary: D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety) Secondary: E Strategic G | | Agreement to increase project management support to other projects such as the introduction of food waste. | | | | | |
| | | | Performance Management Framework compliance. | | | | Internally, proposals for a modest restructure of the Council's management structure have been approved creating an additional Assistant Director post, deleting a Director post and freeing up some capacity for the Chief Executive to focus on LGR and Devolution through having fewer direct reports and more distributive leadership through new reporting structures for Management Team and the additional AD post. | |

Risk Name:

CR 042 - Coastwise – delivery within Government financial timeframes

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event | Inherent risk score | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| | 2. Cause of risk | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Consequence of risk happening | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Risk category | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Risk appetite | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | Likelihood x Impact | | |
| Greener: Coast: 1 Realising the opportunities of external funding to secure a sustainable future for our coastal communities through transition and adaptation responses | Inability to deliver well considered coastal transition activities within the limited timeframe offered by Government funding windows | 4 x 4 = 16 | Ongoing and timely discussions and updates with the Environment Agency | 3 x 4 = 12 | Approaching Government to extend programme timelines | 3 x 3 = 9 | If the action of approaching the Government of amendment to timelines is successful, the target score could be achieved. | Rob Goodliffe |
| | Urgent need from the government to progress but limited by national funding allocation time frames which don't fit community timeframes, the complexities of the project and development of completely new approaches. | | Ongoing monitoring of financial forecast and programme | | | | | |
| | Government do not roll forward funding into future years and north Norfolk misses out on the opportunities this funding is enabling | | Ongoing reporting to Environment Agency and DEFRA | | | | | |
| | Primary – Financial, Secondaries – Strategic, Environmental and Social, Reputational, Projects | | Utilisation of Local Adaptation Fund Reprofiling of forecast spend where necessary and possible | | | | | |

Risk Name: CR 043 - Introduction of Domestic Food Waste Collection

| Corporate Objective | 1. Description of Risk or potential event 2. Cause of risk 3. Consequence of risk happening 4. Risk category 5. Risk appetite | Inherent risk score Likelihood x Impact | Existing Controls | Residual Risk Score Likelihood x Impact | Action (to achieve target score) | Target Score Likelihood x Impact | Progress update | Lead Officer |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| Our Greener Future: Tackle Environmental Waste and Pollution & Statutory Obligation | Non-Delivery of domestic weekly food waste collections in line with the statutory obligation as part of the amended Environment Act 2021 and the introduction of Simpler Recycling. | 4 x 4 = 16 | Risk Management Policy and Framework | 4 x 4 = 16 | Working closely with contractors to address issues around depo capacity | 1 x 1 = 1 | Vehicles procurement added to capital programme at Full Council in April 2025. Order to be placed May 2025. | Emily Capps |
| | Our contractor Serco not being ready to deliver on the deadline of April 2026, as a result of high demand on national supply lines of equipment such as vehicles and receptacles. Issues relating to depo capacity. | | Project Management Framework | | Looking for suitable alternatives and options | | Scoping of alternative sites for vehicle storage. | |
| | Non-compliance of statutory obligations. Potential reputational risk. Financial impact from the inclusion of food waste in the general loads. Primary – G Governance, Secondary - F Environmental and Social, H Reputational | | Adequate staff or appropriately qualified external contractor support DEFRA funding of capital schemes. Procurement responsibility assigned. Budget Process / Budget Monitoring. The risk overseen by the project board. Regular stakeholder meetings – meetings taking place weekly – completed in the last quarter Keeping ward Members informed. Regular dialogue with Norfolk County Council. Monthly project meetings with contractor. Timeline prepared | | Following project plan and meeting deadlines contained within. | | | |

KEY

Impact

| Corporate Risk | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Impact Type | Catastrophic 5 | Critical 4 | Moderate 3 | Marginal 2 | Negligible 1 |
| Objectives | The key objectives in the Corporate Plan will not be achieved. | One or more Key Objectives in the Corporate Plan will not be achieved. | Significant impact on the success of the Corporate Plan. | Some impact on more than one Service. | Insignificant impact on more than one Service. |
| Financial Impact (Loss) | Over £1.5m | £500K - £1.5m | £300K - £500K | £20K - £300K | £0-20K |

Likelihood ratings and dimensions

| Grade | Likelihood | Probability | Timing |
|-------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 5 | Very High | Over 90% | Within six months |
| 4 | High | 60 - 90% | Within a year |
| 3 | Moderate | 40 - 60% | Within 1 to 2 years |
| 2 | Low | 10 - 40% | Probably within 15 years |
| 1 | Very Low | below 10% | Probably over 15 years |

Risk Scoring

Inherent risk score - Impact x Likelihood = Total rating. Risk score if no controls were in place.

Residual Risk Score - Impact x Likelihood = Total Rating. Risk score after current controls are taken into account.

Target Score – Impact x Likelihood = Total Rating. Risk score needed to ensure the risk score matches the risk appetite.

Rating score of 1 to 6 = Green, 8 to 12 = Amber, 15 to 25 = Red.

Change of direction

Rating score the same as the previous quarter →

Rating score higher than the previous quarter ↑

Rating score lower than the previous quarter ↓

Categories of risk

- A Financial
- B Macroeconomic
- C Credit and counterparty
- D Operational (including capacity/ delivery/ resources/ health & safety)
- E Strategic
- F Environmental and Social
- G Governance
- H Reputational
- I Projects