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**Notes**

1. **Work is on-going to identify any additional risks and opportunities, refine the description of the risks and opportunities already on this log, select the appropriate rating score and the officers who will be responsible for owning and completing any required actions and developing the correct response - in order to mitigate the risks or explore opportunities.**
2. **The risk score shown is the assessment after taking into account any mitigating actions that are given in the ‘Mitigating Actions / Progress’ column.**
3. **This register considers risks during the project stages.**

**Key to Risk Scoring**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | |  | **Impact** | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Likelihood** | **A** |  |  |  |  | *Risks that score C1 or above on the matrix are regarded as having a greater potential risk to the project and are shown in the register below in red in the columns marked ‘likelihood’, ‘impact’ and ‘score’.* | | | | | | | **B** |  |  |  |  | | **C** |  |  |  |  | | **D** |  |  |  |  | | **E** |  |  |  |  | | **F** |  |  |  |  | |  |  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  | **Impact** | | | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Risk Categories:**   * Economic * Environmental * Financial * Legal / Regulatory * Organisational/ Management * Political * Reputational / Social * Technical * Other |
| A | Very High |  | 1 | Catastrophic |  |
| B | High |  | 2 | Critical |  |
| C | Significant |  | 3 | Marginal |  |
| D | Low |  | 4 | Negligible |  |
| E | Very Low |  |  |  |  |
| F | Almost Impossible |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Stages** | **Includes (in no particular order):** |
| 1. **Preparation**   ***(RIBA stages 0 & 1)*** | Preparation of outline business case, drafting of MoU between CSPC, TWBC & KCC. |
| 1. **Development  *(RIBA stages 2 & 3)*** | Appointment of architectural team, drafting of legal agreements, signing of MoU/CA between CSPC, TWBC & KCC along with signing of the call options. Drafting of outline operational plan and updating of outline business plan, development of the design, development of decant plan and options for provision of interim service, development of ICT plan, planning consent process. Work to progress FA foundation grant. |
| 1. **Delivery  *(RIBA stages 4 & 5)*** | Final business case agreed, finalisation of design, tendering of contracts, preparation and decant of services, construction and fit out, preparation for opening. |
| 1. **Conclusion of building contract, handover and launch  *(RIBA stage 6)*** | Opening, conclusion of building contract, project team handover to new delivery team. |
| 1. **Evaluation - review and benefits realisation  *(RIBA stage 7)*** | Review of project performance, review of project outcomes, tracking and monitoring the delivery of project benefits. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **All stages of the project** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1 | The outline/business case / plan is not sufficiently robust | There is a risk that the business case / plan may not be sufficiently robust. If this risk occurs its impact could be seen in the current or future phases of the project. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | CSPC will work with surveyors and partners to develop and refine the business case based on feedback from CSPC to assist with the operational delivery elements. Input is particularly required in checking the assumptions and financial data in the business case. | Community Centre Management | Open |
| A2 | The needs of the services that are to be incorporated in the Community Centre are not given sufficient consideration | There is a risk that the needs of the services that are to be incorporated in the Community Centre are not given sufficient consideration. This could occur if the main focus of the project becomes the design and construction of the building. | Risk  Category:  Financial and  Reputational / Social | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | The project is aware of this risk and the project structure includes a ‘Management Group’ which consists of officers representing the services that will be included within the Community Centre. The Management Group will ensure that the project remains on track to deliver the stated benefits. Sub groups of the Management Group will be done when required to focus on various areas as required. | Community Centre Management | Open |
| A3 | The proposed scheme is not universally supported | The proposed project is a large multi-faceted development including residential enabling development. The detailed designs of the Cranbrook Community Centre have been difficult to get a consensus on from all stakeholders despite numerous consultations. | Risk  Category:  Financial and  Reputational / Social | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Housing is complete. The revised Community Centre has been re-designed and is now in delivery. Public communications will continue throughout the life of the project. CSPC are proposing a public event. | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | Open |
| A5 | Legal related risks | Risk that important issues are missed - such as claw back, covenants etc. | Risk  Category:  Legal | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Collaboration Agreement and revised CA is in place and operating well.  All major legal agreements have now been completed to secure the capital element of the scheme. Revenue legal agreements will remain outstanding but substantially there with regard to the major partners.  The risk of important issues being missed is greatly reduced by the fact that the Legal teams are available to support the project and, if required, can source external solicitors to advise on any specialist areas of law. | KCC legal  TWBC legal  CSPC legal | Open |
| A6 | Equalities matters – not handled correctly | There is a risk that, as the development of a Community Centre will result in changes to the way in which services are delivered and the design of the building, equalities legislation will not be adhered to. Ultimately this could result in legal challenge, additional costs and adverse publicity. | Risk  Category:  Legal/ Regulatory | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Jonathan White | Full EQUIA has been carried out and is being kept up to date. It has been consulted on and shared with members of the public and is being regularly reviewed. | Community Centre Management    Jonathan White | Open |
