

| Risk no. | Risk Theme | Risk Description | Probability | Impact | Gross | Risk treatment | Mitigation | Update |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------|--------|-------|----------------|--|--|
| 1 | Risks to Housing Delivery | | | | | | | |
| 1a | | Reduction in market demand results in slowdown in housing completions | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Undertake regular engagement with developers to understand any early signs of market decline and potentially explore re-phasing of affordable housing. | |
| 1b | | Significant changes to national policy (e.g. affordable housing policy) creates climate of uncertainty | 3 | 4 | 12 | Tolerate | Keep up to date with government policy consultations and assess possible detrimental impacts to Bicester housing delivery. | The Housing White Paper (<i>Fixing Our Broken Housing Market</i>) was published in February 2017. This contains suggested proposed reforms to planning for housing delivery, which are subject to consultation. The nature of the proposed reforms are at the strategic level and if they come into effect, may have some impact on delivery of housing in due course but it is hard to define what these could be at the current time and when they might take effect. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|----|-------|--|--|
| 1c | | Developer interest in sites slows, resulting in a fewer number of planning applications being submitted to CDC | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Maintain awareness of what applications are being submitted to CDC Development Management and follow up with conversations with developers to understand their timescales / reason for slowdown. | |
| 1d | | Slow completion of S106 agreements which delays issuing of planning permissions leading to delayed start on sites. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Identify source(s) of delay and agree with relevant parties' actions and those responsible for implementing with timescales to resolve. | |
| 2 | Risks to delivery of Strategic Commercial Sites | | | | | | | |
| 2a | | Risk that market demand for premises does not match the Use Class(es) which are being sought. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Explore potential for attracting wider range of business to Bicester. | |
| 2b | | Reduction in market demand results in slowdown in completed commercial development | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Undertake regular engagement with developers to understand any early signs of market decline and potentially explore if there are any options to remediate the situation. | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|----|-------|---|--|
| 2c | | Slow completion of S106 agreements which delays issuing of planning permissions, leading to delayed start on sites. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Identify source(s) of delay and agree with relevant parties' actions and those responsible for implementing with timescales to resolve. | |
| 3 | Risks to delivery of Strategic Infrastructure | | | | | | | |
| 3a | | General issue of inadequate funding to deliver infrastructure to support planned development | 4 | 4 | 16 | Treat | Work with government and other partners to secure necessary infrastructure to support growth. | |
| 3b | | Reductions in staff capacity of consultees leading to delays in providing advice, comments on applications etc. | 4 | 3 | 12 | Treat | Identify area of reduced capacity and assess likely impact on infrastructure delivery. Explore alternative options to provide capacity in-house in CDC. | |
| 3c | | Development sites do not come forward speedily and / or in the manner anticipated so adversely impacting on comprehensive and timely delivery of infrastructure | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Engage in regular dialogue with developers to understand underlying causes and see what can be done to re-profile timing of infrastructure provision. | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|----|-------|---|---|
| 3d | | Developers challenge CDC / OCC S106 requirements resulting in a reduction of the developer funding needed to support the delivery of necessary infrastructure. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Work with developers / colleagues to agree a compromise if possible which avoids undermining the delivery of key infrastructure. Initiate discussions with the HCA / LEPs to explore opportunities to close major funding gaps. | |
| 3e | | Issues around Network Rail requirements threaten to delay completion of S106 agreements. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Maintain continuous dialogue with Network Rail, OCC and A2D. Maintain regular dialogue with relevant government departments including DfT and CLG. | Meetings have taken place with Network Rail and A2Dominion who are progressing design of rail crossings. Tis work will provide certainty over costs and the timing of track possession to undertake the works. Whilst progress is being made this matter continues to move slowly risking delay to completion for S106s. |
| 4 | Risks to securing a whole town approach | | | | | | | |
