

Town Deal Programme Risk Register – Summary as at end October 2025

Appendix A

NB: This is a new, temporary format for display pending new software system.

Ref	Risk title and description.	Risk Owner	Target Risk Score	Previous Risk Score	Current Risk Score	Risk Direction
R1	Business continuity, including recruitment and retention loss of programme staff, key partners and contractors The programme/projects are unable to be delivered as a result of a significant loss of staff, partners and contractors.	Programme Support Team / Senior Responsible Officer	4	9	9	↔
R2	Cost over runs/ construction inflation The programme/projects exceed the sum available from the Towns Fund and agreed match funding contributions from partners and may be unviable at business case assessment due to a low benefit cost ratio.	Project Managers	4	12	12	↔
R3	Cost over runs/ construction inflation The programme/projects exceed the sum available from the Towns Fund and agreed match funding contributions from partners and may be unable to deliver the approved business case outputs and outcomes.	Project Managers	4	12	12	↔
R4	Construction delays Delays in the sector arise from factors such as labour and material shortages or prolonged bad weather or unexpected site issues.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	9	9	↔
R5	Engagement from key stakeholders Low levels of engagement erode confidence in the ability to deliver the programme and realise ongoing benefits and wider outcomes for King's Lynn.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	6	6	↔
R6	Project creep Projects shift away from their agreed business case.	Programme Support Team	4	6	6	↔
R7	Programme and project management capacity The delivery of the programme and projects is delayed by insufficient programme and project management support.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	6	6	↔
R8	Due diligence checks Stamp Duty, Land Tax, VAT and subsidy control implications unknown and could have negative impact on project viability.	Monitoring Officer & Project Managers	4	6	6	↔
R9	Compliance with regulations and consents in place Including Planning delays or failure to secure planning, consents in general - traffic, Network Rail, etc.	Project Managers	4	12	12	↔
R10	Public engagement and support in project Programme fails to engage stakeholders and wider community leading to significant negative media coverage.	Project Managers & Comms Manager	4	9	9	↔
R11	Political support Political support for the programme diminishes and vulnerabilities regarding effective leadership and political leadership within each project.	Programme Support Team	4	8	8	↔
R13	Project assurance Local project assurance cannot be completed within timescales and to the required standard, caused by lack of capacity in the Accountable Body, resulting in enhanced scrutiny by MHCLG.	Programme Support Team	4	6	6	↔

Ref	Risk title and description.	Risk Owner	Target Risk Score	Previous Risk Score	Current Risk Score	Risk Direction
R15	Secured funding Projects cannot demonstrate a secured funding package, caused by delays in securing required match funding contributions, resulting in failure to comply with approved business case.	Project Managers	4	16	16	↔
R16	Deliverability of projects Projects cannot provide sufficient assurance with regards to deliverability, caused by delays or failures to secure sites required for projects, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R22	Changes in Government policy and legislation The Government's policy and legislative framework prioritises activities not covered by the Vision King's Lynn Town Investment Plan.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R23	Government funding decisions Non- compliance with agreed Heads of Terms, delivery profiles and assurance exercises leads to the clawback of funding and potential cancellation of projects and related cashflow issues.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R24	Gateway reviews External factors such as consumer spending, performance indicators, etc lead to a radical change in scope.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R25	Project review Business analysis at the project end identifies that outputs and outcomes have not been achieved.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R26	Local Government Review and Devolution The review distracts capacity and focus from the effective delivery of the Towns Fund programme, Board support and future strategy and funding programmes.	Project Managers & Programme Support Team	4	12	12	↔
R27	Delivery of outcomes Footfall data for the programme is not available and therefore improvements brought about via the outputs of the programme cannot be so easily demonstrated	Regeneration Programmes Manager	4		9	New entry

IMPACT

Risk Scoring Matrix		1	2	3	4	5
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
LIKELIHOOD	5 Almost Certain	G	A	R	R	R
	4 Likely		G	A	R	R
	3 Possible		G	G	A	R
	2 Unlikely			G	G	A

1	Rare					G

High 15-25	Risks scored at this level represent a high threat to the delivery of Town Deal programme objectives and service delivery and should be treated as a priority, action is required to reduce the rating to a score within tolerance or removed. Reporting on progress will be required to the Town Deal Programme Board and the King's Lynn Neighbourhood Board until the risk level is reduced to tolerance.
Medium 10-12	Risks scored at this level represent a medium threat to the delivery of Town Deal programme objectives and service delivery, proportionate mitigation and regular monitoring required. These risks can be managed at operational/service level but regular management review of assurance on control effectiveness should occur. Routine reviews should also be carried out to ensure there is no change.
Low 5-9	Risks scored at this level represent a low threat to the delivery of Town Deal programme objectives and service delivery. Review required to ensure risk score does not change/increase, however these risks can be managed at an operational / service level.
Very Low 0-4	Risks scored at this level represent an insignificant threat to the delivery of Town Deal programme objectives and service delivery. No further action is required.