| A7 | Dependencies between this and other works | There is a risk that there will be dependencies between this and other works which could impact upon the timetable/finances for delivery. *In particular the Crest Nicholson development which is running in tandem with the SH development and the JVIP development and likely to see all three projects overlap.* | Risk  Category:  Organisational/ Financial | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *Crest Nicholson residential development has been delivered and is almost complete with all clashes resolved bar some on drainage.*  *JVIP development remains to be started and their impact is likely to be minimal based on the adjacency of the site being further away.* | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | Open |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **All stages of the project** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A8 | The added complexity of the project being conducted by three Local Authorities – CSPC, KCC and TWBC | *The site has been given to CSPC, for community use* | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *KCC, CSPC and TWBC are all supportive of the concept of a Community and medical Centre and have agreed to fund the project jointly with partners entering into a MoU and subsequently the Collaboration agreement. This is a partnership project and every effort will be made to understand the reporting timetable of both local authorities and factor this into the project timetable.*  *Land swaps have been completed and all land is principally owned by CSPC.* | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Open |
| A9 | Political decision making timetable  Or  Possible delays in the decision making process  *Applies during all stages of the project* | The political decision making timetable could result in a delay to the project. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | The timetable for the decision-making process and the key decisions required by the project have already been put in place.    This project is sufficiently high profile to warrant the arrangement of special meetings to ensure that additional decisions can be taken as required. | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | Open |
| A15 | Organisational changes within KCC and TWBC  *Applies during all stages of the project* | There is a risk that current or future organisational changes within KCC and / or TWBC could have an adverse effect on the project. Services could be transformed, officers who are involved in the delivery of the project could either leave the organisation or move to other areas not connected with the project. This could lead to delays in the project e.g. while officers who are new to the project become familiar with the detail or the organisations could struggle to provide sufficient officer resource. | Risk  Category:  Organisational/  Management | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board  Jonathan White | Every effort will be made to brief any officers who join the project thoroughly and quickly and for a formal handover of project responsibilities to take place.  The availability of the appropriate officer resource will be monitored closely and senior officers will make the case for the needs of this high profile project to be taken into account in any re-structuring plans of the two LAs. | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Open |
| A16 | Dependencies between this and other projects  *Applies during all stages of the project* | There is a risk that there could be dependencies between this and other projects. This could result in disruption to the timetable for the project and ultimately this could have a financial and / or reputational impact. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 2 Critical | D2 | Community Centre Management | *KCC agree to move the library.*  *NHS CCG agree to take a lease on a new medical centre*  *New housing is expected to deliver substantial S106 funding.* | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Closed |
| A17 | Unclear priorities, instructions or approvals for design and project management  Applies during all stages of the project | There is a risk that if priorities, instructions or approvals for the design and management of the project are unclear this could lead to delay, additional cost and / or failure to deliver the aims and objectives of the project. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | To date, significant consultation has taken place between the partners, stakeholders and the general public. The partners have had to make decisions on certain elements where competing groups have different requirements and these decisions are being taken in the best interest of the long term viability of the facility. | Community Centre Management | Open |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **All stages of the project** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A18 | Lack of political support or the political situation may change and impact upon the project  *Applies during all stages of the project* | There is a risk that:   1. The project, and in particular the funding of the capital and future running costs, will not be supported by Cllrs of one or more councils   Or   1. There could be changes in political representation and / or priorities during the term of the project making it difficult to establish and maintain political buy in and support.   This could lead to the project not progressing and the benefits that it is expected the project will deliver not being realised. | Risk  Category:  Political | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | If there is a lack of political support for this project this is likely to be evident during this stage of the project as:   * The decision for funding (capital and future revenue costs) will be put to Members/Cllrs of all three councils during this stage * *The next elections will take place in May 2021* | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Open |
