

Risk Ref	Risk	Risk Category	Link to Corporate Business Plan	Owner
1	Residents go to Media to dispute the Council's approach, increase in complaints, MP letters and petitions	Reputation	An innovative and effective council	Mike Davies/ Nicole Smith
2	Increase in rent arrears and high voids	Financial	An innovative and effective council	Mike Davies/ Nicole Smith/ Leanne Sykes
3	Potential increase in fly tipping / damage	Health & Safety	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Mike Davies/ Nicole Smith/ Leanne Sykes
4	The lack of investment and repairs on these two sites are leading to conditions which could be prejudicial to health	Health & Safety	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Tim Bruce/ Janet OBrien/ Leanne Sykes
5	Dairy House Bridge is fast becoming unsustainable with only 13 of the 18 units in occupation and the overall layout is non-compliant. Increased fly tipping, vandalism and loss of rental income and unmet housing need	Reputation	An innovative and effective council	Tim Bruce/ Janet OBrien

6	The current Transit site which is next to Oak Tree Field has been closed for 4+ years and there are no suitable facilities on site to bring it back into use without investment. This is a breach of planning obligations	Legislative	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Tim Bruce/ Janet OBrien
7	Attracting contractors to carry out the remedial works	Financial	An innovative and effective council	Tim Bruce/ Janet OBrien
8	Contract delivery will require constant supervision which will have resource implications for the Council	All	An innovative and effective council	Tim Bruce/ Janet OBrien
9	Disruption to marketing process	All	Strong communities	Mike Dawson
10	Inability to dispose of the site	Legislative	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Mike Dawson/ Leanne Sykes

11	No financial value generated	Financial	Growing the economy	Mike Dawson/ Leanne Sykes
12	Resrictions on sale of land.	All	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Graham Garrett
13	Preferred bidder is unable to secure a site licence.	All	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Graham Garrett
14	The cost of surveys, remedial works and disposal process to be met from G & T revenue budget. Not yet fully determine but could range from £20k to £120k	Financial	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Leanne Sykes
19	Residents end up on the road or double up on private sites.	Reputation	Protecting those who are most vulnerable	Highways Enforcement and planning services.
20	Increased difficulty meeting identified need through site allocations in the Local Plan.	Financial	Strong communities	Planning & Property Services

21	Increased need for affordable pitches to be made available through Local Plan allocations.	Financial	Strong communities	Planning & Housing
22	Unable to gauge resident's accommodation needs	Reputation	Strong communities	Spatial Planning

Cause	Primary Impact	Secondary Impact	Likelihood (1-4)	Impact (1-4)
Residents consider the Council has failed to deliver promises made, residents are angry and frustrated with the Council	Adverse publicity and Local members placed under pressure	Officer time dealing with media enquiries and members having to make statements	4	2
Residents discontinue paying rent. Residents move to different location and voids increase	Financial - loss of income	Health & Safety due to increase fly tipping and damage to voids	4	3
Loss of respect for site, decide to	Health & Safety to residents,	Financial impact to remove hazardous waste	3	3
For a number of years these sites were intended for redevelopment however, the source of funding for this investment has since been withdrawn. Bids for external funding will not be available to carry out repairs and remedial works.	Conditions on site are extremely poor and the drains in particular are becoming unsustainable and causing rat infestations and constant blockages	The residents on site have been patient but this patience is now running out as the Council have not delivered on redevelopment of both these sites	4	4
The Fire Safety and Layout requirements set out in the Government's Model Standards 2008 for Caravan Sites in England are not being met on Dairy House Bridge	Units are either too close to each other or the boundaries to comply with the Design Standards	Even if we were carry out repairs/ remedial action to the site, the layout and access to the site would still be non-compliant without substantial investment.	3	4

The use of current transit site was always included the original redevelopment proposals but the Council has been unable to identify any alternative sites.	Having a transit site next to a permanent site is unlikely to be successful or sustainable and will lead to disputes and excessive management time to keep all residents satisfied	Resident dissatisfaction whether we invest or not as there will be an impact on them which ever decision is reached	3	3
Contractors are likely to increase their costs on any works that are seen to not fully address the needs of the community. Residents refusing to accept the Council's decisions may refuse access to complete the required works	Any prices are likely to include high risk allowances for undertaking and completing the work unless an effective partnership can be created between the contractor, the Council and the residents.	Time delays as attracting suitable and sufficient contractors may prove difficult unless grounds can be found a more negotiated contract.	4	3
Unless the residents are onboard and there is the understanding that flexibility will be required to deliver the works, the contract may be extremely difficult to effectively deliver within a reasonable timeframe	Tendered or agreed prices do not reflect the actual cost of delivering the works and either the contractor has difficulty in delivering the works or the Council ends up paying considerably more for the works	The works will be inconvenient and may prevent residents having access to bathing or cooking facilities for times of the day on an individual basis whilst works to the drains could affect many residents	3	3
Residents on site refusing access and other forms of disruption	Inability to market site effectively	Lack of site access	2	3
Title issues	Defective title results in legal impediment on sale of site	Delay to sale of site	2	3

