

| Risk Title | Risk Causes | Risk Consequences | Likelihood (1-4) | Impact (1-4) | Risk Score | Mitigation | Immediate Actions | Residual Likelihood | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
|---|---|--|---------------------|-----------------|------------|---|---|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Failure to design and implement a scheme for the CWR area as set out in the SPD | Failure to gain approval to appoint the recommended Development Partner following the procurement process, Political instability and policy 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 | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open | Maintain cross party political and community support to move the project forward, Continue to engage with key landowners, partners and stakeholders, Identify a suitable Development Partner through thorough and robust analysis and evaluation of tender submissions. Once appointed, work with the recommended Development Partner on their draft Development Delivery Plan and planning application and produce a Full Business Case. | Continue with member engagement including cross party where appropriate. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| 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 | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Continue to engage with key partners and stakeholders, Ensure the recommended Development Partner is able to access sufficient levels of funding in their tender submission, Work with the recommended Development Partner once appointed to ensure proposals are realistically assessed for viability and opportunities for funding are investigated and applied for | Hold next steps conversations with potential funding partners and monitor opportunities to submit relevant bids. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Lack of cooperation from landowners and support from stakeholders and general public | WCC cannot secure support to deliver aspirations of the SPD | Objections and challenge from stakeholders and general public. Failure to deliver cohesive redevelopment of CWR | Likely (3) | Moderate (2) | Open | Continue to engage with key landowners, occupiers and general public. Ensure recommended Development Partner has demonstrated suitable approach to engagement as set out in the tender documentation. | Ensure thorough and robust analysis and evaluation of approach to engagement within the tender submissions. | Unlikely (2) | Moderate (2) | Moderate |
| Perceived conflict of interest between Council as landowner and local planning authority | Inconsistent or unpopular planning decisions, Lack of transparency | Reputational damage, Potential challenge | Likely (3) | Moderate (2) | Open | 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 | | Likely (3) | Moderate (2) | Open |
| The proposed scheme is not financially viable | Market changes, Unrealistic expectations for the scheme Political instability and policy change | Compromises have to be met on the SPD aspirations unless external funding can be found | Likely (3) | Significant (4) | Hungry | Undertaking high level testing of viability, engaging specialist consultants where required, Ensure the recommended Development Partner has demonstrated realistic and considered approach to viability Ensure the recommended Development Partner provides ambitious yet realistic proposals for addressing any financial gaps. Interrogate viability and explore funding options through production of the Full Business Case. | Explore opportunities for external funding where appropriate | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open |
| The proposed scheme is not affordable to the council | Market changes, Unrealistic expectations for the scheme Political instability and policy change | Compromises have to be met on the SPD aspirations unless external funding can be found | Likely (3) | Significant (4) | Hungry | Undertaking extensive financial modelling, engaging specialist consultants where required Continuing engagement with WCC members and other key stakeholders, Interrogate viability and explore funding options through production of the Full Business Case. Ensure the recommended Development Partner is able to provide ambitious yet realistic proposals for addressing any financial gaps. | Explore opportunities for external funding where appropriate | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Recommended Development Partner loses interest. | Lack of confidence in Winchester City Council in the market, National economic conditions, Lengthy period between evaluations and decision / announcement of recommended Development Partner | 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 | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure consistent engagement with the recommended Development Partner Work with the recommended Development Partner to understand key risks / concerns and how they might be mitigated | Continue engagement with the recommended Development Partner Where possible take steps to reduce areas of concern such as archaeology by carrying out additional investigative works prior to commencing redevelopment. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Conflict between the outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposed scheme for CWR | The outputs of the Winchester Movement Strategy and the proposals for CWR are not aligned | Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR, Reputational/political damage to the administration Ongoing maintenance and repair costs | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Continue working with WMS officer team and consultants both at WCC and HCC as proposals for CWR and outputs of the Movement Strategy are progressed to ensure close monitoring and alignment. | Ensure recommended Development Partner is aware of importance of relationships with key stakeholders such as HCC and implements appropriate strategy for engagement | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Construction cost increases and supply chain disruptions | Impact of Brexit, the Covid19 pandemic, war in Ukraine and increased inflation resulting in shortage of materials and skills leading to a delay in the project and / or affect the viability of the scheme. | Implications for viability and affordability of the scheme, leading to potential delays Council / recommended Development Partner forced to make undesirable compromises | Highly Likely (4) | Major (3) | Hungry | Regular close monitoring of construction market supply and demand. | | Highly Likely (4) | Major (3) | Hungry |
