

Risk Log

Date last updated: 06/05/25

Ref No.	Description of Risk/Issue	Likelihood of occurrence (1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high)	Impact on project (1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high)	Risk Score	Date identified	How will the risk be mitigated?	Status (Open/Closed)
3	Through a Council owned and operated model, maintenance and cleaning responsibilities would fall to the council.	5	1	5	04/06/24	Therefore, to ensure that the asset remains at peak operation, a comprehensive contract for maintenance and cleaning must be in place to mitigate the risk.	Open
5	If a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) route was chosen, as the Council would not own the asset, there is a risk that the asset will be left to the Council to decommission after its usable lifetime. PPA means that the Council can own some and 3ti own some of the solar canopies.	5	3	15	04/06/24	These risks can be mitigated through amending the contracts with any potential supplier to ensure they are covered. Plus using learning from other local authorities who have put them in place	Open
6	A physical risk of the solar canopy is that it may have carpark logistical implications. Such as that drivers collide with the structure, and it could restrict vehicles over a certain height.	3	2	6	04/06/24	This can be mitigated with abundant signage and route optimisation for tall vehicles (such as coaches).	Open
8	A planning application will be required for a development of this size. This is a risk as the development will need the permission granted.	5	5	25	04/06/24	This can be mitigated through pre application discussions and then by allowing the supplier to be responsible for the planning applications. The planning process will take place while the carpark is being built. This has now become an issue.	Open
9	The Council agreed capital funding in December 2024 but with a view to seeking strategic CIL as well.	5	5	25	04/06/24	This could have originally been mitigated by demonstrating that the ROI will be favourable, but with Local Government Reorganisation and limits on capital borrowing this risk has moved from green to red as funding from capital borrowing is no longer available. Only alternative is to seek CIL funding and seek to mitigate other risks noted below	Open
11	Any planned battery store may take up further carparking spaces and must be 20m away from the Solar Canopy.	2	5	10	11/07/24	Spelthorne insurance requires the 20m distance. Can mitigate this risk through design and planning.	Open
14	Availability of key people due to illness or to other workloads. (Especially in light of the LGR and Commissioner changes.)	3	5	15	06/11/24	Hard to mitigate except by having contingency built in to the planning. The project manager in assets leaving has led to proposal of outsourced project management with associated costs	Open
17	The operator requirements may not be fully understood. There is a need to keep them engaged over the design of the solar canopy, the facilities provided and the energy provided. They need to be a key stakeholder.	4	5	20	13/02/25	Explore options as early as possible. Meeting was held today and actions to be taken to ensure we are informed. Also would need to discuss changed situation if solar canopy was built after the Phase 2 works were completed which could involve further risk to the project 30/4/25 RM also had an email from Martin Anderson Projects Director, Places Leisure stating 'Many thanks for the email and yes absolutely this aligns with our carbon reduction strategy and happy to confirm our non-binding interest.'	Open
20	That there is not enough coach turning space for Leisure purposes.	3	4	12	30/04/25	Explore options. Bear in mind that there is a trade off between coach turning space versus solar energy generated..	Open
21	Belated notification about the presence of flood attenuation tanks led to a redesign being required which put the project out of alignment with the construction of the car park. Any delays on car park construction would have had costs associated with it.	5	6	30	28/04/25	The redesign would require planning permission and due to the redesign it may be considered necessary to re procure the scheme.	Open

22	Full Planning permission will be required and there has been a delay due to the necessity of redesign to take account of 3ti had advised us that no planning permission was needed for the foundations. However, advice has changed and full planning permission will be required before any work commences.	5	6	30	15/01/25	30/04/2025 It is now clear that at least 3 months must be added to the timeline. This means that the foundations can no longer be built during the Phase 2 Works timeline, as planned. Therefore the solar canopy would have to be a follow on project resulting in parts of the new car park having to be dug up. Warranties could mitigate any potential long damage caused but would have to consider the further disruption caused to Eclipse leisure centre users.	Open
23	Risk that the operator might not buy the electricity.	2	3	6	15/01/25	A meeting was held on 13/02/2025. It was decided to wait for the new design from 3ti and then conduct a new cost/benefit analysis and report to the group. Richard Mortimer confirmed that PfP have maintained that they would be very interested in purchasing the solar canopy generated electricity, to reduce their carbon footprint but would need to understand minimum guaranteed annual supplies/tariffs.	Open
24	The Project Manager left at the end of March. Would need to outsource project manager now no internal resource available There is a risk of delays, depending on what level of management is required.	5	5	25	13/02/25	This can be mitigated to some degree using some help from the Project team. Ideally though would have to source external assistance so this put the project on hold while costs were sought.	Open
25	Risk that 3ti stop work due to the lack of contract.	1	5	5	13/02/25	Mitigate by having the contract completed.	Open
26	Legal advised that we may need to go back to tender because of the redesign.	4	5	20	10/04/25	Mitigation: this may not be necessary because the redesign can be seen as part of the Pre-Construction Services. If the option 2 redesign proposal is preferred, then it retains the capacity and is cost neutral to the original proposal. Explore the options with Legal and Procurement.	Open