Objective 1 – to conduct its affa Risk Description	Risk Impact	Existing Controls	Assessment	Actions
<ul> <li>Fail to establish and run a properly constituted and informed Parish Council</li> <li>Fail to run the Parish Council in line with Government legislation</li> <li>Fail to maintain awareness of changing District Council regulations</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parish Council ineligible to do business</li> <li>Increased scrutiny by the District Council</li> <li>Parish Council not in tune with the needs of the parish</li> <li>Parishioners complain about the use of funds</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parish Council members (chairman and councillors) elected in accordance with regulations</li> <li>Suitably qualified clerk in post, employed by the Parish Council, with clearly specified responsibilities</li> <li>Clerk maintains a calendar of activities and publishes same as required</li> <li>Clerk ensures an appropriate number of meetings are held</li> <li>Clerk produces an agenda for and minutes of all meetings</li> <li>Relevant training courses are brought to the attention of the Parish Council and members are encouraged to attend</li> <li>Notices are regularly placed on Parish notice boards</li> <li>Parishioners are encouraged to attend meetings and contribute ideas</li> <li>Parish website under development to ensure transparency of processes and availability of documents for public scrutiny</li> </ul>	Moderate risk due to Clerk vacancy	Process underway for recruitment. Chair currently responsible for processes during vacancy - to be voted on March 2024 meeting Website uploading to be completed by May meeting.

Objective 2 – to conduct its financial affairs diligently and professionally				
Risk Description	Risk Impact	Existing Controls	Assessment	Actions
<ul> <li>Fail to safeguard Parish Council funds</li> <li>Fail to maintain adequate financial records</li> <li>RFO is named on bank mandate so that he is able to do transfers and reinvest bonds</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parish council funds are misappropriated</li> <li>Increased scrutiny by District Council or external audit</li> <li>Bad publicity in local press</li> <li>Parish Council Members/RFO may be dismissed from office</li> <li>Parish Council members not re- elected</li> <li>Parish Council sued for negligence</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Suitably qualified RFO in post, currently one of the Councilors, with clearly specified responsibilities</li> <li>Sound system of financial control in place with close control over receipts and payments</li> <li>Transactions processed through bank, with reconciliations produced and monitored by the Parish Council</li> <li>Cheques require two signatories, therefore RFO is unable to pay cheques even though he is on mandate.</li> <li>Financial accounts and procedures are audited by internal auditor on annual basis.</li> <li>Bank balances are checked at each meeting to ensure they are correct</li> </ul>	Low risk no action required	
•	•			

Objective 3 – to set an appropriate precept				
Risk Description	Risk Impact	Existing Controls	Assessment	Actions
<ul> <li>Precept results in an excessive and unreasonable surplus</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parishioners question the appropriateness of the precept</li> <li>Parishioners question</li> </ul>	The council sets precept on basis of revenue requirements and capital projects planned, with prior year comparisons made	Low risk no action required	
Precept fails to reflect the needs of the parish	whether value for money is being achieved	<ul> <li>Precept discussed in open meetings with views invited</li> <li>Precept endorsed by the Parish</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Key areas of routine spend are not competitively tendered on</li> </ul>	Parishioners question the level or use of grants	<ul> <li>Council</li> <li>District Council review and acceptance</li> </ul>		
<ul><li>a regular basis</li><li>Key areas of project</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Parish Council members may be dismissed from office</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>New spends are competitively tendered, as are routine maintenance e.g. mowing, where</li> </ul>		
spend are not managed in a visible manner against a set budget	<ul><li>or not re-elected</li><li>Parishoners not</li></ul>	possible		
<ul> <li>Further asset acquisition may prove too costly to maintain and not be</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parisioners not using newly acquired items and therefore items not proving to be cost effective</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Plans to fully project manage any new acquisitions</li> <li>Plans in place to apply for HS2 funding</li> </ul>	Low risk, process underway	For evaluation prior to consultation, Spring 2024
<ul> <li>adequately used</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parishoners questioning the need for toilets/kitchen facility</li> <li>Parish Council struggling with maintenance demands of assets</li> </ul>	• Running costs to be fully researched so public can be fully briefed before decisions are taken regarding any further asset investment on the Playing Field area		