| Detailed planning cannot be obtained or, if obtained, can only be implemented at costs greater than in the original budget. | The implementation the scheme fails to adhere to the terms of the planning permission. | Failure to deliver comprehensive redevelopment of CWR, Loss of trust in the Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure clear expectations with regards to planning requirements are agreed at the earliest opportunity, Ensure plans for the scheme are aligned to key planning documentation and CWR objectives i.e. Local Plan, CWR SPD | Ensure the recommended Development Partner is regularly engaging with the council's planners | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| The demand for the scheme does not match the levels projected / assumed / properties are unoccupied and / or the usage of the development varies from the levels forecast | Lack of or changes in market demand, National economic conditions | The projected benefits of the scheme are not realised, Potential financial loss to WCC, Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure recommended Development Partner is able to demonstrate thorough analysis of projected benefits, this should feed through into the Economic Case in the Full Business Case, Continue to monitor market demand | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------|-----------------|----------|--|---|---------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Recommended Development Partner goes into liquidation | Recommended Development Partner loses a large client, experiences issues with unforeseen rising costs, staff retention and / or increased competition leading to loss of market share. | Financial loss to WCC, Further delays to regeneration of the area, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open | Robust analysis and evaluation of tender submission to ensure minimum financial thresholds are met and sufficient supporting evidence is provided | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Planning requirements related to archaeology result in delays or potentially stop the development progressing | Where planning conditions require excavation, findings result in requirement for further more detailed / costly investigations. | Implications for viability and affordability of the scheme, Further delays to regeneration of the area, Council / developer forced to make undesirable / costly compromises in relation to site layout / building design. | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure the recommended Development Partner continues to demonstrate an appropriate approach to archaeology that is satisfactory to the requirements outlined in the CWR Archaeology Statement. A guidance document for dealing with Archaeology sets expectations in relation to what is required. Ensure the recommended Development Partner is liaising with WCC archaeology experts as plans for the scheme are progressed. | WCC to carry out recommended further archaeological investigations - trial trenching on the site. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Process for procuring the Development Partner is subject to legal challenge | Council is accused of failing to meet procurement regulations / acting unlawfully in respect of the procurement process adopted. Council is challenged by an unsuccessful bidder or external party | Delays and / or failure to procure Development Partner for the site, Further delays to regeneration of the area, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, Financial loss to WCC. | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Continue to engage with specialist legal and procurement experts throughout to ensure thorough and robust process. | Continue to work with legal and procurement specialists throughout process | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Failure to identify and gain approval to appoint the recommended Development Partner prior to pre-election period in 2023 | Failure to follow the timetable / unforeseen delays to the procurement process | Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Unlikely (2) | Major (3) | Open | Ensure timescales for procurement process are strictly followed and internal teams and external consultants are brought into the process as early as possible. | Ensure provision is made to bring in additional resources if required. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Major (3) | Moderate |
| WCC has a change of direction on the CWR project. A change in administration results in the project being stopped / direction changed significantly | An affordable viable scheme is presented but WCC does not approve next steps. Lack of support from all members for the current direction of and proposals for the project | Financial loss to WCC - council liable to pay compensation to the Development Partner, potentially c£3-5m. Further delays to regeneration of the area, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Continue cross party engagement | Hold briefing with all members prior to decision to appoint the recommended Development Partner. | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| Insufficient project governance | Lack of robust governance and management processes and structures. | Further delays to regeneration of the area, Lack of transparency, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to the administration, | Unlikely (2) | Moderate (2) | Moderate | Work with recommended Development Partner to implement robust process for project governance and management - ensure both parties are aligned and the process is agreed from the outset. Closely monitor to ensure governance is followed as agreed. | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Moderate (2) | Cautious |
| 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 it's support for retention of bus stations. Perception that an on-street solution could mean poorer facilities for drivers and passengers. Political instability and policy changes | Vacant possession of the bus station is delayed resulting in delayed development on the site | Unlikely (2) | Major (3) | Open | Recommended Development Partner to enter into early dialogue with transport stakeholders. Work with the recommended Development Partner on developing proposals. Ensure dialogue with key stakeholders is continued to help build confidence in the proposals. Continue cross-party engagement. | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Major (3) | Moderate |
