

Title	Risk Causes	Consequences	Mitigation / Current Controls
All active (9)			
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>Compromises have to be met on the SPD aspirations unless external funding can be found.</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. 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>3. 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>4. 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. Develop ambitious, high quality and realistic development proposals with viability and funding considered at an early stage together with design.</p>

<p>5. Emerging preferred delivery strategy for council to find a single development partner not supported</p>	<p>Legacy of the previous Silverhill scheme.</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>Delivery approach forms part of public consultation - council to consider all comments.</p>
<p>6. Lack of consensus around interim bus solution</p>	<p>SPD aspiration to have bus station on Middle Brook Street car park.</p>	<p>Vacant possession of the bus station is delayed resulted in delayed development on the site.</p>	<p>Continue working with key stakeholders to build confidence in the proposals.</p>
<p>7. Planning permission to demolish Friarsgate Medical Centre is refused</p>	<p>Lack of clarity around long term planning detail across the site.</p>	<p>Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver. Reputational/political damage to the administration. Ongoing maintenance and repair costs.</p>	<p>Continue working with planning authority.</p>
<p>8. Conflict between the outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposals for CWR</p>	<p>The outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposals for CWR are not aligned.</p>	<p>Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR. Potential issues in bringing forward short to medium term improvements to Kings Walk and demolition of Friarsgate Medical Centre. Reputational/political damage to the administration. Ongoing maintenance and repair costs.</p>	<p>Continue working with WMS officer team both at WCC and HCC as proposals for CWR and outputs of the Movement Strategy are progressed to ensure close monitoring and alignment.</p>

9. Cost escalation	Costs given at a very early stage in the project lifecycle (e.g. Kings Walk proposals, FGMC demolition and Interim Open space) may be subject to escalation as designs develop.	Sub-projects exceed budget causing delays for further authorisation or cancellation.	Close monitoring and quick action as designs develop, limit scope of works to meet budget.
--------------------	---	--	--