

Risk no.	Risk Theme	Risk Description	Probability	Impact	Gross	Risk treatment	Mitigation	Update/Change from January 2019
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.	There are some indications of a market slowdown. Housing completions are being monitored quarterly to monitor this.
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.	No change
1c		Developer interest in sites slows, resulting in a fewer number of planning applications being submitted to CDC	2	4	8	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.	No change

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.	Progress on completing S106 agreements is slow. A number of meetings are taking place with relevant parties to explore the resolution of issues and agree new timescales for completion.
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.	2	4	8	Tolerate	Explore potential for attracting wider range of business to Bicester.	CDC has created Perch in the town centre and the Eco Business Centre at NW Bicester, to fill a gap in the market to provide start up office space and meeting space for small businesses. CDC is also engaged in proposals to support and attract innovative and low carbon businesses to the town.
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	No change

							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.	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	3	4	12	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. The government intends to lift the restriction that prevents local planning authorities pooling the financial contributions from

								more than 5 S106 agreements to deliver a piece of infrastructure. This would be a welcome move and would make it easier for the Council to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support the town's growth. The proposed changes are expected to be implemented through amendments to the CIL Regulations, although the timescale for this has yet to be announced.
3b		Insufficient internal and external staff capacity to deliver high quality decisions and development.	4	3	12	Tolerate	Identify area of reduced capacity and assess likely impact on infrastructure delivery. Explore options to address the issue.	No change
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.	No change
3d		Developers successfully challenge CDC / OCC S106 requirements resulting in a reduction of the developer funding needed	3	4	12	Treat	Work with developers / colleagues to agree a compromise if possible which avoids undermining the	No change

		to support the delivery of necessary infrastructure.					delivery of key infrastructure. Initiate discussions with the Homes England / LEPs to explore opportunities to close major funding gaps.	
3e		Slow information relating to new large scale strategic infrastructure which require 3rd party input(e.g.Network Rail, East/West Rail, Highways England) could impact on CDC's ability to secure the necessary infrastructure to support the Town's growth in a timely manner.	3	4	12	Treat	The Bicester Delivery Team will need to continue to work with partners in order to maintain awareness of key issues and timescales for their resolution.	
4	Risks to securing a whole town approach							
4a		Reduction in availability of funding threatens delivery of town wide projects	1	4	4	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.	MHCLG has recently announced that a further £770,000 of Garden Town funding has recently been secured from the government (in addition to £500,000 already received this financial year). Other funding bids to benefit the town are being progressed by the Team.

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.	No change
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.	No change
5.	Risks to progressing the Bicester Healthy New Town Programme							
5a		Expectations exceed what can be reasonably delivered	1	3	3	Treat	Work to continuously manage expectations - through	The funding from NHS England that has supported the programme is due to

							communications, SDB, partners, NHS England etc. Ensure that agreed programme is realistic in terms of the capacity need to deliver actions.	come to an end around March 2019. CDC has now committed to further resourcing of the Programme for additional 5 years and its roll out across the District (including Bicester).
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	3	6	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.	A Bicester Healthy New Town event for all partners involved in the Programme was held on 28 February. The event contained a mix of presentations and interactive exercises which gave the opportunity for stakeholders to feedback their views on what has taken place to date and how the Programme could progress in the future.
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 Programme	2	4	8	Treat	It will be important to	See risk 5a above –

		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).					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.	additional resourcing of the Programme has now been committed to by CDC to allow the Programme to be rolled out for a further 5 years and across the District.
5e		Risk that the programme project officers will have difficulty in sustaining their focus on Bicester whilst they are also helping to enable healthy place making to develop for other places across the Cherwell District.	3	4	12	Treat		This risk is premature in advance of the issue of HNT Programme roll-out being considered by CDC's Executive and related decisions about how it will be implemented.
6	Risks relating to public opinion / stakeholder management							
6a		Lack of momentum results	3	3	9	Treat	Keep a keen watch on	No change

		in an increase in negative opinions around development					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.	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
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