

APPENDIX A

Maidstone Borough Council STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2011/15

Risk Scenario: Priority 1: For Maidstone to have a growing economy

Risk Description 1	The Borough needs a transport network that supports the local economy.	
Vulnerability / contributing factors	Trigger(s) / Event(s)	Potential Impact / Consequences
<p>The Council is not in control of the provision or planning of transport networks – These are controlled by KCC (Highways) and Network Rail (Rail links)</p> <p>LEPs are being formed which have a strong influence over transport infrastructures</p> <p>There is a lack of appetite in Kent to tackle congestion issues</p> <p>Maidstone is growing and has an increasing need for good transport networks</p>	<p>The Local Transport Plan (LTP) does not meet the Council’s transport needs.</p> <p>Network Rail does not provide an adequate rail service for Maidstone</p> <p>LEPs do not meet the Council’s priorities</p> <p>The Council uses its funds to influence the delivery of adequate transport networks</p> <p>The Council develops partnerships with Mid and West Kent Councils to achieve a stronger level of influence with transport network providers</p> <p>Maidstone loses its appeal as a commuter town</p> <p>Housing development stalls</p>	<p>Contraction /relocation of business out of the Borough</p> <p>Commuters chose to live elsewhere</p> <p>Existing residents relocate</p> <p>Economic growth stalls</p> <p>Negative impact on environmental quality - increased road congestion and pollution</p> <p>The Council is forced to reprioritise its capital investment plans to fund transport improvement schemes.</p> <p>Partnerships fail/do not deliver objectives</p> <p>Housing development stalls</p>

Risk Scenario: Priority 1: For Maidstone to have a growing economy

Risk Description 2	The Borough needs a growing economy with rising employment, catering for a range of skill sets to meet the demands of the local economy.	
Vulnerability / contributing factors	Trigger(s) / Event(s)	Potential Impact / Consequences
<p>The local economy depends on local schools and colleges delivering a wide range of education and skills</p> <p>Business growth depends on an adequate quality workforce – and will only locate/stay in the Borough if it has a good range of employment skill sets</p> <p>A high proportion of employment opportunities within the Borough are provided by the public sector or businesses linked to providing public sector services</p> <p>The Borough currently includes a high number of low wage earners</p> <p>The Council’s Economic Development policy/strategy is in need of review</p>	<p>Changing educational policies (Importance of Teaching – Schools White Paper)</p> <p>The Borough comprises a number of low performing schools</p> <p>The LDF is not agreed</p> <p>Planning policies do not support business development</p> <p>Land is not allocated for business development where it is needed and at a pace that is needed</p> <p>Developers do not build the required quality of housing in the required locations to attract a good quality workforce</p> <p>Business leaders decide not to locate their operations in the Borough or leave the area</p>	<p>There is a miss-match of skills</p> <p>Skilled residents are forced to take lower skilled/lower pay employment</p> <p>Skilled residents relocate away from the Borough</p> <p>Key decision makers/business opportunities/economic growth goes elsewhere</p> <p>Reduced employment opportunities leading to rising unemployment</p> <p>Economic decline/stagnation</p>

Risk Scenario: Priority 2: For Maidstone to be a decent place to live

Risk Description 3	The Borough needs decent affordable housing in the right places across a range of tenures	
Vulnerability / contributing factors	Trigger(s) / Event(s)	Potential Impact / Consequences
<p>The Council has a statutory responsibility to provide housing to certain homeless groups</p> <p>There is a resistance to social housing allocations, particularly in rural areas</p> <p>A review of the Affordable Housing DPD under estimates the scale of need for affordable housing</p> <p>The planned schemes in the Local Investment Plan are not delivered through lack of funding; housing associations choose not to build/improve property in the borough</p> <p>Housing development stalls and the market moves elsewhere</p>	<p>The Council does not deliver its housing strategy and is unable to deliver a range of affordable housing</p> <p>There is a revised emphasis on ways of delivering affordable housing</p> <p>The Council’s Affordable Housing strategy needs to be updated to reflect the proposed changes contained in the Localism Bill and responds to the housing market</p> <p>The new affordable rent regime is unable to generate the surplus required to invest in new affordable housing; or surpluses are invested in other areas</p> <p>There is a long-term lack of Government investment in housing at a time when the council has less money to invest in affordable housing initiatives</p>	<p>Housing quality declines; increase in homelessness results in higher revenue costs to the council</p> <p>New housing is not delivered and communities become unbalanced or unsustainable</p> <p>Our ability to provide a range of affordable diminishes whilst demand for affordable housing increase leading to an increase in homelessness</p> <p>Homelessness increases</p> <p>Community cohesion declines and damage is caused to the Council’s reputation</p>

<p>The housing market declines and makes Maidstone a less attractive place to live and invest in.</p> <p>Increase in poverty amongst existing low earners; Maidstone becomes a more attractive proposition for London authorities to house their homeless households due to increased restrictions in their own areas</p> <p>Vulnerable households or those with dependents fall into a spiral of repeat homelessness as tenancies expire</p>	<p>The reduced funding for private sector for housing initiatives leads to a decline in the private rented market or worsening conditions</p> <p>Changes to the welfare system including local housing allowance; new Universal Benefit places a cap on housing benefit</p> <p>The tenure strategy is ill-conceived or does not address housing need</p>	<p>Economically mobile move out of Maidstone; worsening housing conditions that lead to an increase in pressure on the council for social housing</p> <p>Increased homelessness and welfare dependency; migration into Maidstone from London for high needs households looking for cheaper private rented accommodation.</p> <p>Increase in homelessness that results in additional use of inappropriate accommodation such as B&B; communities become fragmented and more transitory</p>
---	--	---

