Risk Assessment

Appendix A

The risk					Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Updated	I	L	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register	
	Does not offer the space required by Cheltenham Festivals and they decide to relocate else where.		23/02/2011	06/07/2011	4	3	12	Yes	Identify suitable space else where. Enter into agreement with Cheltenham Festivals for continued commitment to use of both gardens following Council investment.		Cheltenham Festivals Legal		
	Heritage Lottery Fund declare that the council is not allowing appropriate level of public access to Montpellier Gardens and object to proposals		23/02/2011	06/07/2011	1	3	3	No	Legal view is that appropriate level of access will be maintained and to liaise with heritage lottery fund. Heritage Lottery Fund have accepted proposals allow suitable public access, but want to be satisfied that park is adequately protected and re-instated.	April 2011	NW Legal		
	Park users at both gardens may be dissatisfied with the extent of each site from which they excluded during festival times		23/02/2011		4	4	16	Yes	Do not offer any further space in either gardens. Reduce set up and take down duration		RB / AR		
	Increased use of the gardens for festival activities could accelerate wear and tear on the fabric of the gardens. i.e. use of heavy vehicles and machinery on surfaces not designed to accommodate such use.		23/02/2011	06/07/2011	4	4	16	Yes	Festivals invest in regular aeration of ground. Re- instatement clauses in land use agreement enforced. Cheltenham Festivals build these items into their cost plan. Make alterations to hard		RB / AR/ Festivals		

							surfaces to better accommodate festival vehicles built into proposals		
Too many marquees mean that Festival in a Garden" is unachievable.	23/02/2011	05/10/2011	4	4	16	Yes	Proceed anyway and accept risk. Manage publicity. Review after year one and recommend down size.	RB / AR	