

Appendix 2 - JCS Political & Technical Risk Assessment

<u>Risk</u>	Potential Impact (Low, Medium, High) & Implications	Level of Actual Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Owner	Risk Management Plan	Risk Management Status
Delay in developing the new strategic housing and employment requirements for the JCS area	High – It is essential that having signalled their intention to re-establish housing requirements based upon local evidence that the JCS authorities progress this as a priority. The delay to achieving this will cause uncertainty in planning, especially in the context of determining a 5 year land supply	Medium – currently the JCS team has identified internal resources to be part of a Gloucestershire wide effort to establish consistency in housing and employment projections.	JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources have been identified from the JCS team as well as other Gloucestershire authorities to work collaboratively on this. 	High
Inconsistency of calculating housing and employment requirements with neighbouring authorities outside of Gloucestershire	High – While consistency within Gloucestershire can be programmed there are areas where the JCS borders with Wychavon District Council and a consistent or compatible approach needs to be established between the JCS/Gloucestershire authorities and those of South	High – At present the Gloucestershire approach is still in its early stages. Early discussions with south Worcestershire	JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact with South Worcestershire should be made and regular dialogue held to ensure consistency/compatibility of approach 	High

	Worcestershire.	are required to understand their approach.			
Policy vacuum left by the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy and resulting delay to JCS whilst locally derived projections are established	High – inappropriate development could be promoted that pre-empts the development plan process.	High – policy vacuum exists already and this is severely inhibiting clear and decisive political leadership. Strategic context for the JCS must be agreed as soon as possible	JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive steps required to progress the JCS. Early engagement with developers and interested parties is essential in order to open up dialogue on process and illustrate that work on the JCS is ongoing. • The JCS area must reassess the basis for the strategy for the area including a detailed appraisal of all reasonable alternatives for broad locations of growth. This is recommended by GOSW's SA consultants work on the RSS SA process • Early development of a strategic planning framework. Options document needs to be published as soon as possible. 	High
Failure of Gloucestershire County Council to fund and provide officer resource to	High – the JCS is not adequately supported by the infrastructure evidence base.	High – Awaiting outcomes of CSR.	SIDP Project (Nigel Riglar as SRO of SIDP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public engagement on JCS issues support consideration of infrastructure requirements • SIDP and JCS meetings 	High

<p>complete phase 3 of the strategic infrastructure delivery plan (SIDP)</p>	<p>CIL regulations came into force on 6 April 2010, which are still in force following establishment of Coalition Government. Given early indications that the Government favour retention of CIL it is vital that the SIDP evidence base is continued onto Phase 3 and a charging schedule developed.</p> <p>Failure to progress SIDP will inhibit the ability of the JCS to establish a charging schedule.</p>	<p>Budgets being reviewed by County Council to address MTFs funding gap.</p> <p>Developers are continuing to develop applications on key peripheral sites without being informed by the development plan process and SIDP</p>		<p>occur once every 3 weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSG lobbying Gloucestershire County Council setting out the importance of SIDP to delivery of JCS 	
<p>Resources are not adequate to cover the preparation of CIL alongside the JCS programme</p>	<p>High - The Government is apparently favouring the continuation of CIL as currently proposed over the introduction of another process for securing direct infrastructure provision. This will place a significant burden on the JCS team to produce CIL</p>	<p>High – The JCS authorities require a JCS to be in place as soon as possible and therefore resources are focused on achieving this, however the additional work around developing CIL and a charging schedule is yet</p>	<p>JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A JCS project for CIL should be established to scope out the work that CIL will involve. This should include the development of a programme for the preparation of a charging schedule and associated examination. While CIL and the charging schedule is the responsibility of JCS authorities it should be developed in partnership with SIDP. 	<p>High</p>

		to be scoped given the previous uncertainty around CIL			
The Government's radical overhaul of the planning system bring about significant changes to the development plan process.	High – The Government has signalled its intent on radically overhauling the planning process and has already made significant announcements from abolishing RSS to statements on community right to build scheme. More information is awaited in the Localism Bill expecting in Autumn 2010.	Medium – The JCS is continually making proactive steps to pre-empt planning regime changes. However sight of the Government' proposals is welcomed	JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular review of Government announcements to adjust the programme appropriately • It is quite likely that the Government will give very little advice on preparing development plan and that the onus will be on the local authorities themselves to develop their own approaches to development plan preparation. 	Medium
Differences of view between councils or party political tensions within councils threaten continued joint working.	High – fragmented approach to plan making if a partner pulls out of joint working. Reduction in capacity for all councils to deliver its statutory development plan function in a timely manner.	Low – the 3 authorities have demonstrated a willingness to work together, reaffirmed by MSG on 4 August 2010.	JCS Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns must be fully voiced and resolved in either the Programme Board or the Members Steering Group • In the case of profound disagreement mediation should be attempted • Appropriate reference back to each individual council's decision making processes should be considered on all important issues 	Medium
Gloucester,	Medium – inability to complete	Low – budget	JCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgetary pressures must 	Low

<p>Cheltenham and Tewkesbury councils are unable to adequately fund the preparation and examination of the JCS</p>	<p>key pieces of work and adequately resources examination procedures.</p>	<p>for 2010/11 agreed</p>	<p>Programme Board (Andrew North as Chair)</p>	<p>be raised at the earliest opportunity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular budget monitoring • Reinforcement of priority status of JCS 	
---	--	---------------------------	---	---	--