

DRAFT

APPENDIX D: RISK ASSESSMENT

A risk assessment for the Wiltshire LDF has been prepared including proposed mitigation and contingency measures that may need to be implemented in order to ensure that sound DPDs are developed in a timely manner.

Risk No.	Description	Consequence	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Score	Owner	Mitigation /Contingencies	Target	Current state
1.	Failure to produce sound Core Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Council reputation Disillusionment with spatial planning as delivery tool Planning and investment decisions by appeal Piecemeal development Wiltshire's spatial priorities not addressed 	2	5	10	Director Head of Spatial Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure political commitment Identify Core Strategy as corporate priority Prepare early project and resource plan Secure resources Set up Management Board and Officer Group Set up staff work plans Training plan 	5	HIGH
2.	Failure to secure the input / consensus from members on the Core Strategy, and not approving core strategy at key milestones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Council reputation Delays to the Core Strategy Investment stalls Uncertainty for developers Delays or missed opportunities for delivering infrastructure Increased politicisation of issues 	2	3	6	Director Head of Spatial Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation Executive to approve LDS Identify Core Strategy as corporate priority Set up Management Board Investigate setting up informal members working group Identify Core Strategy as key delivery mechanism for corporate services Involvement of Executive / Full Council at key stages 	3	MEDIUM

DRAFT

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1/1's with key members and officers 		
3.	Changes to legislation / PPS12 / keeping up with emerging practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays to Core Strategy programme Legal challenge Core Strategy found unsound 	3	4	12	Head of Spatial Planning LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training plan Consider QA / external challenge 	6	HIGH
4.	Failure to develop appropriate evidence base for LDF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of connection made between evidence and the development of the strategy, hence plan deemed 'unsound' Uncertainty about impact of strategy on outcomes Risk of legal challenge Connection with poor monitoring thereafter 	3	5	15	LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed review of Districts' evidence base Commission additional technical studies Work with partners to review and update evidence Ensure research contracts are managed appropriately to obtain the right outputs 	8	HIGH
5.	Failure to embed project management and deliver the project on time to the right quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of control over the capacity to coordinate work streams Lack of control and risk of poor quality Project is not delivered on time 	3	3	9	Head of Spatial Planning LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare early project and resource plan Secure resources Introduce reporting arrangements and controls Team accountability and adherence to timelines 	4	MEDIUM
6.	Failure to properly resource the project (finance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor evidence base Delays to Core Strategy programme 	3	4	12	Director Head of Spatial Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position Core Strategy as corporate delivery plan Efficient resource management Investigate alternative 	8	HIGH

DRAFT

							funding options with internal and external partners		
7.	Loss of experienced staff in restructuring, lack of focus of unsettled staff on project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of capacity to keep to timescales ▪ Lack of skills to deliver sound plan ▪ Low productivity levels 	3	4	12	Director Head of Spatial Planning LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure adequate resources for properly resourced team • Identify corporate skill sets and support integrated working • Keep staff informed and involved in new structure • Set up staff work plans • Training plan 	8	HIGH
8.	Lack of public engagement and public opposition to the plan, lack of involvement of key stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criticism from the community and stakeholders about the lack of involvement ▪ Core Strategy is deemed to be unsound/delayed through lack of engagement ▪ Core Strategy is deemed unsound because of lack of integrated delivery plan with other agencies ▪ Core Strategy doesn't address local issues 	3	3	9	Director LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare participation / engagement strategy • Undertake continual engagement with key stakeholders • Ensure breadth and depth of participation particularly at the preferred strategy stage • Build feedback into consultation process 	4	MEDIUM
9.	Need to introduce focused or extensive changes post publication stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Delays to Core Strategy programme ▪ Loss of Council reputation ▪ Delays or missed opportunities for delivering infrastructure 	2	3	6	Head of Spatial Planning LDF Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check soundness of Plan prior to publication stage • Consider QA / external challenge 	3	MEDIUM

Source: Local Development Scheme - Wiltshire Core Strategy Project Plan, Baker Associates, September 2008