| A19 | Lack of buy in and support from local people – or LAs seen as not sufficiently engaging with local people and considering local opinion  *Applies during all stages of the project* | The opportunity exists to engage with the local community to try and build upon the local support and enthusiasm for something to be done.  Engagement and consultation with local people, groups and businesses during this phase of the project has contributed towards delivering benefits to both the project and the town as a whole:  There are risks of reputational damage to the Councils if the project does not go ahead.  There is a risk that local people, groups, businesses and the media will take the view that local opinion has not been taken into account during the project. This could lead to a lack of support for the project and adverse publicity. Ultimately this could jeopardise the project’s outcome and the future support and use of the facility. | Category  as a risk:  Reputational / Social | Very High | 2. Critical | A2  D2 | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | Actions to develop and deliver the benefits that this opportunity offers.  Obtain ideas and insights via consultation and engagement with local people.  To date there has been extensive consultation over the past few years and this will continue as required.  Regular updates are planned as part of keeping people informed of progress on the site. | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Open |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **All stages of the project** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A20 | Communications are unplanned and / or unco-ordinated  *Applies during all stages of the project* | There is a risk that communications will not be planned or co-ordinated between the councils. This could result in the councils and the project appearing to be unprofessional. Staff issues could arise if the appropriate communications are not delivered on time to any staff who could be impacted by a new Community Centre and if consultation with staff unions does not take place at the right time.  Ultimately the reputation of the councils could be damaged which could impact upon support for this and other future projects. | Risk  Category:  Reputational / Social | D. Low | 3.Marginal | D3 | Community Centre Management  Jonathan White | Communication plan has been put in place to ensure the councils work effectively together.  A communication protocol was established and this is to be continued throughout the life of this project. | *Murray Evans*  *Anne McCarthy*  Community Centre Management | Open |
| A21 | Lack of community engagement in decision making for the project  *Applies during all stages of the project* | There is a risk that the project will lack community engagement in decision making. If this risk occurs the project could lack community ownership and this could lead to the increased risk of objections to the project. | Risk  Category:  Social | E. Very Low | 2. Critical | E2 | Community Centre Management | There has been and will continue to be on-going consultation and stakeholder engagement.  Those elements of the project which remain contentious will have to be managed as appropriate and officers are aware that they will be unable to satisfy all groups. | Community Centre Management | Open |
| A22 | Vote to leave the EU impacts on material costs | Following the vote to leave the EU the pound has de-valued against the euro making certain construction materials more expensive which could drive the construction costs of the project up. | Risk  Category: financial | D. Low | 2. Marginal | D3 | Jon White | Work with contractors to ensure that materials are locally sourced where possible and that RIBA4 detailed designs take account of this approach. | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | CLOSED  Risk was mitigated via a pound euro exchange mechanism in the contract which is now no longer valid |
| A23 | Vote to leave the EU impacts on land values  *Applies during all stages of the project* | Following the vote to leave the EU, land valuations on residential developments took a hit but these have since recovered. It is not yet known what the future impact of this decision could be but it does make predicting future values more difficult. | Risk  Category:  Funding | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | The project will continue to monitor values and viability as they progress but this makes delivery of the scheme more difficult to predict.  General uncertainty remains over the Brexit discussions but land values have stabilised and work continues. | Community Centre Management | CLOSED  Land sold subject to contract within anticipated values |
| A24 | Increase the profile of Cranbrook  Applies during all stages of the project | A successful project – may provide the opportunity to publicise the project and thereby raise the profile of Cranbrook as a visitor destination. This could bring additional economic benefits to the town. There will also be an increasing number of opportunities to promote the town as the project progresses. | Opportunity | Significant | Positive | N/A | Community Centre Management | If the project is successful it is likely that this will present an opportunity to publicise the benefits of the scheme and the wider impact it will have. The communication teams of all three LAs will ensure that this is done in the most effective and appropriate way to help raise the profile of Cranbrook as a visitor destination. | Community Centre Management | Open |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **f No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Preparation stage** | | | | | | | | | | |
| B1 | Costs for preparation stage maybe higher than what partners are willing to provide.  *Applies during the Preparation stage* | There is a risk that this budget will not be sufficient to meet all the costs of this phase of the project.  This could result in lack of future support for the project. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 3. Marginal | C3 | Jonathan White | Sufficient funding is being sought from all three partners and sale of residential units will ensure there is sufficient funding should this be required. | Community Centre Management | Closed |
| B2 | An affordable solution for the delivery of the Community Centre is not found  *Applies during the Preparation phase* | There is a possibility that KCC, CSPC and TWBC will not be able to find a solution for the delivery of the Community Centre that is financially affordable and meets the expectations of the local councils, the public and all stakeholders in terms of both capital costs and future running costs. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | The Collaboration Agreement has been entered into showing how the project will stack up and what will be delivered. Partners can invest further funds if required and value engineering will take place to ensure a deliverable scheme. | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Closed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Preparation and Development stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| C1 | NHS lease negotiations and grant allocation are subject to local, regional and national decisions.  *Applies during the Preparation stage* | There is a risk that KCC are unable to agree terms with the NHS over their lease given the bureaucracy within the NHS to decide such matters. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 3. Marginal | C3 | Jonathan White | Early negotiations with the NHS are taking place around the lease and slow progress is being made. Further meetings are ongoing and the GP partners remain committed to delivering the project. | Community Centre Management | Open |