| 4a | | Reduction in availability of funding threatens delivery of town wide projects | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Explore possible alternatives looking at both internal and external sources of funding. Look at re-profiling project | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|---|-------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | outcomes. Consult other delivery partners and investigate pooling resources. | |
| 4b | | Capacity of Bicester Delivery Team is inadequate to deliver projects in a timely and effective manner. | 2 | 3 | 6 | Treat | Utilise Project Delivery Plan to keep a close eye on delivery milestones and ability of Team to meet them, agree which projects are top priority to progress and those of less importance, recruit to vacant posts and explore opportunities for project reassignment / sharing within Team. | A Sustainability Project Officer has recently started in the Bicester Delivery Team to provide temporary cover for Gabi Kaiser's leave of absence and a Project Officer has now commenced in the Team to fill the post previously held by Andrew Bowe. |
| 4c | | Lack of partner interest in collaborating and / or ability to support delivery of projects | 3 | 3 | 9 | Treat | Discuss with potential partners with a view to trying to find compromises / a way forward e.g. if capacity is limited then prioritise areas for involvement. | |
| 5. | Risks to progressing the Bicester Healthy New Town Programme | | | | | | | |
| 5a | | Expectations exceed what can be reasonably delivered | 3 | 3 | 9 | Treat | Work to continuously manage expectations - through communications, SDB, | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | partners, NHS England etc. Ensure that agreed programme is realistic in terms of the capacity need to deliver actions. | |
| 5b | | General understanding of the Programme and its objectives suffers from confusion, leading to lack of support from key stakeholders and lack of interest from the public in taking part in the initiatives. | 2 | 4 | 8 | Treat | Ensure clarity over key messages and deliver all communications according to an agreed strategy which provides a consistent and clear guide to govern all communications. Hold a variety of events which allow people to get involved in the Programme and ask questions, rather than just relying on social media, press coverage etc. | Communications Officer (working part time) dedicated to the Bicester Healthy New Town Programme has now started in the Team, in order to ensure clarity and consistency of message. The public launch of the Bicester HNT Programme is planned for 13 May 2017 and proposals are being worked up for a variety of events to engage the public. |
| 5c | | Funding to deliver Year 2 of the Programme fails to materialise | 2 | 4 | 8 | Treat | Maintain positive dialogue with NHS England to ensure mutual understanding of each other's objectives and priorities. | NHS (England) has notified the Team that £600,000 funding has been earmarked for most of the HNT projects that were bid for to take place 2017 -2019. This is subject to final confirmation by the NHS (England) Finance Committee in the near future. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| 6 | Risks relating to public opinion / stakeholder management | | | | | | | |
| 6a | | Lack of momentum results in an increase in negative opinions around development | 3 | 3 | 9 | Treat | Keep a keen watch on media reports etc around Bicester and act promptly to address negative coverage. Maintain / increase good communications with stakeholders and other delivery partners. | |
| 5b | | Ineffective communication leads to concerns over lack of control and direction of development | 3 | 3 | 9 | Treat | Manage communication to ensure that messages are clearly communicated explaining the Council's role of developing the town. | |

Guide to Risk Assessment

| Probability | Scale | Likelihood | Indicators |
|-------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|
| Very likely | 5 | More than 75% chance of occurrence | Regular occurrence Circumstances frequently encountered |
| Likely | 4 | 50% - 75% chance of occurrence | Likely to happen at some point within the next 1-2 years Circumstances occasionally encountered (a few times a year) |
| Possible | 3 | 30% - 50% chance of occurrence | Likely to happen once or a small number of times over 2-3 years |
| Unlikely | 2 | 10% - 30% chance of occurrence | Only likely to happen once in 3 or more years |
| Remote | 1 | Less than 10% chance of occurrence | Has happened rarely/never before |

| Impact | Likelihood | | | | |
|--------------|------------|----------|----------|--------|----------------|
| | Rare | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Almost Certain |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Catastrophic | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 5 | 5 | | | | |
| Major | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 4 | 4 | | | | |
| Moderate | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 3 | 3 | | | | |
| Minor | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | 2 | | | | |
| Almost none | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | | | | |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| | low risk |
| | medium risk |
| | medium/high risk |
| | high risk |