

| Risk no. | Risk Theme | Risk Description | Probability | Impact | Gross | Risk treatment | Mitigation | Update/Change from January 2018 |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------|--------|-------|----------------|--|---|
| 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. | No change |
| 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 Government recently published a draft revised National Planning Policy Framework for public consultation, which closed in May 2018. It proposes the deletion of a reference to the application of Garden City principles in relation to large scale development. If this change is adopted in the final version of the Guidance, it may make it more challenging to secure high quality large scale development in Bicester. |
| 1c | | Developer interest in sites slows, resulting in a fewer | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Maintain awareness of what applications are | No change |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|----|-------|--|---|
| | | number of planning applications being submitted to CDC | | | | | 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. | <p>Progress continues to be made on NW Bicester S106 agreements, in particular with the Himley Village (1700 dws), envisaged to be completed during Summer 2018.</p> <p>Progress on both the A2 Dominion S106 agreements (2600 dws and 900dws) are to some extent dependent on progress being made resolving the outstanding issues with Network Rail (see Risk 3e below).</p> <p>The s106 for Albion Land's application for residential development has been completed.</p> <p>Its appeal against CDC's refusal of the original application (for both housing & commercial</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|----|-------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | elements) has been allowed. However this is the subject of a legal challenge by CDC relating to the community development elements of the Inspector's decision, the outcome of which is awaited. At the current time there is no discernible impact from this on the progress of S106 agreements. |
| 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. | No change |
| 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. | No change |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|---|--|
| 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. | Progress on commercial sites is being monitored. |
| 3 | Risks to delivery of Strategic Infrastructure | | | | | | | |
| 3a | | General issue of inadequate funding to deliver infrastructure to support planned development | 4 | 4 | | Treat | Work with government and other partners to secure necessary infrastructure to support growth. | The Growth Deal for Oxfordshire, Housing Infrastructure Fund and Garden Town capital funding are all seeking to support infrastructure delivery to facilitate growth and have the potential to unlock development sites. |
| 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. | No change |
| 3c | | Development sites do not | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Engage in regular | No change |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|----|-------|---|---|
| | | come forward speedily and / or in the manner anticipated so adversely impacting on comprehensive and timely delivery of infrastructure | | | | | dialogue with developers to understand underlying causes and see what can be done to re-profile timing of infrastructure provision. | |
| 3d | | Developers successfully 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 Homes England / LEPs to explore opportunities to close major funding gaps. | See risk 1d Albion appeal allowed (Dec 17). CDC's and OCC's S106 requirements were generally maintained by the Inspector, bar those relating to supporting the new community at NW Bicester. However this is the subject of a legal challenge by CDC - specifically relating to the community elements of the Inspectors decision. The outcome is awaited. |
| 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 continue with Network Rail & A2Dominion to progress design of rail crossings and Network Rail agreements to deliver. This work will provide certainty over costs and the timing of delivery. Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) is also being explored to support delivery of the rail |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|----|-------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | crossings. |
| 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. | No change |
| 4b | | Capacity of Bicester Delivery Team is inadequate to deliver projects in a timely and effective manner. | 4 | 3 | 12 | 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. | Maria Curran (Garden Town Delivery Manger) departed at the end of March 2018. Two members of the Team have had their contracts extended. One remains on a temporary contract. Discussions are ongoing regarding Team resources but a post to support the delivery of the plan for Bicester is currently being advertised. |
| 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 | No change |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|---|----|-------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | 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. | No change |
| 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. | 3 | 4 | 12 | 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 | Marianna Russo (HNT Communications Officer) left the Team at the end of June. Discussions are underway to secure her replacement. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|----|-------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | Programme and ask questions, rather than just relying on social media, press coverage etc. | |
| 5c | | Funding to deliver Year 2 of the Programme fails to materialise | 1 | 4 | 4 | Treat | Maintain positive dialogue with NHS England to ensure mutual understanding of each other's objectives and priorities. | Funding confirmed |
| 5d | | Risk that the Team is under resourced to deliver what has already been committed to (and funded) as well as an extension to the local programme, following the conclusion of the funding period for the national HNT Programme (ending March 2019). | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | It will be important to agree with local stakeholders and partners how the local Programme could be extended (both in Bicester and across the District), who will be involved in delivery, their respective roles and associated costs, as soon as possible. Once this has been done, the Team will be able to understand the amount of resource it will need and explore potential funding sources. | A HNT Partnership meeting has been organised for July in order to explore the appetite from delivery partners to extend the Programme. Funding opportunities continue to be explored by the HNT Team. |
| 5e | | Risk that the programme project officers will have difficulty in sustaining | 3 | 4 | 12 | Treat | Any roll out of the Programme across the District will need to take | Once CDC understands the views of HNT Delivery Partners (see above entry), |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | their focus on Bicester whilst they are also helping to enable healthy place making to develop for other places across the Cherwell District. | | | | | account of the potential impacts on the existing Bicester HNT Programme and ensure that resourcing of an extension to the Programme does not rely solely on existing Bicester HNT officers. | the implications for resources will be better understood and informed discussions within CDC can take place. |
| 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. | No change |
| 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. | No change |

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 |
| Major | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| Moderate | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| Minor | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| Almost none | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

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