

Appendix B(1) – Details of Red/Amber risks (Planning & Transportation Committee)

DBE/PLSV/2

Department of the Built Environment / Development Division / Development Management

Procedural errors and/or unsound decisions

A decision is made (or advice is given) which is capable of successful challenge (JR/Ombudsman/Appeal etc)

Unmitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Risk **21**

Status **Review signed off on 8 Aug 12 by Annie Hampson**
Review due by 7 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Because of the volume and variety of data which is required to be processed by a substantial number of officers and support staff -there is opportunity for error.	Experienced staff with appropriate safeguarding systems.
Wrong advice given in relation to planning enquiries, planning applications etc.	Experienced officers, good legal advice and managerial procedures.

Mitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 3 Risk **18**

Further Action

Budget Loss over 3/5 year period

CIPFA guidance states that the Building Regulations chargeable account should balance over this period.

Unmitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 3 Risk **18**

Status Review signed off on 10 Aug 12 by David Clements
Review due by 9 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Need to reduce expenditure (particularly staff numbers) would lead to an inadequate skills mix.	Management review the skills mix on a regular basis.
Increase charges making the service uncompetitive.	Promote the merits of using a quality service.

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 3 Risk **13**

Further Action

Uncertainty of the legislative environment and Central Government advice in respect of Development Management

Uncertainty of the legislative environment and Central Government advice in respect of Development Management

Unmitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Risk **21**

Status Review signed off on 9 Aug 12 by Annie Hampson
 Review due by 8 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Central Government fee regulation changes lead to inability to control budgets (e.g. local fee setting or changes national fees)	Early notification & engagement through professional groups. Responding to Government consultations. Budgets reviewed annually with Chamberlain.
Changes in the scope of the planning process leading to impact on work flow	Early notification & engagement through professional groups. Responding to Government consultations.
Introduction of new procedures and requirements (e.g. CIL/SuDS)	Introduce procedures and new management structure to process new work

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 3 Risk **13**

Further Action

Adverse planning policy context

City Corporation not seen to, or unable to, significantly influence general planning policy or transport plan decision makers in London, leading to lack of capacity of the system to service the City.

Proposed national relaxation of planning controls over change of use from offices to housing has not been included in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) however separate proposals to relax controls over change of use from hotels to housing are the subject of fresh consultation

This risk also applies to the Strategic Transport Team.

Unmitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 4 Risk **16**

Status **Review signed off on 10 Aug 12 by Paul Beckett**
Review due by 9 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Mayoral strategic fund-raising for Crossrail (Sec106 & CIL) could affect City development viability.	Lobby Mayor & respond to consultation exercises on Crossrail funding.
Central Govt national policy initiatives do not take account of City-specific issues	Lobby Central Govt & respond to consultation exercises to increase understanding of City issues.
Mayoral strategic policy initiatives do not take account of City-specific issues	Lobby Mayor & respond to consultation exercises to increase understanding of City issues.
Central Govt transport policy does not meet City needs.	Lobby Central Govt & respond to consultation exercises to increase understanding of City transport needs.

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 3 Risk **13**

Further Action

Not being alive to the needs/requirements of the world financial centre and the political environment

Not being alive to the needs/requirements of the world financial centre and the political environment

Unmitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Risk **21**

Status Review signed off on 9 Aug 12 by Annie Hampson
Review due by 8 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
The division is not alive to the requirements of the world financial centre (political environment)	Experienced staff, ongoing (CPD) training & professional networking within & beyond the City. Membership of EDCOG at a senior level. Role of CPAT includes ensuring that this department is properly briefed. Corporate "feedback" (e.g. from Town Clerk) on the political pressures. LDF policies kept under review to ensure that they mitigate this risk

Mitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 1 Risk **11**

Further Action

The Division becomes too small to be viable

Reduced income resulting in staffing levels that don't provide sufficient breadth of knowledge and experience to offer a viable competitive service.

Unmitigated ... Impact 4 Likelihood 3 Risk **18**

Status Review signed off on 10 Aug 12 by David Clements
Review due by 9 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Competition drives fees to unsustainable levels.	Promote the merits of using a quality service.
City development market continues to slow down	None
District Surveyor's share of the market shrinks	Marketing on all fronts

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 2 Risk **10**

Further Action

Record keeping - inadequate and/or inaccurate

Data held and used by Local Land Charges is either incorrectly supplied, incorrectly recorded within the team or incorrectly provided to others.

Unmitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 4 Risk **16**

Status Review signed off on 8 Aug 12 by Annie Hampson
Review due by 7 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Data may not be correctly supplied to others	Management procedures
Data may not be entered by the section accurately	Management procedures and double checking system.
Data provided by other sections of the department and other departments may not be accurate	Management procedures and double checking system.

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 2 Risk **10**

Further Action Further work in preparation for migration to a semi-automated Local Land charges Search answering system and publishing Land Charges data on the internet to ensure that the data sets are accurate. Managers responsible for data sets to enter into Service Level Agreements to ensure accuracy.

Outdated City development plan policies

Failure to update City development plan policies in accordance with national and strategic context can reduce the City Corporation's ability to permit appropriate development or refuse inappropriate development.

Publication of National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) provides an updated context for development plan preparation.

Unmitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 3 Risk **13**

Status Review signed off on 10 Aug 12 by Paul Beckett
Review due by 9 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Development plan preparation is subject to uncertainty arising from public consultation	Informal and formal consultation to address issues early in the process
Development plan preparation is subject to uncertainty arising from public examination	Following best practice to reduce uncertainty at public examination
Plan preparation needs professional expertise and sufficient funding	DP Team to be adequately staffed and resourced

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 2 Risk **10**

Further Action Changes to national and strategic policy context in 2012 will require further development plan updating. Examples include changes to neighbourhood planning and CIL funding arrangements.

Development Management Development Plan Document in preparation during 2012-13 will provide an opportunity to update as needed.

Preparation of City CIL will also be progressed during 2012-13.

Local Implementation Plan (LIP)

TfL funding for Local Investment Plan ceased or significantly reduced.

Unmitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 4 Risk **16**

Status Review signed off on 20 Aug 12 by Steve Presland
Review due by 19 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Low to nil funding (up to £3M p.a. at risk). Failure to progress medium-term programmes. Public expectations related to project delivery are not met.	Corporate support for the process to ensure timely submissions of a LIP that is fully compliant with TfL requirements. Ongoing staff training. Member involvement with bid proposals. Ongoing engagement with GLA officers. Key projects could possibly be funded by S106 or Community Infrastructure Levy.

Mitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 2 Risk **10**

Further Action

Legislation changes

The government are looking at all regulatory functions to relieve the burden on industry. Any changes to the remit of the Building Regulations will affect the financial viability of the Division.

Unmitigated ... Impact 3 Likelihood 4 Risk **16**

Status **Review signed off on 10 Aug 12 by David Clements**
Review due by 9 Nov 12

Detailed Risk(s)

Specific Risk	Mitigation
Removal of Section 20 of the London Building Acts controls. The government have stated that this section will be repealed. Implementation date expected to be April or October 2013. 1) direct loss of income 2) indirect loss of income - at present applicants come to CoL because only we can do S20 work and for their convenience they also chose CoL to do general Building Regulations work.	Generate alternative income streams within the Non Building Regulations section of the budget. Market the merits of the high quality of service in highly specialised areas.
Introduction of Appointed Persons with subsequent diminuation of Building Control input.	Respond to proposal as part of the consultation.
Any other changes to the extent of Building Regulations control.	Respond to any proposals at the time.

Mitigated ... Impact 2 Likelihood 3 Risk **8**

Further Action