

Local Plan/IDP/CIL Risk Register

Risk	Description of Risk	Likelihood*	Impact	Score	Mitigation
DELIVERING A SOUND PLAN					
Failure to satisfy Inspector that we are planning for objectively assessed growth	The level of growth required, as assessed through objective studies, is higher than the vast majority of residents would like and will be hard to provide for. However, this is the most common reason why Local Plans are found unsound.	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure we have clear and sound evidence for the level of growth we plan for. • Be able to explain/justify this to the public, developers and an inspector.
Failure to comply with Duty to Cooperate (DtC)	The DtC needs to be fulfilled before an Examination in Public takes place. Failure to do so will, in effect, render the plan unsound.	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-regional agreement in place. • Joint housing requirement study commissioned with CCC • Documented, bilateral discussions with all neighbouring LAs needed • Develop and implement a DtC Plan
Failure to justify proposals and policies	All proposals and policies need to be justified to be found sound. However, in most cases, if an inspector disagrees with our justification, he/she will suggest modifications rather than delay the plan.	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure we have a complete, up to date evidence base for the Plan
ADOPTING THE PLAN TO TIMETABLE					
Strategic uncertainty: failure to agree the level of growth	A clear and early strategic steer on growth levels is needed to enable the Plan to be developed to timetable (e.g. planning for infrastructure).	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early involvement of members in confirming growth levels to be planned for and location of development. • Ensure robust evidence base • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board • Develop and deliver a Plan for member involvement in the Local Plan
Strategic uncertainty: failure to agree the strategic sites to deliver the growth	A clear and early strategic steer the location of development is needed to enable the Plan to be developed to timetable (e.g. planning for infrastructure). However, there are no easy options in selecting sites to deliver growth and some options are likely to be subject to significant debate and disagreement (e.g. villages; green belt, urban fringe etc). However the proposals also need to be	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early involvement of members in confirming location of development. • Ensure robust evidence base • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board • Develop and deliver a Plan for member involvement in the Local Plan

	evidence based and sound.				
Strategic uncertainty: Late changes to proposals	There are a number of factors that could result in changes to the plan's proposals at a time which could result in delay. These factors include change of political direction; viability of infrastructure; impacts of plans being prepared by neighbours.	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board
Delays resulting from a Legal Challenge	A Legal challenge to our Local Plan and the process for its development is a possibility given the possibility of significant public and/or developer opposition. The impact of this on the timetable could be significant if the challenge has substance.	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure compliance with the legal framework for Local Plan development. • Ensure resources are in place to seek legal advice as and when required
Insufficient resources to deliver the Plan to timetable	Insufficient resources in Planning Policy team could either delay the Plan timetable or could result in the Plan being found unsound if proposals are not fully justified. Resources provided by partners (e.g infrastructure providers) could also have an impact	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear, prioritised project and resource plan • Early liaison with infrastructure providers including discussions about resources • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board in reviewing the Project Plan
The impact of the Gateway	The Gateway, if recommended for approval by the Planning Committees of WDC and CCC, could have a significant impact on the Local Plan in terms of employment and housing requirements/distribution. Until the SoS make a decision on call-in there will be uncertainty associated with this which could lead to the Plan being delayed	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Planning Committee have reached a resolution, decide whether we develop the Plan with or without the Gateway as a commitment. • Consider contingencies
Difficulties in identifying sites in and adjacent to villages	Because of the range of villages identified in the Preferred Options and the potential for selecting sites in many of these to be controversial, there is a possibility that this work will take considerable time	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with partners/communities to identify possible sites • Consider contingency approaches if sites cannot be identified within Local Plan timetable
Difficulties in identifying Gypsies and Travellers Sites	There is a need to provide for G&T communities in the District, but identifying sites is likely to be difficult.	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with partners to identify possible sites • Consider contingency approaches if sites cannot be identified within Local Plan timetable
Failure to deliver correct technical process leading to EIP delays ○ Sustainability Appraisal	EIPs elsewhere are falling down for a number of technical reasons leading to delays	2	4	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good project management • Ongoing involvement of Local Plan Board in monitoring progress • Keeping abreast of EIPs elsewhere

○ DtC ○ Evidence base					• Applying resources to priorities
PINs unable to meet the timetable	Once the Local Plan is submitted, its progress is heavily dependent on the ability of the Planning Inspectorate to provide the resources required.	2	3	6	• Continue to liaise with PINs on the timetable and provide them with early notification of when we intend to submit
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND COMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY					
Difficulties in working with Infrastructure providers within our timescales	Infrastructure providers may have different priorities in terms of resource deployment leading to uncertainty about infrastructure requirements	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early clarity on location of development • Early involvement of IPs in planning for infrastructure • Ongoing liaison with IPs and developers • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board in reviewing the Project Plan
Delays to Infrastructure Delivery Plan as a result of changes to configuration of sites	There are some significant unknowns about the configuration of sites which could have significant impacts on the infrastructure requirements. If sites change late in the plan process it will be hard to adjust infrastructure plans in time	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early clarity on location of development • Early involvement of IPs in planning for infrastructure • Ongoing liaison with IPs and developers • Prioritisation – ensure priority infrastructure is included in IDP by May 2013, but not necessarily all • Ongoing involvement of the Local Plan Board in reviewing the Project Plan
CIL viability: Inability to deliver expectations on infrastructure	The viability of sites has not yet been assessed, yet expectations for infrastructure are high. There is currently no guarantee that all the infrastructure improvements can be delivered	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete CIL viability work early in process • Commence discussions with infrastructure providers early to assess requirements and potential costs • Check and challenge infrastructure costs to ensure maximum benefit is achieved • Prioritise infrastructure requirements as required.

*Likelihood ratings: as the Local Plan is a one-off process, the methodology for assessing likelihood has been adjusted as follows:

- 1 Very unlikely to happen prior to the Local Plan being adopted
- 2 Unlikely to happen prior to the Local Plan being adopted
- 3 A significant possibility that this could happen prior to the Local Plan being adopted
- 4 A probability that this could happen prior to the Local Plan being adopted
- 5 A strong probability that this could happen prior to the Local Plan being adopted