

# SW Herts JSP

## Risks – June 2021 v12

Risk Description	Score			Current RAG Rating / Consequence	Mitigation/Controls	Score			RAG Rating after mitigation	Owner
	P	I	O			P	I	O		
<b>STRATEGIC</b>										
1. <b>Potential political change/issues within the partnership that could lead to a withdrawal or variation in support to the Programme from one of the partners.</b>	3	4	12	<b>AMBER</b> Depending on the timing, this could delay the JSP process.  Could impact on the deliverability and implementation of the preferred strategic growth options.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular and effective SG and SPMG meetings supplemented by on-going communication and collaborative liaison across all partnership authorities through focused workstreams. Strong communication will assist with the confidence, assurance and clarity of direction required for the programme to be successful.</li> <li>To reduce the risk of this occurring, a revised governance structure has been agreed to include a corporate director Steering Group (SG) that will sit between the SPMG and SPOG.</li> <li>The Statement of Common Ground(s) (SoCG) will establish ambitions for the JSP, the process for withdrawing from the agreement, the identification of the key cross boundary agreements as well as any issues.</li> </ul>	2	4	8	<b>AMBER</b>	SPMG/ HGB
2. <b>Change in Government and/or changes to national policy/legislation in relation to encouraging and facilitating statutory strategic planning approaches. Impact of White Paper and any impacts it could have on strategic planning processes.</b>	4	5	20	<b>RED</b> Significant impact on local/national Govt support for the SW Herts ambition and the ability to attract additional capacity funding.  Significant impact on the ability to successfully prepare and adopt a statutory JSP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of an active, tactical and on-going strategy of Government engagement; monitor legislation changes.</li> <li>Continued close liaison and profile raising with MHCLG and Homes England at ministerial and officer level.</li> <li>Increased advocacy for legislative changes to support statutory strategic plans.</li> <li>Continuing to position SWH as a vanguard for testing legislative strategic planning changes.</li> </ul>	3	5	15	<b>AMBER</b>	SPMG/ HGB

**SW Herts JSP  
Risks – June 2021 v12**

PLANNING										
<p>3. <b>JSP not agreed by Districts, fail at examination or there is significant slippage in the timescales that are beyond the tolerance of the programme.</b></p> <p><b>This could be due to the decision-making processes, technical delays the procurement of evidence, staff resources, or the Planning Inspectorate are unable to meet timetable).</b></p>	3	4	12	<p><b>AMBER</b></p> <p>Potential implications on the soundness of the District Local Plans, specifically in relation to the last five years of the plan periods.</p> <p>Impact on the ability of the district Local Plans to rely on the SW Herts spatial strategy in relation to housing, employment and infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Impact on the JSP budget.</p> <p>Impact on the integrity of the programme and any associated Government support/Government 'deal' implications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised governance structure agreed to include a Corporate Director level Steering Group.</li> <li>• Put in place a standard project planning approach across the participating authorities and regularly monitor the JSP progress against 'key milestones' and work programme, highlighting any risks at an early stage with a proposal as to how this is to be managed.</li> <li>• Each partner authority to work with their committee services to provide a streamlined approvals approach at key stages and ensure that this does not add unnecessary time to the process;</li> <li>• Procurement processes to be agreed by SPMG to ensure JSP work is treated as a priority and procurement facilitates timely commissioning and appointment of consultancy support. This should allow for a bespoke tendering and procurement approach and commitment to fund agreed technical programme to expedite procurement process.</li> <li>• Evidence base and external support considered at 'pre-commencement' stage with project and programme management function, budget and timescales clearly identified.</li> <li>• Early and regular engagement with PINS to ensure timetable for EIP can be met;</li> <li>• Regular review of Plan documents and evidence by JSP team / consultants.</li> <li>• Internal training and development to fill any potential gaps.</li> </ul>	2	4	8	<p><b>AMBER</b></p>	<p>SPOG / SPMG</p>