| C2 | It will not be possible to get commitment from all tenants on levels of rent to the future facility.  *Applies during the Preparation and Development stages* | There is a risk that tenants will not commit to a level of rent or term that is workable for the project. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Community Centre Management | Initial discussions have taken place with partners and tenant enquiries have shown that some if not all are prepared to take on agreements for lease in order to mitigate these issues. | Jonathan White | Open |
| C3 | Agreement is not reached between the partners for the use of space in the new Community Centre  *Applies during the Preparation and Development stages* | There is a risk that the partners will not be able to agree to financial or operational arrangements that provide CSPC with the degree of certainty that enables the project to progress. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Initial discussions have taken place between the partners and third parties which strongly indicates that a workable agreement is highly likely and a Collaboration Agreement has been signed to cover off some of these elements. | Jonathan White | Open |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Preparation and Development stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| C4 | Delivery of new GP and medical services in a dedicated standalone multi GP surgery  *Applies during the Preparation and Development stages* | *GPs will rent the building with backing from the CCG at an agreed rent.* | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *Final funding is yet to be agreed but the outline business case is in line with expectation of a rent and tenancy agreement.* | Jonathan White  *Jacqueline Tolhurst*  Community Centre Management | Open |
| C5 | Delivery of new GP and medical services in a dedicated standalone multi GP surgery | *The GPs will need to dissolve their individual partnerships and form a new single partnership. That one entity will take on the building.* | Risk  Category:  Financial |  |  |  | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *Regular updates from GPs on progress of new partnership* |  |  |
| C7 | Provide new services  *Applies during the Preparation and Development stages* | *The Community Centre is looking to deliver additional services such as the inclusion of a teaching kitchen and multi use rooms.* | Opportunity | Significant | Positive | N/A | Community Centre Management | *Awaiting final expectations of final users* | Community Centre Management | Open |
| C8 | Developing the operational plan  *Applies during the Preparation and Development stages* | *The development of the operational plan is dependent on contracting with an experienced project management team* | Opportunity | Significant | Positive | N/A | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *This has been costed into the Outline Business plan* | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Open |
| C9 | Planning applications  Applies during the Preparation and Development Stages | *The development is subject to a planning application which could be refused including:* | Risk | C. Significant | C. Critical | C2 | Jonathan White | CSPC will work with the planners prior to submission |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Preparation, Development and Delivery stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| D1 | VAT – not fully understood or budgeted for  *Applies during the Preparation, Development and Delivery stages.* | Extensive professional advice has been taken about the VAT issue. | Risk  Category:  Financial | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Jonathan White | The options are to pay VAT on the medical centre build cost or impose VAT on the annual rent.  Modelling suggests paying VAT on the build is more advantageous in the long run. No decision has to be made currently. | Jon White | Open |
| D2 | Cost increases due to inflation / specific material costs  *Applies during the Preparation, Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that the cost of the project will increase due to inflation (or the increase in cost of specific materials). This could result in the project being over budget or having to be scaled back. If the project is scaled back the project may not deliver all the benefits expected. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Jonathan White | Inflation has been taken into account in the preparation of the early stage feasibility. The budget will be closely monitored and refined throughout the project. | Jon White and Build Manager | Open |
| D3 | Costs of the operational delivery plan does not meet budget expectations  *Applies during the Preparation, Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that the cost of the operational model could exceed the budget expectations. This could lead to the operational element being unaffordable to CSPC.  If the operational model is not sustainable the project may not deliver the benefits for local people and groups than would otherwise have been the case and this in turn could have ramifications for KCC, TWBC and CSPC. | Risk  Category:  Financial | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | CSPC intend to have a reserve to pay for the initial operation of the centre. The plan will develop during the project | Jon White  Parish Clerk | Open |
| D5 | Procurement protocols and legislation - not followed correctly or the process could be delayed  *Applies during the Preparation, Development and Delivery stages.* | There is a risk that the exercise to appoint consultants or contractors is not undertaken correctly. This could result in a challenge by a consultant which could then delay the project. Any challenge (whether successful or unsuccessful) is likely to result in significant staff time being spent to manage the response. | Risk  Category:  Legal/ Regulatory | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | *Jacqueline Tolhurst* | Every effort is being made to ensure that the correct process is being followed and advice is being sought from various colleagues/consultants to ensure this is the case. | Jon White | Open |
