**Appendix 3: Risks associated with the next stages of the Oxfordshire Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue**  | **Impact**  | **Level of risk** | **Mitigation**  |
| **Further changes to national planning policy and guidance**  | * Could require an early review of the plan
* Uncertainty over role, status and timing of the Cambridge Oxford Arc Spatial Framework
* Consistency with national planning policy is a soundness test (Oxfordshire may be required to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities)
 | High  | * Agree on transitional arrangements
* Written agreement about the consistency of the plan with the spatial framework
* Undertake self-soundness test.
 |
| **Ensuring close alignment and integration with Local Plan reviews** | * Conformity issue - the Oxfordshire Plan needs to be produced in a timely manner to help inform and run alongside Local Plan reviews
* Enable Local Plans to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Plan
 | High  | * Agree on work programme and the commissioning of joint evidence
* Update the Local Development Scheme to help inform/steer Local Plan review timescales when appropriate
 |
| **Ensuring the duty to cooperate is demonstrated throughout the production of the plan** | * Need to ensure compliance with the statutory duty
* Need to ensure effective plan making
 | Low  | * Need to maintain a close working relationship with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies.
* Ensure prescribed bodies are continuously involved (as outlined in the Statement of Community Involvement)
* Prepare statements of common ground and a duty to cooperate statement
 |
| **Resourcing due to changes to personnel and/or increased workload in response to consultation responses and changes to policy or legal requirements**  | * Availability of qualified and skilled planning officers with the required specialist knowledge
* Maintaining a fully resourced team
* Risk of overspend - costs of commissioning new technical evidence
* Risk of timetable slippage
 | Medium  | * Sharing costs of preparing evidence
* Consider use of consultants if financial resources allow
* Keep the timetable up to date and under regular review
 |
| **Unknown impact of covid-19 pandemic, including future restrictions**  | * Staff sickness / loss of support
* Team morale
* Lack of face-to-face engagement
* Risk of timetable slippage
 | Medium  | * The team are set up to work from home, and most activities can be successfully carried out from home
* Stakeholder engagement will be carried out online wherever possible but in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement
* New and innovative ways of engagement will be employed.
 |
| **Continuous and ongoing member and stakeholder engagement to secure sufficient buy-in**  | * Need to ensure effective, coordinated and timely oversight and governance among the six Oxfordshire authorities LPAs, in view of long lead-in times
* Need to achieve agreement of key partners at all key stages and on plan strategy and content
 | Medium  | * Regular updates on progress to Future Oxfordshire Partnership
* Coordination of meetings
* Innovative use of online tools
* Hold joint collaborative workshops as part of ongoing engagement
* Effective duty to cooperate discussions
 |
| **Maintaining an up-to-date evidence base**  | * Interdependencies and sequencing - evidence feeds into other technical work (e.g. modelling)
* Relationship with Local Plans and other development plans documents
* Complexity of technical work
* Ensuring compliance with statutory requirements
 | Medium  | * Evidence needs specialist advice from consultants
* Set up consultant summits to discuss sequencing of evidence
* Prepare background papers
 |
| **Risk of timetable delays**  | * Operational delay / management of the plan making process (e.g. governance arrangements)
* Achieving the agreement of the five councils
* Ensuring a sound and legally compliant plan before progressing to examination
* Risk of examination delays (e.g. appointment of planning inspector)
* Unexpectedly high volume of representations
 | Medium  | * Management structures and oversight
* Close working among partner organisations
* Regular reports to Future Oxfordshire Partnership and any amendments made to the timetable agreed with the

[Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC)](https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwi0j-nq4sr1AhWhoFwKHXX6CIgQ6F56BAgGEAE&url=https%3A%2F%2Ftwitter.com%2Fluhc%3Fref_src%3Dtwsrc%255Egoogle%257Ctwcamp%255Eserp%257Ctwgr%255Eauthor&usg=AOvVaw1KrfOGA8ClM7qMuVuXDRqq)* Agree the examination timetable with the Planning Inspectorate and appoint a programme officer to support the administration of the examination as early as possible
 |