

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
<p>1. Further requirements deriving from legislation or new national guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to undertake more work in order to amend the Plan and the work programme</li> <li>• Programme slippage</li> </ul>	<p>Monitor work that's being done with regard to new legislation and guidelines so that we are in a good position to respond as soon and effectively as possible to any changes</p>
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>Since work on the Joint LDP started, some national planning policies have been published that must be considered when preparing the Joint LDP or that have implications in another way:</p> <p>Publication of the 5th edition of Planning Policy Wales            Consultation on policy and guidance on waste issues            New Joint Housing Land Availability Study process, which means that Councils lead rather than Government, - through the Joint Planning Policy Unit</p>		
<p>2. Heavier than expected work load</p>	<p>Programme slippage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure a realistic timetable which has flexibility</li> <li>• Ensure that we consider how much time it takes to undertake every aspect of the work</li> <li>• Consider additional resources</li> </ul>
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>Dealing with a significant number of objections to the information in the SPG for onshore wind energy and assisting the Planning Service to provide guidance for this field (e.g. checklist) has led to unexpected heavy workload. In order to minimize the impact on the timetable of the Joint LDP, it was necessary to appoint an external consultant to assist with additional consulting work for the SPG. But that meant that some time was lost to appoint a company.</p>		

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
<p>It is important that the Joint LDP and its policies are based on credible, contemporary and robust evidence. A lot of evidence has been collected and will continue to be collected in order to obtain the necessary information. Some of this work is done by officers within the Joint Planning Policy Unit while some is being done by external consultants and other services within the Council. The evidence here includes the Renewable Energy Capacity Assessment, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment, Strategic Flood Implications Assessment, Employment Land Assessment, Retail Assessment, and an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment. By looking at the work that other Councils have carried out, it is clear how important it is to do this work. A few studies have taken longer because of the need to look at a larger area than usual, and dependence on information from a 3rd party. Some officers have had to do more work than planned in assisting the external consultants or in doing their own work.</p>		
<p>More sites were received than expected for inclusion on the Candidate Site Register, which in turn meant that more time was spent inputting the information into a database /GIS.</p>		
<p>3. Substantial objections by consultation bodies</p>	<p>Programme slippage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility built into the timetable</li> <li>• Ensure that we consult early on (before the formal consultation period) with specific bodies</li> </ul>
<p>4. Lack of political consensus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to agree on the key aspects of the Plan</li> <li>• Conflict undermining what is noted in the Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Seek to resolve as much conflict as possible in the Joint LDP Panel meetings and by discussing with the leading Members e.g. Portfolio Leaders</p>
<p>5. Failure to report to a committee at the appropriate time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme slippage</li> </ul>	<p>Discuss requirements with those that arrange both Council's committee timetable as soon as possible</p>

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>It became apparent that the expectations as regards reporting to committees in two Councils were more complicated than anticipated at the start of the process, e.g. the need to report to Angelsey County Council's Scrutiny Committee and to the full Council – steps that had not been foreseen in the formulation of the Timetable in 2011.</p>		
<p>6. Lack of consensus between different Council departments</p>	<p>Failure to agree on key aspects of the Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that we are in accordance with the Councils' strategies (Community Strategy, Three Year Plan)</li> <li>• Ensure that there are effective internal discussion procedures in place in relation to the Plan</li> </ul>
<p>7. Delay with translation/printing process</p>	<p>Programme slippage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use external translators</li> <li>• Share the translation work to different individuals/companies</li> <li>• Consider additional resources</li> </ul>
<p>8. Lack of available funding throughout the process of preparing the Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to fund specific and important work tasks e.g. as part of the evidence base</li> <li>• Programme slippage</li> </ul>	<p>Constant monitoring in order to ensure that the funding is used in the most effective way</p>
<p>9. Change in staff or losing staff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of capacity and skills</li> <li>• More pressure on other officers</li> <li>• Programme slippage</li> </ul>	<p>Consider additional resources</p>

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>Unforeseen staff absences because of sickness have affected the timetable by having to redirect staff and make temporary arrangements.</p>		
<p>10. Lack of expertise</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower standard of work</li> <li>• Failure to identify weaknesses and note suggestions while verifying the work of consultants</li> <li>• Problems with regard to ensuring the 'soundness' of the Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Train specific staff to specialise in different fields</p>
<p>11. Failure on behalf of the Planning Inspectorate to meet the timetable/targets</p>	<p>Delay with regard to holding the investigation and/or in relation to receiving the report</p>	<p>Ensure close contact with the Planning Inspectorate in order to ensure a process which is as easy as possible. This will also give the opportunity of early warning regarding any problems</p>
<p>12. Plan fails the 'soundness' test</p>	<p>The Plan cannot be adopted without having to undertake further substantial work</p>	<p>Ensure that the LDP is sound by ensuring that we conform to procedures, laws, regulations along with all other specific soundness tests</p>
<p>13. Legal challenge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abolish the adopted LDP (or parts of it)</li> <li>• Additional workload</li> </ul>	<p>Ensure that we adhere to procedures, laws, regulations etc.</p>

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
14. Elections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme slippage</li> <li>• New members with different opinion regarding the contents of the Plan – changing priorities</li> </ul>	Ensure a realistic timetable with built-in flexibility
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>It was decided to hold local elections in Anglesey in May 2013 instead of May 2012. Approval was secured for the Preferred Jont LDP Strategy before the 'purdah' period, but because of this period it was not possible to hold a public consultation until after the local elections.</p>		
15. Problems with I.T. work/Problems in relation to GIS work	Programme slippage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure a realistic timetable with built-in flexibility</li> <li>• Ensure that the Council's I.T. Service is aware of the requirements and schedule time to this purpose</li> <li>• Purchase appropriate software</li> </ul>
16. Results of the SA/SEA outlining the unexpected problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional workload</li> <li>• Programme slippage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the timetable is flexible enough to deal with such a situation</li> <li>• Consider additional resources</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1: Risks that have influenced the timetable

Risk	Possible Effect	Mitigation Measures
17. Consultation bodies failing to submit observations as soon as expected	Programme slippage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that specific groups are consulted early on at any relevant stage during the process.</li> <li>• Seek to consult at times of the year when the majority of people are likely to be at work e.g. not during August or over Christmas</li> </ul>
<p><b>June 2013 Comments</b></p> <p>Because only limited resources that were available to them and their workload at the time, some key stakeholders have failed to respond as promptly as need when we requested information about opportunities or constraints in relation to potential sites.</p>		
18. Receive significant information late in the day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme slippage</li> <li>• Additional workload</li> </ul>	Ensure that the timetable is flexible enough to deal with such a situation
19. Requirements associated with responding to the Wylfa B project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme slippage</li> <li>• Additional workload</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor progress with regard to this project</li> <li>• Ensure a close working relationship between the Energy Island Project Team and the Joint Planning Policy Unit</li> </ul>