Risk Scenario: Priority 2: For Maidstone to be a decent place to live

Risk Description 4	Maidstone needs a clean and attractive environment for people who live in and visit the borough	
Vulnerability / contributing factors	Trigger(s) / Event(s)	Potential Impact / Consequences
<p>The Council has limited influence on delivering the required built environment</p> <p>Funding pressures to reduce spending on street cleansing and grounds maintenance, including parks and open spaces</p> <p>The Council is largely dependent on its in-house contractor (MBS) to deliver a clean and attractive environment</p> <p>The Council has an ongoing responsibility for the public realm</p> <p>Public perception of 'run down' parts of the town</p> <p>The prolonged economic downturn leads to stalled investment in improvements to the built environment</p> <p>Priorities for delivering leisure and culture services have changed (Localism Bill)</p>	<p>Ongoing lack of investment - both for the delivery of new, and the maintenance of the current environment</p> <p>Bad planning decisions are made</p> <p>Supply chain failure</p> <p>High Street regeneration project</p> <p>Poor public perception could develop</p> <p>Reduced RSG</p> <p>Negative press opinion / lack of press support</p> <p>Greater involvement from the private and voluntary (CSO) sector</p> <p>Private sector and CSO fail to engage</p> <p>The Council reviews how leisure and cultural services are provided</p>	<p>Declining standards of cleansing services</p> <p>Increased litter and graffiti</p> <p>Public realm infrastructure becomes dilapidated</p> <p>Built environment becomes dilapidated</p> <p>Poor customer satisfaction</p> <p>Visitor numbers decline – retail and tourism</p> <p>Residents move out of the Borough or chose not to move to the Borough</p> <p>Business leaves/ does not locate to the Borough</p> <p>Economic growth stalls</p> <p>Failure/closure of leisure and culture facilities</p>

		Reputational damage due to Localism failure
--	--	---

Risk Scenario: Priority 3: Corporate and Customer Excellence

<p>Risk Description 5</p>	<p>The Council needs to ensure that residents are not disadvantaged because of where they live or who they are; vulnerable people are assisted and the level of deprivation is reduced.</p>	
<p>Vulnerability / contributing factors</p>	<p>Trigger(s) / Event(s)</p>	<p>Potential Impact / Consequences</p>
<p>The council has a commitment to assist vulnerable people</p> <p>Partnership working and the funding it brings is essential to enable services to be effectively delivered</p> <p>Demand for council services is increasing while funding is decreasing</p> <p>Lack of clarity on what communities need and how best to deliver support to meet these needs</p> <p>The 'Big Society' is expected to deliver effective solutions</p> <p>Vulnerable people are dependent on benefits support</p> <p>Government decentralisation provides opportunities for the Council to take on new responsibilities</p>	<p>Ineffective partnership working</p> <p>Consequences of welfare reform</p> <p>Reduction in preventative measures</p> <p>Lack of buy-in to the 'Big Society' vision</p> <p>Lack of ability to deliver the 'Big Society' vision</p> <p>Benefits reforms</p> <p>The council commits to new responsibilities and opportunities</p>	<p>Service failure</p> <p>Increased deprivation</p> <p>Declining community cohesion</p> <p>Increased demand on council services</p> <p>Reprioritisation of expenditure is required across council services</p> <p>Failure to deliver economic prosperity</p> <p>Failure to deliver a skilled and healthy workforce</p> <p>Displacement from London places greater demand on Council housing services</p> <p>The Council receives new funding streams</p>

		The Council takes on new services
--	--	-----------------------------------

Risk Scenario: Priority 3: Corporate and Customer Excellence

Risk Description 6	The Council needs to deliver value for money council services that resident are satisfied with.	
Vulnerability / contributing factors	Trigger(s) / Event(s)	Potential Impact / Consequences
<p>The Council needs to deliver value for money services</p> <p>The Council needs to deliver the services that the public/local business wants</p> <p>Government decentralisation delegates greater control to the Council</p> <p>There is a need to manage customer/partner expectations</p> <p>There is an expectation that the cost/value of council services can be compared with other local council services</p> <p>It is difficult to accurately and reliably compare costs and value for money across councils' services</p> <p>Accurate and timely performance data is required</p> <p>There is an expectation to deliver</p>	<p>The Council fails to deliver on its promises</p> <p>Councils set local service standards which do not meet customer/ business expectations</p> <p>Inadequate communications</p> <p>Benchmarking is ineffective</p> <p>The Council selects the wrong</p>	<p>Public dissatisfaction</p> <p>Loss of credibility leading to reduced external funding</p> <p>Loss of partnership opportunities</p> <p>Post code lottery for services</p> <p>Service costs increase</p> <p>Political instability</p> <p>Poor business decisions are made</p>

<p>services through partnerships/ shared services or outsourcing</p> <p>The ability to deliver value for money services depends on a productive workforce with people in the right place at the right time</p>	<p>commissioning 'model'</p> <p>The council has insufficient skills and capacity to deliver services</p> <p>Organisational change is not managed well</p>	<p>The service fails or does not provide value for money</p> <p>Governance failure</p> <p>Decline in staff morale and engagement and high Staff turnover</p> <p>Damage to the to the Council's reputation</p>
--	---	---

Risk Prioritisation Matrix



