Appendix 4: Corporate Risks – New Build Programme

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigation |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Cost increases on | 5 - Certain | 5 -Certain | Cost plans are regularly reviewed and updated, |
| approved projects | Risk of increased budget requirements | 1.Committee approval needed for | and contracts are fixed price to the council. |
| | due to Brexit, Ukraine War, building reg. | additional capital funding | 2. Latest budgets consistently reviewed as part of |
| | changes, inflation and supply chain cost | 2. Unplanned public expenditure | BSR and MTFS Process. |
| | increases are being encountered. | 3. Loss of value for money | 3. Regular updated risk management and |
| | Staffing and materials shortage and delays | 4. Reputational risk to Council | budgeting completed as part of risk reviews work |
| | to SOS due to funding uncertainties | 5. Reduction in overall delivery | across the Council. Supply chain and materials |
| | increase potential for this risk. | achievable | concerns under close monitoring. |
| | | | 4. Committee approval to progress schemes ahead |
| | | | of firm grant certainty mitigates cost increases |
| | | | ahead of entering into build contracts. |
| | | | 5. Depending on the extent of the additional cost |
| | | | this may be managed within scheme level |
| | | | contingencies approved in Budget Setting Report. |
| Conving Dianning | 3 - Noticeable Effect | 3 - Noticeable effect | 1.Pre-app process used effectively, and schemes |
| Securing Planning | 1. Failure in obtaining planning permission | Schemes are developed with planners | aim to be policy compliant. |
| Permission on new | or Conditions signoff cause delays and | through the pre-application process. | 2.Build in of additional lead time where required to |
| schemes | increase costs. | Lack of planning resource and Planning | ensure schemes progressing within target |
| | 2. Delays in receiving a planning decision | Department staff shortages or | schedules |
| | lead to increased costs being incurred and | substitution would lead to delays in | 3. Ensuring officers and councillors are involved in |
| | delays in submission of Funding Bids. | arranging for the pre app meetings, and | decision making from project early stages |
| | 3. Additional time and effort required to | subsequently planning submissions and | |
| | redraft plans should revised applications | approvals. | |
| | be required. | | |

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigation |
|--|--|--|--|
| Sales risk – exposing Council cash flow forecast | 2 - Some possibility 1. deceleration of sales / purchase/ acquisition cycle 2. Depreciation of assets Influx of market led schemes now requires increased consideration of risk of income reducing against assumed margins. | 1 – Little Chance Housing market fluctuations are beyond council control and current circumstances may exacerbate such fluctuations or delay buyer activities in the short-medium term. Market sales have however performed well and the Cambridge market remains relatively stable. However significant market sale developments are progressing which may require review. | Close engagement with market through private sector partners Share risk with private sector partners Financial and sensitivity analysis for the new project site selections, before project starts. Specialist partner input to sales forecasts |
| Decanting residents / leaseholders | 4- Probable 1. Regeneration schemes will not be progressed if residents are not decanted. 2. Complication in buybacks where Lease/freeholders face difficulties for obtaining new mortgages for their onward purchase, in non-portable cases, or where challenges are made to CPO proceedings 3. Redevelopment of estates with high % Lease/freehold ownership poses greater risk of CPO proceedings being required | 3 – Noticeable effect Decant of Schemes under the 10yr programme is on-going and if this is not achieved on time there will be impact on the costs of the project. | 1.Decant and rehousing officers regularly liaising with residents requiring decanting to ensure successful rehoming. 2.Decanting and liaison with tenants started early on in the development process. CPO and NOSP process outlined to be proceeded as necessary on future schemes. 3. Additional resource to support this work allocated. 4. Resident liaison groups established. |
| Not securing necessary grant for new schemes | 2- Some possibility In case the grant is not secured or at a lower level the business plan may need to be reviewed and the level of housing and tenure delivered may need to change. | 3 - Noticeable effect HE Grant funding now secured on 7 schemes approved under the new 10yr programme, with additional funding allocated from separate streams at | 1.Continual discussions with Homes England and other funding bodies are providing greater security on grant funding ability. Issues in securing the level required to support the costs of developing in Cambridge are an issue, and we will continue to |

