

| Risk no.  | Risk Theme                       | Risk Description   | Probability | Impact | Gross | Risk treatment | Mitigation   | Current Position  | Owner (Source)       |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------|--------|-------|----------------|--|---|----------------------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>Risks to Housing Delivery</b> |  |             |        |       |                |  |   |                      |
| <b>1a</b> |                                  | 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. | Level of delivery is maintained as Covid-19 did not affect Q4 of 2019/20 (sites were closed in March). However, this may change in the next few quarters due to reduced workforce on construction sites, new health and safety measures in place and other factors.   | YW (Planning Policy) |
| <b>1b</b> |                                  | 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.                             | On 1 October 2019, the government announced a number of initiatives to improve the quality and design of development including a new “green standard” for all new build homes to cut carbon emissions and the publication of “the first government design manual” to promote the building of attractive new |                      |

|           |  |  |   |   |    |                 |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|----|-----------------|--|--|--|
|           |  |  |   |   |    |                 |  | homes. The delivery of high quality design is consistent with Garden Town principles.  |  |
| <b>1c</b> |  | 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. | Planning applications continue to be received as working as business as usual.   |  |
| <b>1d</b> |  | 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. |  |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>Risks to delivery of Strategic Commercial Sites</b> |  |   |   |    |                 |  |  |  |
| <b>2a</b> |  | Risk that market demand for premises does not match the Use Class(es) which are being sought.                      | 2 | 4 | 8  | <b>Tolerate</b> | 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.  |  |
| <b>2b</b> |  | 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B use (employment) completions – Over 35,000sqm of employment floorspace delivered in 2019/20. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most of this is in B8 Warehousing – Symmetry Park along A41</li> <li>○ A fall from previous year which saw nearly 50,000 sqm delivered</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Nearly 8,000sqm of A1 retail floorspace delivered. This is primarily at the retail units along Oxford Road, opposite Tesco superstore.</li> <li>• Only 1 scheme (Unit 4a Pioneer Square) completed within the town centre, the rest were outside of the town centre.</li> </ul> | YW (non-residential monitoring only undertaken once a year, generally March/April. |

|           |  |   |   |   |    |       |   |   |       |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|----|-------|---|---|-------|
|           |  |   |   |   |    |       |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is nearly 250,000sqm of employment floorspace with permission but not built</li> </ul>   |       |
| <b>2c</b> |  | Slow completion of S106 agreements which delays issuing of planning permissions, leading to delayed start on sites. | 4 | 3 | 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. Opportunities for closer working between CDC and OCC being explored.   |       |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>Risks to delivery of Strategic Infrastructure</b> |   |   |   |    |       |   |   | AC/DF |
| <b>3a</b> |  | 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. For example, there is not currently sufficient funding to forward fund |       |

|           |  |   |   |   |    |          |  |   |  |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|----|----------|--|---|--|
|           |  |   |   |   |    |          |  | <p>the realignment of Howes Lane.</p> <p>Recent communication with Home England suggests that the reallocation of funds to support the realignment of Howes Lane is supported, given the potential to accelerate housing in this area.</p> <p>The amendment to CIL Regulations which lifts the restriction that prevents local planning authorities pooling the financial contributions from more than five S106 agreements to deliver a piece of infrastructure came into force on September 1<sup>st</sup> 2019. This is a welcome move and will make it easier for the Council to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support the town's growth.</p> |  |
| <b>3b</b> |  | Insufficient internal and external staff capacity to deliver high quality | 4 | 3 | 12 | Tolerate | Identify area of reduced capacity and assess likely impact on infrastructure delivery. | The allocation by the government of additional Garden Town funding to Bicester has provided   |  |

|    |  |   |   |   |    |       |   |   |  |
|----|--|---|---|---|----|-------|---|---|--|
|    |  | decisions and development.  |   |   |    |       | Explore options to address the issue.   | resources to secure an additional officer and urban designer for Bicester. We have begun the recruitment process and hope to be able to begin advertising this quarter (COVID-19 has slowed the process whilst reacting to the pandemic). |  |
| 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 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. | <b>Probability increased as the likelihood of developers challenging s106s or undertaking viability assessments is all but guaranteed in the current climate.</b>   |  |
| 3e |  | Slow information relating to new large scale strategic infrastructure   | 2 | 4 | 8  | Treat | The Bicester Delivery Team will need to continue to work with   | No Change   |  |