## SW Herts JSP Risks – June 2021 v12

4. <b>One or more of the partner Local Plans are found unsound with regards to the JSP strategic matters and/ or fail to comply with the Duty to Cooperate.</b>	3	4	12	<b>AMBER</b> Could undermine and delay the JSP process, and the implementation (in policy) of the SW Herts spatial strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular liaison between Local Plan teams.</li> <li>Early and regular engagement between the districts and PINs</li> </ul>	2	4	8	<b>AMBER</b>	SPOG / Local Plan leads
5. <b>Insufficient resources and skills to deliver the JSP to programme.</b>	5	4	20	<b>RED</b> Would delay the JSP process and lead to programme milestones being missed or delayed, with a resultant impact on the timing of the adoption of the JSP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that the JSP scope is kept tight, agreed early by all partners, and focussed to key policy areas and the evidence needed to support this – avoid ‘scope creep’.</li> <li>Undertake a full audit of existing and available resources and capacity to be undertaken at the JSP commencement stage.</li> <li>SPMG to set a realistic budget for JSP preparation, taking into account all potential internal and external sources of funding (including Planning Delivery Fund, Council support and potential funding from growth deal to support capacity)</li> <li>Secure programme management support during pre-commencement stage</li> <li>Work on a ‘South West Herts’ basis, ensuring making the more effective and efficient use of all resources and skills across all six partner authorities – create a SW Herts skills bank.</li> </ul>	5	4	20	<b>RED</b>	SG/ SPMG
6. <b>Evidence base highlights significant challenges in delivering the JSP Spatial Strategy /</b>	2	3	6	<b>AMBER</b> Could delay the production of the JSP and the adoption timing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify potential challenges in the JSP Delivery Plan (e.g. infrastructure funding) and agree risk management plan for addressing</li> <li>Ensure Strategic Growth Options Study considers all options and is based on an up to date and robust evidence base.</li> <li>Ensure focussed contract management of the Strategic Growth Locations Study to ensure any issues are highlighted, escalated and resolved in a timely fashion.</li> </ul>	1	3	3	<b>GREEN</b>	SPOG

**SW Herts JSP  
Risks – June 2021 v12**

7. <b>JSP Spatial Strategy undermines the District Local Plan spatial strategy(ies)</b>	1	3	3	<b>GREEN</b> Could impact on the soundness and timing of the adoption of the Local Plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider an alternative approach which will still deliver the same outcome.</li> <li>Ensure focussed contract management of the Strategic Growth Locations Study to ensure any issues are highlighted, escalated and resolved in a timely fashion.</li> </ul>	1	3	3	<b>GREEN</b>	SPOG			
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>													
8. <b>Public consultation attracts opposition and seeks to undermine JSP Spatial strategy</b>	2	3	6	<b>GREEN</b> Could delay the preparation of the JSP with resultant impacts on the date of adoption. Potential for JR and associated delays/cost implications. Could mean additional evidence is required, with resultant impact on budget and timing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear and targeted JSP Communications and Engagement Strategy to be prepared early. Strategy to ensure ongoing briefings and opportunities to engage in JSP preparation are explained for all partner authorities, external and internal stakeholders and the community.</li> </ul>	1	3	3	<b>GREEN</b>	District Comms team?			
<b>FINANCIAL</b>													
9. <b>No additional funding from MHCLG/ Government due to the lack of a further round of PDF bidding and/or additional funding resourcing opportunities.</b>  <b>Insufficient and/or delays to funding from MHCLG could also impact the JSP budget and the delivery of the programme priorities.</b>	4	5	25	<b>RED</b> Councils may need to fund the continuation of the Project from existing resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of an active, tactical and on-going strategy of Government engagement; monitor legislation changes.</li> <li>Lobbying of the Government for financial flexibility;</li> <li>Expedite any Government 'deal' and ensure it includes capacity funding to prepare the JSP;</li> <li>Continued close liaison with MHCLG at ministerial and officer level, and willingness to take action if the JSP budget looks incompatible with the JSP programme.</li> <li>Ensure that there is a budget contingency</li> </ul>	4	5	25	<b>RED</b>	SPMG/ HGB			

## SW Herts JSP Risks – June 2021 v12

### Explanatory Key

A risk is something that **could** happen in the future and have an impact on the completion or outcome of the Programme.

All programmes have an element of risk; all new risks will be recorded as soon as they are identified and all risks will be updated when a change (positive or negative) occurs. This is to ensure that the programme can demonstrate how it will deal with potential problems or varying severity in a controlled manner.

Risk is calculated according to the probability (P) of it happening and the impact (I) of this occurrence, based on a scale of 1 (very low) and 5 (very high) for each element of the calculation. A RAG rating is then assigned to the total score (i.e. the outcome, which is calculated by multiplying the probability score and the impact score:  $P \times I = O$ ).

### Definition of Scores

	1 (Very Low)	2 (Low)	3 (Medium)	4 (High)	5 (Very High)
<b>Probability</b>	Unlikely 0-10%	Low 11-30%	Possible 31-50%	Probable 51-80%	Definite 81-100%
<b>Impact</b>	Minimal (no interruption to programme delivery)	Minor (temporary interruption to programme delivery)	Significant (lasting interruption to programme delivery)	Severe (complete interruption to programme delivery)	Catastrophic (programme will fail unless risk urgently mitigated/resolved)

RAG Status	Score	Definition	Action
<b>Green (Low)</b>	1-5	The programme is meeting expectations.	No action required.
<b>Amber (Medium)</b>	6-15	The programme is not meeting expectations. There are mitigating circumstances in most cases and improvement is likely but risks need to be flagged to the programme team.	SPOG should be notified at the earliest opportunity; mitigation action will be explored at the appropriate governance level and implemented, as appropriate.
<b>Red (High)</b>	16-25	There are significant problems with the programme and it is not meeting expectations to date. Corrective action is required to meet business objectives. The problem cannot be handled solely by the programme team.	The matter should be escalated to the SG immediately for consideration/resolution at the appropriate governance level.