| D6 | Lack of clarity of the various services regarding their future needs.  *Applies during the Preparation, Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that insufficient clarity exists within some services as to their likely future needs. Some services could undergo transformation programmes that could see services delivered via alternative models.  This could result in the business case and specification for the Community Centre not being sufficiently robust which could impact the capital and revenue plans. | Risk  Category:  Organisational/  Management | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | The need for flexibility of design to ‘future proof’ any future Community Centre has already been identified and will continue to be a theme throughout the project should it progress beyond the current stage. | Community Centre Management | Open |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Development stage** | | | | | | | | | | |
| E1 | The project has an anchor tenant in the GPs  *Applies during the Development stage* | The project is looking to get income from leases, grants and partner contributions. All these are subject to negotiations which could be difficult to predict timewise. | Risk  Category:  Financial | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | The risks are being extinguished as the project develops however the budget monitoring has been complicated by this fact and valuations have been obtained where necessary to try and bring some income/cost certainty.  Grants updated positions known  Partner contributions updated | Jon White | Open |
| E2 | The budget for the RIBA stage 4 (development phase of the project) is exceeded  *Applies during the Development stage* | There is a risk that this budget will not be sufficient to meet all the costs of this phase of the project.  This could result in the need for partners to provide additional funding. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 3. Marginal | C3 | Jonathan White | The RIBA stage 4 costs have been funded from KCC, any additional RIBA stage 4 funds will come from the proceeds of the residential land sale. | Jon White | Open |
| E3 | It is not possible to raise the full budget to meet the costs of the Community Centre including allowing for a sufficient contingency.  *Applies during the Development stage* | The current project costs are based on estimates however this shows that the project is close and would be better if there was a contingency in place to manage any overspends. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | *CSPC will add a further £500k into the Worst Case scenario to allow for additional contingency should it be required.* | Jon White | Open |
| E4 | Unregistered land  *Applies during the Development stage* | Land is unregistered meaning that the land will first need to be claimed via the land registry otherwise the project cannot proceed. | Risk  Category:  Technical | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Community Centre Management / Jonathan White | The unregistered land is being registered. | Jon White |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Development and Delivery stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| F1 | Rights of Light and rights of way  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that occupiers of properties close to the Community Centre could decide to object to the development on the basis of their right to light or rights of way. This could cause a delay to the project if an objection results in the need to re-design the scheme or the requirement to pay compensation which could impact the financial viability of the scheme. | Risk  Category:  Legal | E. Very Low | 2 Critical | E2 | Jonathan White | The rights of way and rights to light are being dealt with via negotiations. | Jon White |  |
| F2 | Health and safety – legal aspects  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that the Councils will not fulfil their legal obligations under health and safety legislation. If this risk occurs the impact upon the project and the Councils would vary according to the nature and severity of the breach – ultimately could result in a very large fine, reputational issues and consequences for individual officers. | Risk  Category:  Legal / Regulatory and Reputational | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | The Councils take their responsibilities very seriously. The Council’s Legal Services Department are aware of the issues and will ensure that specific contracts with all consultants are drafted to deal with Health and Safety matters. | Legal departments | Open |
| F3 | Health and safety – operational aspects  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that the Councils will not fulfil their operational obligations under health and safety legislation (e.g. to secure the safety of construction workers and other users). If this risk occurs the impact upon the project and the Councils would vary according to the nature and severity of the breach – ultimately could result in a very large fine, reputational issues and consequences for individual officers. There could also be a delay to the project. | Risk  Category:  Legal / Regulatory and Reputational | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | The Councils take their responsibilities very seriously and will actively manage the H& S aspects of its contract with the lead consultant.  A CDM (Construction, design and management) co-ordinator will be appointed to manage this aspect of the project. | Jon White | Open |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Development and Delivery stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| F4 | Procurement approach does not result in the appointment of a team with the appropriate experience and skills for this particular project  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages.* | There is a risk that, if a framework agreement is used to select and appoint a team of consultants to work with KCC, CSPC and TWBC on the detailed design and construction phase, the team selected will not be suitable / sufficiently specialised to deliver the stated aspirations of the project.  In addition, the use of a framework agreement could result in criticism that the procurement process has not been fully open and transparent and has not given local firms the opportunity to tender.  Perceived lack of transparency could result in adverse publicity and reputational issues for the partners and challenge could delay the project.  The appointment of an unsuitable team of consultants could have wide ranging and possibly long lasting consequences – an unsuitable building that is not fit for purpose or for Cranbrook, delays, overrun on costs etc. | Risk  Category:  Financial | C. Significant | 2. Critical | C2 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | KCC is running the procurement process via its OJEu compliant framework.  This will be discussed and agreed with the partners.  KCC are providing expert guidance on the procurement of consultants and contractors. | Jon White |  |