|           |  |   |          |   |           |       |  |   |  |
|-----------|--|---|----------|---|-----------|-------|--|---|--|
|           |  | 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. |          |   |           |       | partners in order to maintain awareness of key issues and timescales for their resolution.   |   |  |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>Risks to securing a whole town approach</b> |   |          |   |           |       |  |   |  |
| <b>4a</b> |  | Reduction in availability of funding threatens delivery of town wide projects   | <b>1</b> | 4 | <b>4</b>  | 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.  | Earlier this year MHCLG announced that a further £770,000 of Garden Town funding had been secured from the government for Bicester (in addition to £500,000 already received this financial year). Other funding bids to benefit the town are being progressed by the Team. |  |
| <b>4b</b> |  | Capacity of Bicester Delivery Team is inadequate to deliver projects in a timely and effective manner.  | 4        | 3 | <b>12</b> | 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 | The Sustainability Project Officer is being seconded from the team to work elsewhere in the Council to work on initiatives to support CDC's climate change emergency declaration. Discussions are underway to backfill this role.   |  |

|    |  |  |   |   |   |       |   |  |  |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|-------|---|--|--|
|    |  |  |   |   |   |       | for project reassignment / sharing within Team.   |  |  |
| 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. | <b>Risks to progressing the Healthy Bicester Programme</b> |  |   |   |   |       |   |  |  |
| 5a |  | Expectations exceed what can be reasonably delivered, particularly in light of budgetary pressures | 1 | 3 | 3 | Treat | Work to continuously manage expectations - through communications, SDB, partners, Ensure that agreed programme is realistic in terms of the capacity need to deliver actions. | The funding from NHS England that has supported the programme came to an end in March 2019. CDC has committed to further resourcing of the Programme for additional 5 years and its roll out across the District (including Bicester). <b>This budget is likely to be reduced from 2021 and so the programme will focus on priorities where it can most value.</b> |  |

|    |  |  |   |   |   |       |   |  |  |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|-------|---|--|--|
| 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 | 2 | 4 | 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 Healthy Bicester event for all partners involved in the Programme was held on 13 March 2020. 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. <b>Regular newsletters are also issued to sustain communication with stakeholders.</b> |  |
| 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 is under resourced to deliver what has already been committed to (and funded) as well as an extension to the local programme, following the  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 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   | See risk 5a above – additional resourcing of the Programme has now been committed to by CDC to allow the Programme to be rolled  |  |

|          |  |   |   |   |    |       |  |   |  |
|----------|--|---|---|---|----|-------|--|---|--|
|          |  | conclusion of the funding period for the national HNT Programme (ending March 2019).  |   |   |    |       | 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. | 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 | Ensure adequate officer time is still focussed on Bicester and that the delivery programme is refreshed with partners on an annual basis.  | See 5b  |  |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Risks relating to public opinion / stakeholder management</b> |   |   |   |    |       |  |   |  |
| 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   | A new officer has now been recruited to the Team as a dedicated Bicester resource to manage communications. |  |

|           |  |   |   |   |   |       |   |   |  |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
|           |  |   |   |   |   |       | with stakeholders and other delivery partners.  |   |  |
| <b>6b</b> |  | 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. | A new officer has now been recruited to the Team as a dedicated Bicester resource to manage communications. |  |

**Guide to Risk Assessment**

| Probability | Scale | Likelihood                         | Indicators  |
|-------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|
| Very likely | 5     | More than 75% chance of occurrence | Regular occurrence<br>Circumstances frequently encountered  |
| Likely      | 4     | 50% - 75% chance of occurrence     | Likely to happen at some point within the next 1-2 years<br>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<br>1  | Unlikely<br>2 | Possible<br>3 | Likely<br>4 | Almost Certain<br>5 |
| Catastrophic<br>5 | 5          | 10            | 15            | 20          | 25                  |
| Major<br>4        | 4          | 8             | 12            | 16          | 20                  |
| Moderate<br>3     | 3          | 6             | 9             | 12          | 15                  |
| Minor<br>2        | 2          | 4             | 6             | 8           | 10                  |
| Almost none<br>1  | 1          | 2             | 3             | 4           | 5                   |

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