

**Dover Leisure Centre - Project Risks**  
**Dover District Council**

Revision: B

Risk ID Code	Risk Area	Risk Description	Assessment of Risk			Action Taken (Provide details of what you have done to date to manage the risk)	Further Action to be Taken (Describe what further actions you will take to reduce the impact/ likelihood should the risk become an issue)	Risk Owner	Further survey work to be undertaken to establish and/or mitigate risk
			Impact (1-5)	Likelihood (1-5)	Score				
B01	Brief	Changes to facility mix / brief.	4	4	16	Core facility mix agreed as part of Stage 2 Feasibility Study. This has also been discussed with Leadership Forum.	Review of the facility mix is being carried out as part of the Stage 2 Feasibility to achieve sign off of the facility mix as part of the September Cabinet approval. Any changes to the facility mix / brief to be subject to an assessment of the cost, programme and business plan implications before changes are made.	DDC	
C01	Cost	Land purchase is more than anticipated and/or makes the project unaffordable.	5	4	20	Council have commenced negotiations with the land owner.	Council to continue negotiations with the land owner. Formal public consultation not to take place until negotiations have been concluded to maintain negotiating position.	DDC	
C02	Cost	Project costs exceed budget/available funding (affordability).	4	4	16	Experienced consultant team have been appointed to develop Stage 2 design and cost plan. Current funding gap is c.£2.3m, which it is assumed will be funded from the Council's capital reserves.	Cost consultant appointed to prepare cost plan based on similar projects. Allowances to be made for all of the costs to deliver the project, including construction, professional team, off-site works, fit out, etc., etc. Contingency to be included commensurate with the stage of the project. Costs to be closely monitored as the project progresses.	DDC	
C03	Costs	Increase in tender prices.	4	4	16	Allowance included for tender inflation based on BCIS Indices. Early involvement of the contractor through the two stage approach will provide good market intelligence.	To be reviewed on a regular basis and allowance adjusted.	DDC	
C04	Costs	Increase in cost estimate due to scope creep or inclusion of good ideas/nice to haves.	4	4	16	Experienced consultant team have been appointed to develop an efficient Stage 2 design.	Design to be closely monitored and the implications of any changes to be fully outlined to the Council for approval before proceeding with changes. Formal Change Control process to be introduced from the start of Stage 3.	DDC	
D01	Design	Changes in design due to new consultant team or delay due to the new team getting up to speed.	4	4	16	Consultant procurement options have been considered.	Appointment of current consultant team being looked into.	DDC	
D02	Design	Design doesn't meet Council expectations.	4	4	16	Case study visits have been carried out with key officers and members. Flitwick Leisure Centre has been agreed as the benchmark for this project.	Formal project governance and approval process to be put in place. Technical Steering Group to be put in place to review the developing design and provide direction to the design team. Formal stage reports to be provided at key design stages for sign off.	DDC	
D03	Design	Operator requires changes to the design incurring additional cost or impacting on programme.	4	4	16	Programme seeks to bring on board the operator at the earliest opportunity so they can input on design.	No further action at this stage.	DDC	
D04	Design	Building location changed.	5	3	15	A number of options have been considered and a preferred location selected for completion of the Stage 2 Feasibility Study.	No further action at this stage, but risk rating remains high until Stage 2 design has been signed off.	DDC	
D05	Design	Poor quality finishes specified, which impacts on maintenance costs and business plan.	4	4	16	Case study visits have set the benchmark to be followed.	Specifications to be reviewed as the design is developed. Life cycle cost analysis to be carried out to aid choice of materials.	DDC	
D06	Design	Sport England standards not met.	4	3	12	Design Team appointed for Stage 2 have worked with Sport England on other projects and have a good understanding of Sport England standard.	Design Team with Sport England experience to be appointed for Stage 3 onwards. Any deviations from Sport England standards to be raised by the Design Team and discussed with Sport England.	DDC	
E01	Ecology	Ecologically impacts on building design or impacts on the delivery programme.	4	4	16	No information currently available, hence the high risk rating.	Preliminary Ecological Survey being carried out. Additional surveys and mitigation measures to be confirmed once received.	DDC	Preliminary Ecological Survey + reptile and bat surveys
F01	Finance/Funding	Sport England funding not obtained.	5	4	20	Initial meeting held with Sport England to discuss the project. Timeline for applications and approvals included in project programme. Sport England funding could be £1m-£1.5m, whereas the working assumption is £1m which is at the lower end. However, no current commitment, hence the high risk rating.	Dialogue to continue to Sport England once Cabinet approval has been received. Procurement strategy, consultant and contractor appointments to be discussed with Sport England to ensure their buy in.	DDC	