| F5 | Low number of proposals received from prospective contractors / architectural teams  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages.* | There is a risk that a low number and / or inadequate quality of proposals will be received from prospective contractors/consultants to work with KCC, CSPC and TWBC on the development. This could result in little choice and failure to procure a team at the right price and with the appropriate experience and skills.  This could in turn lead to any work commissioned being more expensive than would otherwise have been the case or of a lower quality.  Alternatively the timescale may slip. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | It is believed that the profile of KCC, CSPC and TWBC and the potential high profile and scale of this exciting project will result in a good level of interest being shown by potential consultants. | Jon White |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Development and Delivery stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| F6 | Specification is changed at a late stage  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that the specification is changed at a late stage i.e. after the design that is to be taken forward has been costed and that costing has been agreed.  This could result in the development being value engineered and cause a delay in delivery of the project. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D Low | 2 Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | There will be clear and detailed communication regarding the design throughout the design phase with all those whose input is required. The risks of changing the design after it has been costed and agreed will be made very clear from the outset. | Jonathan White | Open |
| F7 | Lack of continuity of advisors and specialists  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk of lack of continuity of advisors and specialists working on the project. This could lead to the loss of knowledge about the background to the project and result in progress being delays while new specialists ‘get up to speed’. | Risk  Category:  Organisational / Management | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Jonathan White | The approach will be to appoint an architectural team for the whole of the development stage of the project to ensure continuity. There is a possibility that the team for the delivery stage may not be the same as for the development stage but if this is the case it will be the result of the LA procurement process which is to ensure fairness and the selection and appointment of the most suitable and cost-effective specialists.  Reports and written information is being stored on SharePoint and officers provide continuity. | Jon White and Build Manager | Open |
| F8 | Current facilities on site and re-location  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | The site currently still has the redundant dental surgery with services and a sewer from the Public WCs (closed) | Category  as a risk:  Technical | E. Very Low | 2.Critical | E2 | Jonathan White | Demolition can start once planning permission has been granted, and subject to contract. | Jonathan White | Open |
| F9 | Technical challenges related to the building and / or site  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | Surveys required for the Community Centre may reveal technical challenges related to the site and / or the existing buildings that mean that the capital costs of the project would be much greater than early indications suggest. This could mean that the project is unaffordable in its current format. | Risk  Category:  Technical | D. Low | 3. Marginal | D3 | Cranbrook Community Centre Board | Most surveys now complete and nothing significant to report. Watching brief remains on the archaeology and this could yet be an issue if anything is found during construction.  Contingency to ensure this risk can be covered. | Jonathan White |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Development and Delivery stages** | | | | | | | | | | |
| F10 | Problems meeting building regulations / development control or adhering to planning permissions  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that there could be problems meeting building regulations / development control or adhering to planning permissions. If the scheme that is developed does not comply with building regulations this could lead to the scheme being redesigned, resulting in delay and additional cost. | Risk  Category:  Technical | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jonathan White | The design team will liaise closely with development control, planners and the sustainability manager throughout the project. | Jon White and Build Manager | Open |
| F11 | Stakeholders perceive problems with the design as it progresses  *Applies during the Development and Delivery stages* | There is a risk that stakeholders may perceive problems with the design or if necessary, re-design as it progresses. This could lead to compromises which could result in additional, unbudgeted expense or delay to the project. If the design is changed it is also possible that it may be changed in a way that no longer best serves the services and makes the best use of the space. Alternatively, changes could improve the outcome. | Risk  Category:  Technical | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Jon White  Community Centre Management | Consultation and engagement of services/local groups and people has already taken place and could be further extended if required.  Any concerns about the design will be regularly discussed and resolved and clear explanations given as to why any proposed changes do or do not best serve the partners.    This risk will be carefully monitored and managed to ensure the best and most cost effective outcome within the budget available. | Jon White | Open |
| F12 | Risk of losing NHS funding, GPS have a deadline of 2024 for new surgery within centre to be available | Lack of progress diminishes the chance of delivery on time. | Risk Category:  Financial | D. Low | 2. Critical | D2 | Cranbrook Community centre | GPs are kept abreast of all developments on a monthly basis to ensure they understand the build and issues |  |  |

