Topic for Member Representatives - National Park Management Plan Outcomes:

- i. Biodiversity
- ii. Cultural Heritage
- iii. Natural Beauty (landscapes)
- iv. Climate Change and Natural Resources
- v. Mineral Extraction (assumed to be Chair of Planning Committee)
- vi. Traffic, travel and accessibility
- vii. Recreation
- viii. Tourism
- ix. Understanding the National Park
- x. People and Communities
- xi. Economy

The number of Members proposed to be involved - One member per outcome (except for minerals where the Chair of Planning Committee will be the Authority's lead).

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

i Biodiversity, ii Cultural Heritage, iii Natural Beauty (landscapes), v Mineral Extraction, vii Recreation, xi Economy – John Lomas

iv Climate Change and Natural Resources, vi Traffic, travel and accessibility, ix Understanding the National Park, x People and Communities – Jim Dixon

viii Tourism- Richard Campen

Rationale / Reasons for topic selection and Member involvement

Management Team have considered this and have concluded that in practice there are representative roles for members in all of the major National Park Management Plan areas. This will compose a) external advocacy to partners and communities actions by the whole community to achieve the NPMP (for the National Park) outcomes and b) specific support to work going on within the Authority in pursuit of agreed National Park Authority priority outcomes (our contribution to the NPMP objectives). Experience has shown that whilst in the last few years we have picked 4-5 topics, all the outcomes are important and all have drawn on member involvement. In practice too, each NPMP outcome has a lead officer (mainly in John Lomas' Directorate or Policy Service) and so members will be supported. It is expected that the precise function of each member will reflect the stage of development of the topic and the relative balance between external advocacy and topics more focused on developing work within the Authority. The exception to this general role would be minerals, where the sensitive nature of the position we have means that, as has been our practice over many years, the Chair of Planning or the Chair of the Authority is the spokesperson for this issue.

Anticipated outcomes of Member Representative Roles - Achievement of the outcomes of the National Park Management Plan over the short (3-6 months), medium (1 year) and longer term (2-5 years).

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work : A year and then reviewed

Likely resource implications: As each of these work areas are recognised priorities, then there are no resource implications.

Signed (Proposer)	Date
Jim Dixon, on behalf of the Management Team	4 September 2008

Topic for Member Representative

Historic Environment Champion

The number of Members proposed to be involved

One

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

1 Narendra Bajaria

Strongly supportive in view of current high priority afforded to conservation issues and proven track record at local level in the Peak District.

2 John Lomas

Strongly supportive in the context of Government's recommendation to Local Authorities to identify historic environment champions, since National Park Authorities ought to be at the forefront of authorities demonstrating a commitment to cultural heritage.

Rationale / Reasons for topic selection

1 Overview of the implementation and monitoring of the Authority's Cultural Heritage Strategy.

2 Externally driven by Government recommendation to all Local Authorities. Administered by English Heritage who organise national and regional meetings and training for champions.

Rationale/Reasons for Member involvement

1 Ensuring an Authority member contributes to regional and national debates on safeguarding the historic environment and the new Heritage Bill proposals.

2 Through training and networking with fellow champions gaining knowledge of practices elsewhere and their outcomes.

Anticipated outcomes of Member Representative role

Awareness of and opportunities for influencing, government strategy and new proposals.

Increased awareness among members of cultural heritage issues and their cross-cutting relevance to all our purposes as a National Park Authority.

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work

There will be a continuing need for this role if PDNPA is to fulfil Government expectations.

Likely resource implications

1 Travel expenses etc – to enable attendance at national, regional and internal meetings, to be funded from existing budgets.

Signed (Proposer) Pauline Beswick

Date 5 September 2008

Item 12.2 Annex 2 Page 2

ANNEX 2b

ANNEX 2c

Topic for Member Representative - Climate Change

The number of Members proposed to be involved - 1

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic - Jim Dixon

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for Member Representative role/Task Team

Relatively new area of work that cuts across most of Authority activities. Particularly relevant for:

NPMP outcome 4 and corporate outcomes especially A, E, G; also C, H, K

Emerging PDNPA climate change action plan

National agenda including – emerging Climate Change Bill.

Defra driven focus on NPs and climate change mitigation and adaptation

Defra PSA

Responsibility as Nottingham declaration signatory

Constituent authority focus on cc national indicators within LAAs

Rationale/Reasons for Member involvement

This is a relatively new priority area of growing significance at national, regional and local level: Member involvement gives message that PDNPA is fully aware of need to progress this in policy as well as in management; within Authority and in concert with partners and stakeholders.

PDNPA is in process of developing a Climate Change Action Plan cutting across most Authority activity, and which has had Member rep involvement to date: it would be appropriate to continue this involvement for a full year through to launch of AP and to its roll-out across Authority and initial stages of bedding in. The AP will cover not just NPA activity but actions to be taken forward in partnership with stakeholders.

Member involvement can add value to this relatively new area through external knowledge and challenge, bringing a perspective that is not conditioned by day to day management of the work, and providing a 'whole Authority' outlook rather than a particular service focus .

