

CWR Risk Register

Title	Risk Causes	Consequences	Mitigation / Current Controls
1. Failure to implement an appropriate delivery strategy for the CWR area as set out in the SPD	Failure to develop appropriate delivery strategy, Political change	Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR, Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, Damage to the local economy	Maintain cross party political and community support to move the project forward, Continue to engage with key landowners, partners and stakeholders, Ensure aspirations of the SPD are met when developing proposals and considering planning applications, Continue to monitor and adapt the project plan
1.2. Failure to secure external funding	Lack of confidence in Winchester City Council in the market / with developers, National economic conditions, Proposals not considered viable	Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR, Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, Damage to the local economy	Continue to engage with key partners and stakeholders, Develop Winchester marketing approach targeted at inward investment, Ensure development proposals realistically assessed for viability
1.3. Lack of cooperation from landowners	WCC cannot secure landowner support to deliver aspirations of the SPD	Failure to deliver cohesive redevelopment of CWR	Continue to engage with key landowners and occupiers

<p>1.4. Insufficient internal resources to manage work streams</p>	<p>Insufficient resourcing in WCC project team, Insufficient capacity and skills in other Council departments</p>	<p>Delay in project programme, Errors occurring where there are gaps in knowledge / expertise</p>	<p>Continue to closely monitor capacity within the project team, Seek external expertise where required, Continue to monitor and adapt the project plan, including resources component, Have clear milestones and priorities for the project team</p>
<p>1.5. Perceived conflict of interest between Council as landowner and local planning authority</p>	<p>Inconsistent or unpopular planning decisions, Lack of transparency</p>	<p>Reputational damage, Potential challenge</p>	<p>When making decisions be clear on the capacity in which the Council is acting, Continue to act in an open and transparent manner where legally permitted, Adhere to approach laid out in the SPD distinguishing relationship between WCC and the LPA</p>

<p>1.6. Development proposals arising from the SPD are not financially viable</p>	<p>Insufficient testing of viability, Market changes, Unrealistic expectations for the scheme</p>	<p>Development cannot go ahead as set out in the SPD</p>	<p>Undertaking high level testing of viability, engaging specialist consultants where required, Continuing engagement with WCC members and other key stakeholders, Develop ambitious, high quality and realistic development proposals with viability and funding considered at an early stage together with design</p>
<p>2. Lack of progress on bringing vacant buildings in to use – upper floors at Kings Walk, Coitbury House and Friarsgate MC</p>	<p>Buildings in poor state of repair, Lack of finance to carry out work, Lack of market demand, Lack of a comprehensive scheme proposal</p>	<p>Buildings remain in their current state and possible blight on CWR site, Council continues to pay business rates and maintenance, Reputational damage as buildings continue to remain unused, Lack of options to receive income</p>	<p>Continue to progress proposals for the CWR site with JLL, progress plans as a priority workstream</p>
<p>3. Failure to implement plans to improve the Lower High Street Re-paving and Broadway</p>	<p>Plans for the wider development of the CWR site and movement of the bus station result in a decision not to implement concept design, Failure to secure funding</p>	<p>Expectations raised by the work commissioned up to end of RIBA stage 2 could result in reputational damage</p>	<p>Liaise with Highways Authority, JLL and Transport Planners and ensure plans are included in the wider CWR area proposals</p>

<p>4. Data collected from archaeology investigations is insufficient / unreliable and therefore of little value to potential developers</p>	<p>Unexpected environmental influences or failure of equipment</p>	<p>Potential financial loss to WCC and delay to the programme</p>	<p>Seek specialist expertise to help form appropriate recommendations for investigations, Continue to work with JLL as SPC, with regards to land value</p>
<p>5. Lack of interest from potential developers / investors</p>	<p>Lack of market demand Lack of confidence in Winchester City Council in the market, National economic conditions, Proposals not considered viable / attractive</p>	<p>Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR, Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, Damage to the local economy</p>	<p>Develop Winchester marketing approach targeted at inward investment, Ensure development proposals realistically assessed for viability</p>
<p>6. Stakeholders and public strongly dispute draft development proposals and preferred delivery strategy</p>	<p>Draft development proposals deemed not to be in line with SPD, preferred delivery approach is a development partner (as with Silver Hill)</p>	<p>Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR. Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration and public rally against the delivery approach</p>	<p>Ensure aspirations of the SPD are met when developing proposals, and clearly demonstrate this throughout consultation period. Steps to ensure robust processes and engagement around delivery approach</p>