| 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 | Highly Likely (4) | Moderate (2) | Open | Continue to closely monitor capacity within the project team, Set out requirements for resource and associated fees, Set out and secure funding for required internal resource, Continue to monitor and adapt the project plan, including resources component, Have clear milestones and priorities for the project team - agree where their input / expertise is needed and how this can be provided | Regular monitoring meetings with HoP and PM | Unlikely (2) | Moderate (2) | Moderate |
| Failure to ensure safety and compliance throughout the project lifecycle. | Insufficient health and safety protocol and training in place, Negligence by the council or the recommended Development Partner and contractors in regard to health and safety | Harm, injury, death and/or illness of employees, contractors and visitors. Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to WCC, Potential financial loss to WCC, Delays to the regeneration of the area, | Unlikely (2) | Major (3) | Open | Ensure robust health and safety protocol is in place, Ensure health and safety training is made available to all staff / employees and that this is regularly monitored and kept up to date, Provide clear channels for communicating / escalating any concerns related to health and safety. | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Major (3) | Open |
| Highly confidential and commercially sensitive information contained within the unredacted Development Agreement relating to the recommended Development Partner enters the public domain. | The unredacted Development Agreement is leaked outside of those with restricted access. | Reputational/political damage to WCC, Possible financial damage to the recommended development partner, deterioration of their reputation; loss of their customers, partners, suppliers and / or product markets. | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure robust process in place to determine who will need to have access to the Development Agreement and where possible an NDA is put in place, Ensure robust process is followed for enabling access to the development agreement to those with required clearance. Ensure those with required clearance fully understand the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of the Development Agreement and are aware of the consequences should this be breached | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| The grant of planning permission on the CWR site results in the council incurring high costs related to the Friarsgate 2018 Overage Deed. | Planning permission granted exceeds the NIA (30,741 sqm) stipulated in the 2018 Overage Deed relating to the Friarsgate Medical Centre site. | Financial loss to WCC, Potential delays to regeneration of the area, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to WCC, | Unlikely (2) | Significant (4) | Open | Ensure council and recommended Development Partner continually refer back to the 2018 Overage Deed and give consideration to boundaries it has set out when preparing to submit a planning application and if and when any decisions are taken to bring forward additional parcels of land for development which sit outside the Development Agreement boundary. | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Significant (4) | Open |
| The council is unable to make the payment related to the Friarsgate Medical Centre 2018 Overage Deed following the liquidation of the beneficiary of the Friarsgate 2018 Overage Deed, Silverhill Winchester No 2 Ltd in 2022 | Details of the reassignment of the benefit of the overage deed cannot be found. (please see causes related to risk 22 - payment will only be triggered if the planning permission exceeds the NA stipulated) | Delays to regeneration of the area, Potential financial loss to WCC and recommended Development Partner, Loss of trust in Council abilities to deliver, Reputational/political damage to WCC | Unlikely (2) | Major (3) | Open | Take the necessary steps to sufficiently investigate any reassignment of the overage deed well in advance of any planning application submission to determine whether (in the event the overage payment is triggered) the council is to liaise with another third party or the Crown. | | Highly Unlikely (1) | Major (3) | Moderate |

| | | I M P A C T | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | | Low (1) | Moderate (2) | Major (3) | Significant (4) |
| L I K E L I H O O D | Highly Likely (4) | Cautious? | Open? | Hungry? | Hungry? |
| | Likely (3) | Cautious? | Open? | Hungry? | Hungry? |
| | Unlikely (2) | Averse? | Moderate? | Open? | Open? |
| | Highly Unlikely (1) | Averse? | Cautious? | Moderate? | Open? |

| Likelihood | Probability |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Highly Unlikely | 1% to 25% chance in 5 years |
| Unlikely | 26% to 50% chance in 5 years |
| Likely | 51% to 75% chance in 5 years |
| Highly Likely | 76% to 100% chance in 5 years |

| | Low (1) | Moderate (2) | Major (3) | Significant (4) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Financial | Less than £20K | £20k or over and less than £200K | £200K or over and less than- £2MK | £2M plus |
| Service Provision | No effect | Slightly Reduced | Service Suspended Short Term / reduced | Service Suspended Long Term Statutory duties not delivered |
| Health & Safety | Sticking Plaster / first aider | Broken bones/illness Lost time, accident or occupational ill health | Loss of Life/Major illness – Major injury incl broken limbs/hospital admittance. Major ill health | Major loss of life/Large scale major illness |
| Morale | | Some hostile relationship and minor non cooperation | Industrial action | Mass staff leaving/Unable to attract staff |
| Reputation | No media attention / minor letters | Adverse Local media Leader | Adverse National publicity | Remembered for years |
| Govt relations | One off single complaint | Poor Assessment(s) | Service taken over temporarily | Service taken over permanently |