

Appendix B

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 instability	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, Ensure rationale for preferred delivery option is set out clearly, Continue to monitor and adapt the project plan Developing the delivery strategy through development through the Strategic Outline Case (SOC)
1.2. Failure to progress from the SOC to the OBC	Political indecision due to public views	Delivery route explored in the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) is not implemented	Fully consider through development of Strategic Outline Case (SOC) all aspects including public comment and will ensure a robust narrative to explain the decision
1.3. 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
1.4. To engage key stakeholder support	WCC cannot secure key stakeholder support to deliver aspirations of the SPD	Failure to deliver cohesive redevelopment of CWR	Continue to engage with key stakeholders and occupiers

Appendix B

1.5. Insufficient internal resources to manage work streams	Insufficient resourcing in WCC project team, Insufficient capacity and skills in other Council departments	Delay in project programme, Errors occurring where there are gaps in knowledge / expertise	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
1.6. Conflict of interest between Council as landowner and local planning authority	Challenge on the basis of bias and predetermination	Reputational damage, Potential challenge	Engage external planning consultants to act for the city council in the capacity of landowner. 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
1.7. Development proposals arising from the SPD are not financially viable	Market changes, Unrealistic expectations for the scheme	Justified compromises have to be met on the SPD aspirations unless external funding can be found	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 Full interrogated through production of the Strategic Outline Case (SOC)
2. Failure to implement plans to improve the Lower High Street Re-paving and Broadway	Plans for the wider development of the CWR site and movement of the bus station result in a decision not implement concept design, Failure to secure funding	Expectations raised by the work commissioned up to end of RIBA stage 2 could result in reputational damage	Liaise with Highways Authority, JLL and Transport Planners

Appendix B

3. Data collected from archaeology investigations is insufficient / unreliable and therefore of little value to potential developers	Unexpected environmental influences or failure of equipment	Potential financial loss to WCC and delay to the programme	Seek specialist expertise to help form appropriate recommendations for investigations, Continue to work with JLL as SPC, with regards to land value
4. Lack of interest from potential developers / investors	Unrealistic expectations for the scheme Lack of market demand Lack of confidence in Winchester City Council in the market, National economic conditions, Proposals not considered viable / attractive	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	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 Explored through development of the Strategic Outline Case (SOC).
5. Lack of consensus around interim bus solution	SPD aspiration to have bus station on Middle Brook Street car park, Recent publication of the Bus Back Better Strategy and its support for retention of bus stations Perception that an on-street solution could mean poorer facilities for drivers and passengers	Vacant possession of the bus station is delayed resulted in delayed development on the site	Continue working with key stakeholders to build confidence in the proposals
6. Planning permission to demolish Friarsgate Medical Centre is refused	Lack of clarity around long term planning detail across the site	Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration Ongoing maintenance and repair costs	Continue working with planning authority

Appendix B

7. Conflict between the outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposals for CWR	The outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposals for CWR are not aligned	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	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 Working closely with HCC on a joint narrative for the proposed CWR bus solution and WMS
8. Cost escalation	Costs given at a very early stage in the project lifecycle (e.g. KW 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
9. Lengthy procurement processes for chosen delivery model	Multiple stakeholders involved in developing the brief, marketing materials and reviewing proposals.	Loss of appetite / interest from potential developers / investors Failure to launch into market at appropriate time	Set clear expectations around process for preparing for procurement and where stakeholders can be involved - ensure they are aware of any potential risks surrounding lengthy procurement and review processes Continue working closely with stakeholders such as Cabinet members to ensure any requirements are fully understood and included in specification
10. Failure to secure budget to implement meanwhile use strategy at Kings Walk	The costs to deliver the required works and implement the strategy are too high.	Unable to implement the meanwhile use strategy leading to lack of activation of the space. Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, No signs of progress leading to reputational/political damage to the administration,	Complete current survey work on Kings Walk to fully understand condition of the building and works required. And fully interrogate the figures. Survey reports shared with potential operators.

Appendix B

11. Legal challenge	Procedural requirement(s) not complied with	Diversion of financials resources and personnel to resolve Legal issues leading to potential reputational/political damage to the Council. Possibility of financial loss and/or penalties	Close working with the Council's Legal department and outside Legal advice and assistance throughout the process. Mitigation measures in place should a Legal challenge arise and auditing procedures adhered to throughout process.
---------------------	---	--	--