Market perceives no value in the sites	Disposal of site would be at a loss to the Council	0	3	4
Restrictions placed on title preventing or limiting the ability to sell	Properties cannot be sold or can only be sold with the consent of a third party.	Delay due to seeking the consent of a third party and additional costs in meeting requirements of a third party.	3	3
The preferred bidder is either incapable or unlikely to be granted a site licence	Properties cannot be sold.	Properties are retained by the council.	3	4
Lack of investment over the last few years with redevelopment having been the proposed route. Withdrawal of government funding	Having to meet from a budget which is unlikely to cover everything required and so overspent in a time where savings are required	Resident dissatisfaction with this course of action	4	3
Residents are forced to leave the site after sell-off or struggle to pay rents.	Increase in unauthorised encampments or overcrowding on private sites. Residents end up homeless.	Additional enforcement cases. More applicants on Council register.	3	1
Residents leaving the site are officially in 'need' as they become homeless.	Insufficient supply to meet need through land allocations. Council to purchase additional land for allocation.	Additional costs to purchase land on the open market to ensure sufficient suitable land is allocated in the Local Plan.	3	2

<p>As a follow on risk from the above. Residents leaving the site cannot afford purchasing/renting a pitch on existing or new sites.</p>	<p>Council to ensure affordable pitches are available on new sites allocated in the Plan given the evidence on increased need/demand following sell-off.</p>	<p>Increased risk to Local Plan robustness as RSL or Council may have to step in to bring forward a proportion of new sites with affordable pitches that remain so in perpetuity.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Residents being upset about the prospect of change of site ownership.</p>	<p>Residents unwilling to cooperate when approached for interviews as part of the next Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (likely to be this year).</p>	<p>Incomplete 'needs' data for Local Plan review and site allocations.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>2</p>

Inherent Risk	Controls	Likelihood (1-4)	Impact (1-4)	Residual Risk
8	1. Develop a Communications Plan to ensure there is a joined up process for dealing with enquiries	3	2	6
12	1. Clear communication 2. Robust action on arrears process 3. Regular estate visits	3	2	6
9	1. Clear communication 2. Regular estate visits	3	2	6
16	1. Commission up to date condition surveys to determine the level of investment required to maintain the existing tenancies 2. Obtain funding to undertake essential and emergency works to ensure the safety and well being of the existing residents	3	3	9
12	1. Consider closure on Dairy House Bridge 2. Focus investment on to a single site, but this would reduce the Council's overall provision for the G&T Community	3	2	6

9	<p>1. The Council needs to find alternative sites to use as temporary accommodation (Transit) within the County</p> <p>2. Maintain the site at Oak Tree Field as a permanent Transit Site is unlikely to be successful</p>	3	2	6
12	<p>1. Consider issuing a notice of intention to carry out works and interview prospective contractors to determine if a negotiated contract may prove more successful.</p> <p>2. Accept that traditional tendering, which places the majority of the risk with the contractor, will be unlikely to deliver value for money</p>	3	3	9
9	<p>Creation of an effective partnership to complete the works will take a great deal of trust and negotiation, but investing in creating this platform will be resource demanding on the Council</p>	3	2	6
6	<p>1. Communication strategy to be reobust</p> <p>2. Clear time line issued to residents</p> <p>3. Complementary means of issuing site information</p>	1	3	3
6	<p>1. Clear due diligence on site prior to marketing</p>	1	3	3

12	1. Estimate of site value obtained from outset 2. Cabinet decision accepts may not yield a significant value 3. Determine whether any works would enhance the site value	2	3	6
9	1. Undertake title investigation at an early stage to identify any possible issues.	2	3	6
12	1. Bidders should be required to engage with the Licencing Team before submitting bids or such information as will be required for an application for a site licence should form part of all bids.	3	3	9
12	Difficult to avoid the need to keep people safe but decommissioning of one site may reduce the potential overspend but create other difficulties	3	3	9
3	Free pre-application advice to travellers; development plan policies guiding new development if residents wish to develop private	2	2	4
6	Seek approval from members to purchase additional land otherwise failure to get Local Plan through examination.	3	2	6

6	As above. Allocate sites for delivery of affordable pitches. Seek delivery partner but judged to be difficult at this point as repeat of current exercise basically.	3	2	6
8	Communications Strategy underpinning GTAA project.	3	2	6