

Empty Property Strategy 2013-2018

Risk Score **Impact Score:** 1 =Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic **Probability Score:** 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain

No.	Risk Description Link to Corporate Obj	Gross Risk		Cause of Risk	Mitigation	Net Risk		Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid		Monitoring Effectiveness				Current Risk	
		I	P			I	P	Action:	Outcome required:	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	I	P
1		I	P		Mitigating Control: Level of Effectiveness: (HML)	I	P	Action: Action Owner:	Outcome required: Milestone Date:	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗		
								Mitigating Control: Control Owner:		⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕		
2	Financial Costs	2	1	Cost incurred as a result of legal action being taken and lost.	Mitigating Control: Early and full involvement of Legal Justification for taking formal action. Level of Effectiveness: H			Action: Regular and full involvement with legal services. Action Owner: Empty Property Officer Mitigating Control: Regular meetings with legal services Control Owner: Empty Property Officer	Outcome required: Cost effectiveness Milestone Date: Upon decision to take formal action.						
3	Adverse Publicity			Number of empty properties in the City and enforcement used to deal with empty properties.	Mitigating Control: i) Ensure records held by the Council are updated and therefore accurate. H ii) Encourage positive press as a result of regular contact with local media Level of Effectiveness: H			Action: Regular updates provided to media on empty properties brought back into use and action taken to bring them back into use. Action Owner: Empty Property Officer Mitigating Control: Working with press office. Control Owner: Empty Property Officer.	Outcome required: Positive Press Milestone Date: Quarterly						

This page is intentionally left blank