Further risks will be added and removed as required by the project, subject to what risks are considered to be materially significant or not.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Planning & Design Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Planning approval may not be given |  |  | Low | Very High |  |  | Create new version of business plan. Ensure all planning concerns are addressed as far as possible. Appeal |  |  |
|  | KCC Library may not agree to acceptable terms for the move to the centre |  |  | Low | Low |  |  | Find other users for the space - or redesign the centre to be smaller, for example by taking out a whole floor. |  |  |
|  | The Co-operative Society may not give promised permission at no charge for access to Wilkes Field |  |  | Low | Very High |  |  | Co-op have signed access agreement |  | CLOSED |
|  | Constraints associated with planning approval may prove difficult &/or costly to meet |  |  | Low | Very High |  |  | Negotiate with planners |  |  |
|  | Delays to the Cranbrook Engineering site listing decisions will delay submission of revised planning application |  |  | High | Medium |  |  | Ask politicians to lobby |  |  |
|  | Lack of resolve of the Parish Council to complete project |  |  | Low | High |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Offer to Parish Council for the land for the Community Centre is withdrawn by the owner |  |  | Low/Medium | High |  |  | Negotiation with the landowner |  | CLOSED |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Construction Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Difficulties may be encountered during construction that are costly or impossible to resolve |  |  | Medium - costly  Low - impossible to resolve | Medium |  |  | Ensure project is professionally managed to elicit any problems as early as possible |  |  |
|  | The Parish Council may be short of the skills and expertise to source and manage the construction |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Source skilled people from community. Else hire professionals |  |  |
|  | Construction may not be of desired quality |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | Ensure project is professionally managed to elicit any problems as early as possible. Ensure tenders and potential suppliers are thoroughly researched. Ensure quality control is ongoing |  |  |
|  | Changes in government regulations may require costly changes to the construction specifications |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | None |  |  |
|  | The specifications for the construction may be inadequate |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | Take professional advice on specifications and have then audited. |  |  |
|  | Landscape or ground difficulties may be encountered |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | Ensure project is professionally managed to elicit any problems as early as possible |  |  |
|  | The design may prove difficult, costly or impossible to build |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | Careful choice of builders.  If necessary, change design. |  |  |
|  | Chosen construction suppliers may go out of business before finishing agreed work. |  |  | Low | Low |  |  | Ensure project is professionally managed to elicit any problems as early as possible. Take professional advice on insurance and contracts |  |  |
|  | Lack of resolve and commitment of Parish Council to complete construction |  |  | Low | High |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Financial Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | The Parish Council may not be able to recover VAT on the construction and associated professional fees |  |  | Medium to High | Very High |  |  | Research and use of professional advice |  |  |
|  | Delay in start of construction may result in increased construction costs |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Emphasis on fundraising. Obtain costs for construction in phases, eg footings to DPC level, walls and watertight, complete fitting of inside |  |  |
|  | Fund raising may not achieve the required amount to complete construction |  |  | Low to medium | Very High |  |  | Need active fundraising team. Consider use of fund raising professional to advise. If necessary redesign building to meet new budget |  |  |
|  | If loan permission is not achieved then there will be a delay in the start of construction whilst fund raising reaches a figure appropriate to accept construction tenders |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Prepare and issue poll but plan for negative response. |  |  |
|  | Interest rate from PWLB increase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TWBC may not provide the promised £400k |  |  | Low | Medium |  |  | If money not forth-coming then serious lobbying of TW Council. Else increase fund raising activities |  | CLOSED |
|  | Solar PV Feed in Tariff figures based on figures as of December 2014 |  |  | Medium | Low |  |  | None |  |  |
|  | If the construction costs are not within range expected then there will be a potential impact on the ratepayers |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Careful review of specifications. Due diligence on choice of construction contractors. Consider insurance. Increase fund raising. |  |  |
|  | Pledged monies may not be forthcoming |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The professional advice and fees may be greater than budgeted |  |  | Medium/High | Low/ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | If the design or construction phase runs into financial difficulties then there would be a direct impact on the ratepayers |  |  | Medium |  |  |  | (as per 3.7 above?) |  |  |
|  | The precept may be capped by the government, preventing any further increases. |  |  | Medium | Medium/ |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **General Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Expected regular users of the centre may cease to exist (eg, CAB) |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Increase marketing of facilities to wider range of potential users |  |  |
|  | Administration may be more time consuming than estimated |  |  | Low to Medium | Medium |  |  | Constant review of processes and research into alternative methods of delivery |  |  |
|  | There may be a shortage of other users for the Vestry Hall complex. |  |  | Medium | High |  |  | Marketing of facilities |  |  |
|  | Lack of availability of parking spaces may impact hiring of rooms |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Consideration of potential areas for additional parking. Consideration of charges for existing parking spaces |  |  |
