

Risk Assessment for E-Scooter Rental Service (Concession Model)

Prepared by : Christopher Whitehouse, Transport Planning Team

8th May 2026

Risk Scoring Assumptions

- Likelihood: Low / Medium / High
- Impact: Low / Medium / High
- Overall Risk reflects **post-mitigation residual risk**, consistent with Cabinet reporting.

1. Safety and Public Protection Risks (existing – expanded)

1.1 Collisions involving riders, pedestrians or vehicles

Risk: Injury or fatality involving e-scooters, including to vulnerable road users.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: High

Risk Type: Public safety / Legal / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Speed caps, geofencing and no-ride zones in pedestrian areas.
- Licence checks and age restrictions.
- Mandatory operator insurance and maintenance regimes.
- Ongoing monitoring of collision and near-miss data with Dorset Police.

Residual Risk: Medium

1.2 Pavement obstruction and accessibility impacts

Risk: Poorly parked scooters obstruct footways, disproportionately impacting disabled pedestrians.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: High

Risk Type: Equality / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Mandatory designated parking bays.
- App-based parking validation and rapid removal SLAs.
- Engagement with disability groups to review locations.
- Penalties for repeat misuse.

Residual Risk: Medium

2. Reputational Risks (new)

2.1 Public backlash and loss of confidence in the Council

Risk: Negative public perception due to safety incidents, perceived inaction, or comparison with private illegal e-scooter misuse.

Likelihood: Low–Medium

Impact: High

Risk Type: Corporate reputation / Political

Mitigation:

- Clear public communications distinguishing regulated rental scooters from illegal private use.
- Transparent reporting of performance, incidents and corrective actions.
- Phased rollout with visible enforcement and early wins.

Residual Risk: Medium

2.2 Perceived disregard for disabled residents' concerns

Risk: Damage to Dorset Council's reputation as an inclusive authority if disabled people's concerns are not seen to be taken seriously.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: High

Risk Type: Equality / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Early and ongoing engagement with RNIB, Guide Dogs and local disability groups.
- Publication of accessibility mitigations and monitoring outcomes.

- Willingness to amend or withdraw scheme elements if impacts are unacceptable.

Residual Risk: Medium

3. Financial Risks (new)

3.1 Unplanned revenue costs to the Council

Risk: Officer time, complaints handling, monitoring and legal oversight exceed anticipated levels, creating financial pressure.

Likelihood: Low–Medium

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Financial / Operational

Mitigation:

- Clear contractual allocation of responsibilities to the operator.
- Cost-neutral concession model with no Council subsidy.
- Review capacity requirements at set milestones.

Residual Risk: Low–Medium

3.2 Operator financial failure or withdrawal

Risk: Operator becomes insolvent or exits the market, disrupting service and requiring Council intervention.

Likelihood: Medium (industry-wide)

Impact: Medium–High

Risk Type: Financial / Service continuity

Mitigation:

- Due diligence during procurement.
- Step-in and termination clauses.
- Limiting Council exposure through concession (not ownership) model.

Residual Risk: Medium

3.3 Reputational impact of low value for money

Risk: Public or Member concern that scheme delivers limited benefit relative to effort or risk.

Likelihood: Low

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Financial / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Clear articulation of wider social, environmental and accessibility benefits.
- Benchmarking performance against BCP and national trials.

Residual Risk: Low

4. Legal and Compliance Risks

4.1 Non-compliance with DfT trial conditions

Risk: Failure to meet DfT requirements results in withdrawal of trial permission.

Likelihood: Low-medium

Impact: High

Risk Type: Legal / Strategic

Mitigation:

- Regular compliance audits.
- Dedicated liaison with DfT and Police.
- Clear contractual obligations on the operator.

Residual Risk: Low

4.2 Legal challenge linked to equality or accessibility impacts

Risk: Challenge under Equality Act duties if impacts on disabled people are not adequately mitigated.

Likelihood: Low

Impact: High

Risk Type: Legal / Equality

Mitigation:

- Comprehensive EqlA and mitigation plan.
- Evidence-based decision-making and monitoring.
- Proportionate, responsive adjustments.

Residual Risk: Low–Medium

5. Operational and Delivery Risks

5.1 Inadequate enforcement capacity

Risk: Misuse (pavement riding, antisocial behaviour) persists due to unclear enforcement responsibilities.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Operational / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Operator-led enforcement and graduated sanctions.
- Clear reporting routes for public and Police.
- Regular review of hotspots.

Residual Risk: Medium

5.2 Integration issues with existing transport and public realm

Risk: Conflict with pedestrians, cyclists or existing bike hire schemes.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Operational

Mitigation:

- Integrated parking design.
- Clear signage and user education.
- Ongoing coordination with highways and town centre teams.

Residual Risk: Low

6. Strategic and Policy Risks (new)

6.1 National legislation changes mid-trial

Risk: Future legislation restricts or materially alters e-scooter use.

Likelihood: Medium

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Strategic

Mitigation:

- Participation in the national trial to shape evidence.
- Flexible concession terms allowing scheme adjustment or exit.

Residual Risk: Low–Medium

6.2 Failure to deliver policy objectives

Risk: Scheme does not meaningfully contribute to modal shift, carbon reduction or access objectives.

Likelihood: Low–Medium

Impact: Medium

Risk Type: Strategic

Mitigation:

- Targeted deployment in appropriate locations.
- Monitoring of car-trip replacement and accessibility outcomes.

Residual Risk: Low

7. Partnership and Stakeholder Risks (new)

7.1 Breakdown in relationship with Police or PCC

Risk: Loss of support due to perceived enforcement or governance failures.

Likelihood: Low

Impact: High

Risk Type: Partnership / Reputational

Mitigation:

- Formal governance arrangements.
- Regular data sharing and review meetings.
- Clear escalation routes.

Residual Risk: Low

Overall Risk Position

- **Current Risk Rating:** Medium
- **Residual Risk Rating (post-mitigation):** Low

The **concession-based, regulated model**, combined with strong governance, engagement and the ability to adapt or withdraw elements of the scheme, means risks are **manageable and proportionate** for a Dorset Council trial approach.