F02	Finance/Funding	Business Plan projections aren't met and can't support prudential borrowing.	5	3	15	The Sports Consultancy has been appointed to prepare the Business Plan. This is based on a prudent business plan. Facility mix has been soft market tested with key operators, with good feedback received.	Operator to be tendered in parallel with the construction contract so that the full financial position is known at the time contracts are placed.	DDC	
F03	Finance/Funding	Increase in Prudential Borrowing rates.	5	3	15	Current assumption is 40 year loan @ 3.75% on an annuity basis.	To be closely monitored.	DDC	

F04	Finance/Funding	Change in financial stability of the Council.	5	3	15	No current action proposed.	To be closely monitored.	DDC	
G01	Governance	Change in Council administration impacting on project.	5	3	15	Current cross-party support.	To be closely monitored.	DDC	
G02	Governance	Change in key Council Officers.	4	3	12	No current action proposed.	To be closely monitored and mitigation strategy put in place if this occurs.	DDC	
OP01	Operation	Gap in continuity of leisure provision, e.g. existing centre has to close early and prior to completion of the new centre.	3	4	12	Risk of significant failure of plant, fabric or other systems at the existing centre that is uneconomic to repair.	To be closely monitored and communicated early if this risk materialises.	DDC	
OP02	Operation	Maintenance obligations not met on current centre.	4	4	16	Contractual obligations of the current operator to be closely monitored.		DDC	
OP03	Operation	Operators not interested in project.	4	2	8	Initial soft market testing has shown there to be strong operator interest in the project.	Clear procurement process to be set out. Robust tender documents to be prepared. Robust and open tender process to be run. Consider appointment of experienced consultant to run the procurement process.	DDC	
OP04	Operation	Inclusion of older Tides centre in the operator contract impacts on market interest or compromises financial offers.	4	2	8	Initial soft market testing has shown there to be strong operator interest in the project even if Tides is included.		DDC	
OP05	Operation	Existing operator doesn't perform and standard at existing centre compromised if they don't win the new contract.	4	4	16	Contractual obligations of the current operator to be closely monitored.	This would need to be closely monitored in this eventuality.	DDC	
P01	Planning	Insufficient parking impacts on business plan.	4	4	16	Car parking numbers being looked at as part of Stage 2 design.	Car park numbers to be assessed as part of Transport Assessment.	DDC	Transport Assessment
P02	Planning	Future of the existing leisure centre site is linked to the planning application for the new centre.	4	2	8	It is not currently anticipated that the future of the existing centre will be linked to the new centre planning application.	Continue dialogue with planning team.	DDC	
P03	Planning	Planning application is rejected or consent is delayed.	4	3	12	Proposals are a departure from the Employment Use planning designation. Planning consultant has been appointed to carry out Sequential Test and provide early planning advise. Discussions have taken place with the planning team to ensure this meets their requirements and to agree documents to be submitted with the planning application.	Design to be developed to Stage 3 to ensure robust planning application is submitted. Pre-app submission and meeting to take place.	DDC	
P04	Planning	Judicial Review of the planning decision.	4	2	8	This is consider to be a low risk, but is identified as a risk to monitor.	No further action proposed at this stage.	DDC	
P05	Planning	Public opposition to the new centre.	4	3	12	Good response received to initial public communications about the new centre.	Formal public consultation/communication of the Stage 2 proposals to be carried out.	DDC	
P06	Planning	Significant Town Centre impact.	4	3	12	This is not thought to be an issue, but a formal assessment has not been completed, hence the slightly higher risk rating.	Town Centre Impact Assessment to be carried out.	DDC	Town Centre Impact Assessment
P07	Planning	Onerous planning condition requiring changes to the design or incurring additional cost.	3	4	12	Unknown at this stage, hence the higher risk rating.	Surveys / report to be commissioned to support the planning application, which will inform the likely planning requirements. Discussions to take place with relevant departments included EHO, Ecology, Archaeology, Highways, etc. to agree the surveys/reports required and discuss the report outcome and recommendations to pre-empt the likely planning conditions.	DDC	
P08	Planning	Full EIA required.	4	4	16	Initial view is that this won't be required, but this won't be confirmed until initial surveys are complete and EIA Screening Opinion is submitted, hence the high risk rating.	Undertake initial surveys/reports and submit EIA Screening Opinion at the earliest opportunity. Make allowance in programme for EIA Screening Opinion process.	DDC	
P09	Planning	Planning decision called in by the Secretary of State.	4	2	8	Unlikely to be called in, but identified as a risk to monitor.	No further action proposed at this stage.	DDC	
P10	Planning	Flood risk	3	3	9	Site is in 'Flood Zone 1' with minimal risk of flooding, hence the low risk.	A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Management Plan to be carried out as part of the Stage 3 design.	DDC	Flood Risk Assessment
P11	Planning	S106 Agreement/Developer Contribution required for offsite highway improvements or contribution to Bus Rapid Transit	4	5	20	It is likely that a contribution will be sought to the BRT.	Initial discussions to be held with bus operator. Transport Engineer to be appointed to carry out Transport Assessment.	DDC	Transport Assessment