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigation |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | Aylesborough, and for Refugee housing. | review assumptions in the business plan as |
| | | Remaining grant across new programme | negotiations develop. |
| | | schemes not yet secured, other than that | 2. A recent report from DLUHC has additionally |
| | | funding committed by the Council. The | highlighted major risk to the governments |
| | | business plan for the MTFS and BSR | Affordable housing programme if grant rates |
| | | assumes grant. | remain static against current inflation. |
| | | | |
| Incufficient Project | 3 - noticeable effect | 3 - noticeable effect | Appointment of new consultants |
| Insufficient Project Management Resource | 1. Inability to properly manage projects | Schemes brought forward to be managed | 2. Resourcing fund for new recruitments to ensure |
| to complete programme | 2. Council entering into contractual | by existing team on top of additional | capacity |
| to complete programme | obligations without proper oversight | corporate developments (Civic Quarter, | |
| | | District Heating), cladding issues (Clay | |
| | | Farm, Virido) as well as managing legacy | |
| | | defects (communal heating issues at the | |
| | | Meadows) and staff overworked. Also | |
| | | there are increased need in adding data | |
| | | and compliance and fire safety statutory | |
| | | requirements to the projects | |
| Future anti- development | 3 - noticeable effect | 4- Significant disruption | Establishing focussed steering groups early |
| Future anti- development campaigns | 1.Potential for reputational damage for | increase in number of leaseholders/ | where necessary |
| | HDA and Cambridge City Council | freeholders in new larger schemes | 2.Focus on early public engagement via different |
| | 2.unexpected extended time frame for the | increases risk of push back against | events and consultations |
| | project | potential redevelopment activities | 3. potential development to be informed by detailed |
| | 3. complications in submission of the | | options appraisals |
| | scheme for planning consideration and | | |
| | funding approval. | | |

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigation |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 5- Certain | 4- Significant disruption | Prioritisation of investigations into Council holdings |
| Failure to secure net unit | Estate regeneration requires significant | Estate regeneration through a mixed | which indicate scope for net housing gain |
| gain on redevelopment | decant and buyback costs which may mean | tenure approach holds inherent | |
| sites | rental income streams may not offset initial | challenges in increasing net gain of | |
| | investment | affordable homes. | |
| | 4- Probable | 5 -Certain | Land value assessed, affordable price within range |
| Hanover and Princess- | 1) Reduced housing delivery 2) | Leads to increased Financial pressure on | considered, sales values checked, build costs |
| financial Viability | International economic uncertainty. 3)Cost | HRA | reduction in line with Cam Standard adoption |
| | inflation. | | expected. |
| Meadows- heating | 5- Certain | 4- Significant disruption | |
| system issues which are | 1)Significant disruptions to tenants 2)Cost | Due to Reliance on specialist | M&E consultants advising Council on this matter. |
| affecting residents and | increases to council and CIP 3)Significant | subcontractor which went into liquidation | List of key actions provided to contractor, and they |
| community centre users | delays in handover of new flats blocks and | | are working to resolve. |
| Community Centre users | loss of revenue | | |
| | 4- Probable | 5 -Certain | |
| Agreed Fire strategy not | Risk to safety, and possible delays in the | Fire strategy and remediation actions | Fire strategy and remediation actions confirmed for |
| enacted/in place across | resale of affected Shared Ownership | confirmed for Clay Farm, Fire Strategy | Clay Farm. Fire Strategy and plan of works to be |
| all affected blocks at | properties due to a lack of EWS1 | and plan of works is still to be agreed by | agreed by Senior Management for Virido. |
| Virido | Certification on the cladding system | Senior Management within the Council for | |
| | | Virido | |