Objective 4 – to manage its responsibilities in a cost effective manner in compliance with District Council regulations

Risk Description	Risk Impact	Existing Controls	Assessment	Actions
<ul> <li>Fail to adequately maintain Parish Council property including:         <ul> <li>playing field, equipment</li> <li>bus shelter</li> <li>street furniture</li> <li>Village green wall</li> </ul> </li> <li>Fail to identify and report potential problems with trees</li> <li>Fail to regularly review and update the risk management process</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Danger/injury to users/public</li> <li>Insurance claims raised against the Parish Council</li> <li>Potential litigation</li> <li>Potential medical costs</li> <li>Bad publicity in local press</li> <li>District Council may dismiss the Parish Council</li> <li>Risk process may become outdated and not fit for purpose leaving the council open to litigation should any risk become an actuality.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Property damage/public liability insurance in place</li> <li>Notices near property asking users/public to report problems</li> <li>All assets are maintained in a database with details of inspection frequency, results of inspections and date of next inspection</li> <li>Database is discussed at each meeting and any inspections due are allocated to individuals</li> <li>Playing field and equipment are inspected by councillors on a documented rota.</li> <li>A sinking fund has been set up to allow for replacing assets when necessary</li> <li>The risk process is reviewed annually at the March meeting and updated as necessary.</li> </ul>	Moderate risk	ActionsNew Asset Registerto be developed -not yet agreed asto next stepsMaintenance dateand process forplaygroundequipment to beagreed at theMarch meeting.Tree survey to beapproved MarchmeetingVillage green wallin need of repair -to be agreed atMarch meeting
<ul> <li>Fail to process planning applications in a timely manner in accordance with District Council guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Planning applicants or objectors sue for negligence</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Planning applications are discussed at regular meetings when possible. If necessary, special meetings are called, with appropriate notice being given.</li> </ul>	Moderate risk,	consider upskilling existing council member as planning lead.
<ul> <li>Fail to report road and footpath problems to District Council in a timely manner</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>District Council may dismiss the Parish Council</li> </ul>	• Parishioners are encouraged to report problems either directly to the district council or to a parish councillor. Any problems reported to parish councillors are immediately reported to the district council via the parish clerk or a member of the parish council	Low risk, no action required	

<ul> <li>Failure to maintain stone wall on village green leading to high repair costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Risk in patency of the wall</li> <li>risk to public if stones become unstable/unsafe</li> <li>high repair costs beyond PC budgeting</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Wall undergoes annual inspection by Parish Councillors</li> <li>Ivy to be added to maintenance task list</li> <li>Budget fin place to allow for repair</li> </ul>	Low	Repair estimates for approval at March 24 meeting
<ul> <li>Risk of harm due to poor safety measures at Claydon Level Crossing</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Risk of harm to persons crossing the railway</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parishoners are encouraged to report problems either directly to Railtrack or to report concerns via Parish Council</li> <li>Parish Council to have person of contact at Railtrack</li> </ul>	Moderate	To invite Railtrack representative to May PC meeting

Objective 4, continued – to ma Risk Description	Risk Impact	Existing Controls	Assessment	Actions
<ul> <li>Fail to keep footpaths in good order/open</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Complaints from parishioners and the public</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parishioners are encouraged to report problems either directly to the district council or to a parish councillor. Any problems reported to parish councillors are immediately reported to the district council via the parish clerk or parish council</li> <li>Blue brick path to undergo annual maintenance as part of existing grass-cutting schedule</li> </ul>	Low risk, no action required	
<ul> <li>Fail to maintain road safety for parishoners</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Risk of harm to pedestrians from traffic</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Application in for reducing speed limit to 20mph in the village</li> </ul>	Moderate	

	<ul> <li>Request has been submitted to Highways regarding moving of existing 30mph signage.</li> <li>PC considering investment to extend Blue Brick path and to add pavement area close to playing field</li> </ul>	
--	---	--