P12	Planning	Sequential test identifies an alternative site as being more suitable in planning terms.	5	2	10	A number of sites were reviewed as part of the Sports Consultancy Feasibility Study, from which the preferred site was selected.	DHA have been appointed to carry out a formal sequential test. The initial view is that this will support the preferred site.	DDC	Sequential test
PR01	Procurement	Challenge by unsuccessful contractor	3	3	9	Likelihood of challenge is reduced through the proposed use of the SC Framework rather than a full OJEU.	Robust and open tender process to be run in full compliance with SC Framework and OJEU rules.	DDC	
PR02	Procurement	Lack of interest in the project by contractors.	4	3	12	Two stage procurement route proposed to make the project more appealing to the market. This also reflects the limited number of suitable contractors in the local market, and the current buoyant tender market. Positive response received from three experienced contractors to the soft market testing of the SC Framework.	Continue to engage with the interested SC Framework contractor and provide regular updates on progress and dates for tender to ensure they have a bid team ready.	DDC	

PROG01	Programme	Poor performance by the Consultant Team. Change in key personnel.	4	3	12	Experienced consultant team have been appointed to carry out Stage 2 Feasibility Study.	Experienced consultant team to be procured for Stage 3 onwards and appointment to seek to prevent change to key personnel where possible.	DDC	
PROG02	Programme	Decisions not provided in a timely manner causing delay to the programme.	5	3	15	Programme sets out key project stages and when Cabinet approval is required.	Communications strategy to be prepared.	DDC	
PROG03	Programme	Cabinet approval not received or delayed.	4	4	16	Programme includes allowance for preparation and obtaining Cabinet approval.	To be monitored.	DDC	
PROG04	Programme	Consultant team doesn't meet programme.	4	4	16	Programme is very tight and includes no contingency, hence the high risk rating.	Expectations to be managed on the opening date of the new centre to allow contingency for delay.	DDC	
PROG05	Programme	Construction programme is insufficient.	4	5	20	Programme is based on similar projects, but it is very tight and includes no contingency, hence the high risk rating. Initial feedback via the SC Framework soft market testing was mixed with some contractors expressing a nervousness at the length of the construction programme allowance.	Programme to be tested through Stage One tender for contractor. Early involvement of the contractor will identify any programme concern at an early stage.	DDC	
PROG06	Programme	Delay during construction due to weather or unforeseen events.	4	4	16	Programme is based on similar projects, but it is very tight and includes no contingency, hence the high risk rating.	Transfer programme risk to contractor where possible. Weather is likely to be an exception to this.	DDC	
PROG07	Programme	Lack of availability of materials or resource during construction.	4	3	12	Transfer risk to contractor.		DDC	
S1	Site	Poor ground conditions.	5	4	20	Initial desktop study suggests that ground conditions may be suitable for shallow pads and ground bearing slabs. However, a high risk rating has been noted pending the on site investigations.	Cost allowance to be included for a piled solution until further ground information is available. Ground conditions to be verified as part of Ground Investigation.	DDC	Ground Investigation
S2	Site	High ground water.	4	2	8	Desktop review suggests that groundwater is likely to be more than 5m below the surface, which shouldn't therefore affect the project.	Groundwater levels to be verified as part of Ground Investigation	DDC	Ground Investigation
S3	Site	Surface water strategy to use deep bored soakaways not possible and connection required to sewer network.	4	4	16	Desktop review carried out of the surface water (SW) drainage, which suggests deep bored soakaways supplemented by underground attenuation tanks is appropriate for the site (SUDS features, e.g. swales and ponds) are not consider suitable for this site). Rainwater harvesting is also an option to reduce the quantity of water to be discharged.	On site soakaway testing to be carried out as part of Ground Investigation. Application to be made to Environment Agency if final proposal incorporates discharge to ground.	DDC	Ground Investigation
S4	Site	Unground obstructions found during construction.	4	3	12	No information currently available, however there has been no previous buildings on site, hence the relatively low risk rating.	Given the previous site use, no further investigations are proposed. Considering transferring the residual risk to the contractor.	DDC	
S5	Site	Unground services found during construction, which requires protection or diversion.	5	2	10	Nothing has been identified on the topographical survey and utilities search, hence the low risk ratings.	No further action proposed at this stage. Consider transferring the residual risk to the contractor.	DDC	
S6	Site	Archaeological remains found during construction.	4	3	12	No information currently available.	Desktop assessment to be carried out as part of Stage 3. Ground Penetrating Radar Survey to be carried out if desktop assessment identifies potential for archaeology. Trial trenches only to be undertaken if the desktop assessment and RADAR survey identifies anything. Approach to be discussed with the County Archaeologist once the desktop assessment has been completed.	DDC	Archaeological Desktop Assessment
