

RISK ASSESSMENT

This Appendix provides the results of the risk assessment carried out to assess the issues that would be caused by a decision to move the CTRL between the A93 and A94 to the northern route. This has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Risk Management Policy and an extract from the Council's Risk Management Process Guide is included to show how this has been calculated.

Risk No.	Risks associated with the decision to progress with the northern route between the A93 and A94	Probability	Impact	Score
1	Delay in the delivery of the scheme (by at least 17 months)	5	5	25
2	Increase in scheme cost, resulting in shortfall of £7.1 million to deliver the scheme	5	5	25
3	Abortive costs for work done to date (estimated to be at least £550k) will require to be recharged to Revenue, where there are existing pressures	4	3	12
4	Disengagement of landowners given extent of dialogue and agreement so far (evidenced in responses to consultation on the northern route)	2	4	8
5	Objections to CPO	4	5	20
6	Risk to approval of CPO	4	5	20
7	Objections to Planning Application, and greater planning risk as the northern route is not in within the defined corridor (i.e. departure from LDP)	4	4	16
8	Risks relating to Reporter's Examination of LDP2 given close correlation between CTRL and effective housing land supply	3	3	9
9	Inability to meet the Council's ability to maintain a 5 year effective land supply; and prejudice delivery of the strategic housing sites	2	4	8
10	Delay in addressing the air quality issues in and around Perth, and particularly Bridgend and Atholl Street	5	4	20
11	May have to provide a Low Emission Zone in Perth until CTRL is in place	3	4	12
12	Key phases of PTFP (especially Phase 1) forward funded on basis that developer contributions to Capital cost of project would be recoverable	2	4	8
13	Risk to success of Sustrans Places for Everyone bid given that match funding from the CTRL is needed, and the CTRL is unlikely to be in place within the timescales for funding spend i.e. 2024	4	4	16
14	Negative press coverage on decision to move the route at such a late stage, resulting in bad publicity for the scheme and the Council	5	3	15
15	Breach in statutory duty to provide Best Value	5	5	25
16	Overall risk to the deliverability to the scheme given the statutory process that have been followed and decisions made (i.e. reviews, assessments, reports and approvals - STAG, DMRB Stages 1 & 2, Council decisions, LDP etc.)	3	5	15

APPENDIX 5

RISK HEAT MAP					
IMPACT					
5. Critical			16	5 6	2 1 15
	4. Major	4 9 12	11	7 13	10
	3. Moderate		8	3	14
	2. Minor				
	1. Insignificant				
		1. Very Remote	2. Remote	3. Possible	4. Probable 5. Almost Certain
PROBABILTY					

Extract from the Council's Risk Management Process Guide:

IMPACT SCALE		
Impact	Classification	Score
Critical	Risks which could have a potentially disastrous effect on the Council without immediate comprehensive action to reduce the level of risk.	5
Major	Risks which have a serious impact, and detrimental effect on the achievement of objectives. Action plans should be developed to reduce the level of residual risk, and reviewed periodically.	4
Moderate	Risks which can be reduced within a reasonable timescale, in a cost effective manner. Any mitigating actions must be monitored and recorded.	3
Minor	Risks where any action to further reduce the level of risk would be inefficient.	2
Insignificant	Risks may occur only in exceptional circumstances but has no interdependencies with other risks or plans.	1

PROBABILITY SCALE			
Probability	Criteria	Likelihood	Score
Very High	>75%	Almost Certain	5
High	51% - 75%	Probable	4
Medium	26% - 50%	Possible	3
Low	6% - 25%	Remote	2
Very Low	0% - 5%	Very Remote	1