

APPENDIX 5 – LOCAL PLAN RISK REGISTER

| Risk | Triggers | Consequences | RAG (Red = 9+ Amber = 4-8 Green 0-3) | Current Risk Score (4 is high and 1 is low) | Likelihood | Overall score | Target score (following mitigation) | Mitigation Method | Lead Officer |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|
| Programme delays or stalls | Political change (national) – a further general election prior to adoption of the new Local Plan results in a new government which may bring in significant changes to current policy and statutory requirements for plan making process | Failure to meet the council's statutory duty to have an up-to-date Local Plan within programme timeframes that have been established at the start of the project | | 4 | 4 | 16 | 8 | Keep abreast of planning press and ministerial announcements following any election | Project manager |
| | Political change (borough) - following the Mayoral and ward elections in 2018 there is a change of Mayor and/or political make-up of the Council | Political priorities shift and new Cabinet members take time to get up-to-speed with key issues, or require substantial amendments to the Local Plan | | 4 | 3 | 12 | 6 | Set up regular briefing sessions with Mayor, Lead Member and Cabinet members to identify key issues | |
| | Delays in internal procurement process | Procurement of additional evidence or support for EiP is delayed | | 4 | 3 | 12 | 6 | Close working with procurement colleagues | |
| | Poor governance structure | Project milestones slip and expectations of politicians and senior officers are not met | | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4 | Establish clear governance structure during project initiation and agree this with project sponsor | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|----|---|---|
| | Poor project management (e.g. resources and time management) | Project milestones slip and expectations of politicians and senior officers are not met | | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4 | Regular and ongoing monitoring by the project manager |
| | Resourcing and changes to personnel in lead and contributing/supporting teams | Project milestones slip and expectations of politicians and senior officers are not met, or expertise is lost prior to EiP | | 4 | 4 | 16 | 8 | Setting realistic project timeframes and rigorous monitoring and contingency |
| Failure to deliver the vision to meet both political and community aspirations | Poor communication with locals and the community | Lacking political and key stakeholders' support for vision and policy direction, leading to strong objections and challenges at examination stage | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | Ensure the governance structure clearly reflects the reporting process, which involves members |
| | Poor presentation of the Regulation 19 consultation documents | Lacking political and key stakeholders' support for vision and policy direction, leading to strong objections and challenges at examination stage | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | Prepare an engagement and consultation strategy during the scoping stage and keep it under review |
| Failure to fulfil the duty to cooperate | Poor communication with stakeholders and neighbouring authorities | The plan will be found unsound during the examination which will delay delivery of the programme | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | Liaise with neighbouring authorities to ensure that strategic cross-boundary issues are identified and any cross-boundary impacts are assessed prior to EiP |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | The Council's reputation may be damaged by poor media coverage | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | All the actions following discussions with neighbouring authorities should be evidenced alongside the plan making process |
| Poor presentation of the final published documents | Inadequate time and resources allocated to this part of project results in failure to produce well-branded documents | Impacts negatively on the reception of the document | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | Allocation of adequate time and financial resources for high quality desktop publishing of document as part of project plan |
| Failure to develop a comprehensive evidence base to support the Local Plan | Inadequate time and resources allocated to this part of the project | The plan will be found unsound during the examination which will delay delivery of the programme | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | Close working with council colleagues and stakeholders throughout project to ensure all evidence base requirements have been identified |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Failure to have fully identified all necessary evidence base requirements and emergence of new evidence base requirements | The plan will be found unsound during the examination which will delay delivery of the programme | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | Close working with council colleagues and stakeholders throughout project to ensure all evidence base requirements have been identified |
| | Failure to secure sufficient budget to commission all necessary additional evidence or external support to defend the Local Plan at EiP | The plan will be found unsound during the examination which will delay delivery of the programme | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | Close working with council colleagues and stakeholders throughout project to ensure all evidence base requirements have been identified |
| Failure to have fully understood current legislation and requirements for policies during drafting stages | Submission of weak policies that are challenged at Regulation 19 consultation and EiP | The plan will be found unsound during the examination which will delay delivery of the programme | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | Experienced project managers in place to lead on policy areas |