S7	Site	Unexploded Ordinance (bomb) found during construction.	5	3	15	No information currently available.	UXO desktop assessment to be carried out. Radar survey to be carried out if this identifies a risk.	DDC	UXO Desktop Assessment
S8	Site	Topography impacts on design efficiency.	3	3	9	Topographical survey has been completed. The preferred site is relatively flat, which in turn allows for a relatively simply and efficient design, hence the low risk rating.	Stage 3 design to be tested and refined based on the topographical survey completed.	DDC	
S9	Site	Visual impact.	4	4	16	The site is currently a farmed field and the proposals will therefore have a significant visual impact. Photos have been taken from key views to demonstrate the impact in the summer and winter months for use in the LVIA.	A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to be carried out during Stage 3.	DDC	LVIA
S10	Site	Road access need to be improved.	3	2	6	There is an existing road and entry point to the site, which is unlikely to require modification. However, the current Stage 2 proposals require S278 works to provide a coach drop off on the highway, hence the higher risk rating.	Stage 3 design to look at accommodating a coach drop off within the site boundary and eliminate the requirement for highway modifications and/or a S278 Agreement. Transport Engineer also to be appointed to assess this as part of the Transport Assessment.	DDC	
S11	Site	Ground contamination or material not suitable for reuse on site.	4	2	8	No information currently available, but previous agricultural use of the site suggest this won't be an issue, hence the low risk rating.	Ground investigation to be carried out.	DDC	Ground Investigation
SO01	Site Ownership	Delay / unable to purchase the site.	5	5	25	Council have commenced negotiations with the land owner.	Council to continue negotiations with the land owner. Consider progressing discussions with adjoining land owner in parallel to maintain some leverage and have a fall back option.	DDC	
SO02	Site Ownership	Site boundary unconfirmed and/or the land comes with restrictive covenants or easements.	4	4	16	Council have commenced negotiations with the land owner.	Council to request details from the landowner. Land registry search also to be carried out to obtain Land Registry details.	DDC	
STAT01	Statutory	Changes required to obtain Building Control sign off.	3	2	6	Assuming the appointment of a competent design team and the early input of the contractor through a two-stage procurement route, then this risk is considered to be low	Experience design team to be appointed. Contractor to be brought on board early through a two-stage procurement route. Building Control to be appointed to carry out a plan review and inspections during construction.	DDC	

SUST01	Sustainability	BREEAM Very Good not achieved.	4	4	16	Council planning policy is BREEAM Very Good. This is more difficult to achieve on a green field site and a leisure centre/pool building. BREEAM Pre-Assessment has been carried out which suggests a score of 61.75% could be achieved which provides a buffer to the 55% required for Very Good. Allowance made in Cost Plan for BREEAM requirements, including an ecological roof.	BREEAM advisor to be appointed in Stage 3 to progress the BREEAM requirements.	DDC	
SUST02	Sustainability	New centre costs more to run.	4	3	12	Premise is that the building is to be efficient and reduce running costs.	EPC Rating to be achieved to be confirmed in conjunction with the design team. Cost plan to include for energy efficient systems, thermally efficient building fabric and good quality finishes. Avoid untried technology. Maximise use of natural light.	DDC	
U01	Utilities	Insufficient water supply capacity to serve the proposed development. Increased cost and programme delay. Payment required for offsite works.	5	5	25	Water supply is thought to be the biggest issues and the Council have commenced discussions with Affinity Water. Utilities are notoriously difficult to deal with, particularly if new supplies are required and discussions need to commence early.	Existing services and capacity requirements being looked at by the consultant team as part of the Stage 2 Feasibility Study along with the likely works required to serve the site. Council to commence discussions with Utility companies once this information is available.	DDC	
U02	Utilities	Insufficient foul water drainage capacity.	4	4	16	Desktop reviews suggests the foul water can be connected to a manhole to the adjacent Honeywood Parkway road. Foul water capacity check has been instructed to identify any upgrades required to the existing infrastructure including sewers and pumping stations.	Discussions to commence with Southern Water to agree method of discharge and flow rate once capacity check complete. Design and costs to assume on site attenuation as a worst case until further information is available. Note also that a trade effluent licence is likely to be required for the backwash discharge.	DDC	Foul water capacity check
U03	Utilities	Insufficient electrical supply and/or nothing local to the site.	5	4	20	Desktop review suggests a new 500kVA sub-station will be required. Unclear where supply will be taken from, hence the high risk rating.	Further investigation required. Including discussions with UKPN.	DDC	Further enquiries with UKPN