|  | Adverse impact on other letting facilities in area |  |  | Low | Low |  |  | Conduct community facility audit in 2015. Include other facilities in marketing activities |  |  |
|  | Lack of management expertise in Parish Council or in appointed management team |  |  | Low/Medium | High |  |  | Buy in expertise |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **Financial Risks – Post Build** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | The potential implications of VAT may be onerous and impact the charging rates, the amount of administration and consequently the cost of running the centre |  |  | High | High |  |  | Research and use of professional advice prior to construction start.  Adjust legal framework and hire charges as necessary |  |  |
|  | The take-up of the rooms may not match estimates |  |  | Low | High |  |  | Increased marketing of facilities |  |  |
|  | Running costs and maintenance may be higher than estimated |  |  | Medium to High | High |  |  | Careful control of budgets and costs |  |  |
|  | The additional staff needed may be more in number and higher in cost than estimated |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  | Consider the use of volunteers |  |  |
|  | If Centre runs into financial problems then there will be a direct impact on the ratepayers |  |  | Medium | High |  |  | Ensure management team is efficient and effective. Consider leasing Centre to Charity or Trust or similar if this would mitigate risk |  |  |
|  | The Centre may require employment of management at additional cost |  |  | Medium | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **COVID-19 Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | Tenders – current circumstances might limit the quality of the tender returns |  |  |  |  |  | * Engagement with the market has confirmed that while some construction sites and face to face suppliers maybe affected by the pandemic, the majority of contractors, sub-contractors and consultants remain open to bid for work and able to return tenders as this does not require face to face interaction. * With the private sector putting some work on hold there is currently an oversupply of consultants looking for work and eager to secure new business. * The initial stage of the contract does not involve work on site and therefore current circumstances are not likely to impact on the project unless they remain in place for a prolonged period of time. |  |  |
|  |  | Contractors risk pricing could vary significantly given current market uncertainties |  |  |  |  |  | * Given the cut backs in private sector work, feedback from the industry suggests that new work is being sought and tenders are needing to become more competitive on that basis. This should result in lower tender prices for CSPC and a good opportunity for us to secure and lock in these lower prices. * Inflation prices in the construction industry are also anticipated to slow because of the current situation and this will further help keep costs down. Once the effects of the pandemic and the “new normal” resume, any timing benefit in terms of pricing will have been lost. * JCT Design and Build 2016 contract including the schedule of amendments will ensure that any risk going forward is acceptable to CSPC. |  |  |
|  |  | The ability to deliver effective public consultation and ensure the project stands up to scrutiny in these times could lead to reputational damage for the council |  |  |  |  |  | * The Council have and will continue to undertake substantial public consultation. The means by which it does so will be under constant review and will need to take into account the “new normal” once this becomes more established which may or may not allow for communications to be done in the same way as they were done before. * Planning committees and public meetings continue to be held with the help of technology and new and innovative means of communication with residents will need to be considered and brought forward. |  |  |
|  |  | Interest rates have fallen further but could PWLB restrict further borrowing |  |  |  |  |  | * The lower interest rates from the PWLB have not yet been reflected in the revised business case which will further lower costs to residents from the loan. * Central government are not currently consulting on any lending cap for public authorities. |  |  |
|  |  | CSPC is seen to be delivering a project in a high-risk environment during a period of time when the public will not necessarily see this as a priority |  |  |  |  |  | * Delaying the scheme will result in funding secured to date being eroded by inflation and lead to the potential loss of significant S106 moneys when the agreements time out. * The public will be kept aware of progress with the facility and will have every opportunity to feedback and comment on all the next steps of the proposals. * Progressing the scheme now when the private sector is cutting back investment will also provide a boost to the town and potentially secure jobs that would otherwise have been lost. |  |  |
|  |  | Will Covid19 have an impact on the current business case and potential future revenue income |  |  |  |  |  | * Longer term it is unlikely that there will be any impact to the business case. In the short and medium term the business case will be kept under review particularly in regard to timelines and when the actual delivery will take place. * The growth in housing continues despite the pandemic and the business case clearly shows that just relying on the new income from the houses would be more than enough to sustain the facility with little to no income. |  |  |
|  |  | Potential future down turn could deliver a lower price in the future for the council get a better price |  |  |  |  |  | * The likelihood of a recession seems almost certain given the current circumstances and with the current position of the project it would seem to be ideally placed to hit the market at the best possible moment and therefore benefit from the lowest costs. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No.** | **Title and stage of the project to which this risk applies** | **Risk / Opportunity Description** | **Risk or Opportunity**  **and Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Score**  (Note 3) | **Risk / Opportunity Owner** | **Risk Mitigating / Opportunity Development Actions and Progress** | **Mitigating Action Owner** | **Status**  **(Open or Closed)** |
| **BREXIT Risks** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Exchange rate risk  Logistic delays if using a foreign construction elements |  |  |  |  |  |  | * Note and have a substantial contingency. Not in a position to forward buy currency. * Potential to slow down the delivery of the project. |  |  |