Anticipated outcomes of Member Representative role

Process will:

Continue to raise profile and knowledge of climate change issues in Authority. Ensure approach taken across all relevant Authority areas.

Member rep role will involve:

Contributing to achievement of NPMP and corporate and defra priorities. Contributing to fulfilling responsibilities associated with Nottingham declaration Helping to define direction of key policy areas to ensure climate change issues incorporated. Helping to develop capacity to respond to Government and regional priorities Representing Authority externally.

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work One year max

Likely resource implications

Current resources – relatively small amounts of expenses for member involvement. No new resources envisaged for this.

Resource impact of Action Plan not yet known. Strategic member day and budget planning will be able to signify what priority should be attached to any Authority activity associated with the plan.

Signed (Proposer) Anne Ashe	<u> </u>	Date 4 Sept 2008	
-----------------------------	----------	------------------	--

Topic for Member Representative

Asset Management

The number of Members proposed to be involved - 1

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

Director of Operations, Richard Campen

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for topic selection

The relevant corporate outcome is:

• We provide quality, customer focused, sustainable services and ensure continuous improvements in the way these are delivered

The relevant corporate action (Level 3) is:

• Ensuring value for money, sustainability and high standards of corporate governance in the way we deliver services

The Organisation Development Review (National Park Authority, October 2006) resulted in the development a single Property Service (Services Committee, September 2007). These developments provide an opportunity to consolidate our approach to property management and development to achieve the aims stated above.

Rationale/Reasons for Member involvement

To strengthen the external role of members (in particular working and communicating with partners on asset management issues)

To increase the opportunities for members to contribute their expertise and knowledge and to build capacity within the membership

Anticipated outcomes of Member Representative role

A full review of the Asset Management Plan with specific actions aimed at achieving the overall aims stated at the Authority meeting of July 2006.

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work

12 months, with a review in October 2009.

Likely resource implications: No additional resourcing needs have been identified.

Signed (Proposer) Richard Campen	Date August 2008

ANNEX 2d

ltem 12.2 Annex 2 Page 5

ANNEX 2e

Topic for Member Representative

Transformational Government

The number of Members proposed to be involved

1

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

Ruth Marchington Director of Corporate Resources

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for Member Representative role

Following a number of internal audit recommendations and the support services review and in parallel with gathering evidence for the performance improvement self assessment we have been developing a revised Strategy for Managing Information. This builds on the previous IT strategy considered by Audit and Performance Committee and aims to deliver four outcomes:

- an IT infrastructure with improved reliability and resilience and reduced environmental impact
- technologies that enable staff to improve efficiency and the quality of service delivery
- data that is secure and fit for purpose and meets information/records management standards
- a sustainable IT team sufficient to maintain core IT core systems and support super users and other staff.

The proposals developed so far will feed into our Autumn planning work and the revised strategy will need to be brought formally to all Members in due course following this. A Member Representative would:

- 1. Provide a Member perspective in finalising the strategy and the presentation of it prior to bringing to Members formally
- 2. Advise on how to brief members in the future on the implications of the strategy
- 3. Continue to represent the Authority on external, member led bodies e.g. Derbyshire T-Gov group and NPA E-Gov Steering Group

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work

No longer than October 2009

Likely resource implications

No additional resources to those already agreed

Signed (Proposer)	Date
Ruth Marchington	3 September 2008

Item 12.2 Annex 2 Page 6

Member Representative Role Proposal

ANNEX 2f

Topic for Member Representative

Member Learning and Development

The number of Members proposed to be involved

1

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

Director of Corporate Resources, Ruth Marchington

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for Member Representative role/Task Team

Members have agreed to sign up to the East Midlands Member Development Charter and a Member being an advocate for achieving the Charter and monitoring progress against the action plan is essential.

All authorities who have achieved the Charter have cited member involvement is crucial to their success in being awarded the Charter. Assessor Training is also provided for a Member and officer representative to help support the Charter journey.

The role of the Member will be to :

Generate / promote understanding and engagement of Members in achievement of Member Development Charter.

Be an advocate for Member development and leading by example

Encourage Members to be actively involved in decisions and processes that affect their development.

Provide a constructive and informed challenge in ensuring the approach to Member development meets current and future needs of the individual and the Authority.

The likely time needed to complete the Member Representative's work

The role will be needed for the period it takes us to attain the Charter. However at this time proposed for one year to be reviewed in October 2009.

Likely resource implications

No additional resources anticipated other than already agreed.

Signed (Proposer)	Date
Ruth Marchington	3 September 2008

Task Team Proposal

Item 12.2 Annex 2 Page 7

ANNEX 2g

Topic for Task Team Plans Review Task Team

The number of Members proposed to be involved

9 (option A) or 10 (option B)

Either Option A: Chair and Deputy of the Authority Chair and vice chair of Planning Committee Chair and vice chair of Services Committee and of Audit and Performance Committee 3 other members appointed to reflect the three categories of members and drawn from the whole Authority membership

Or Option B:

Chair and Deputy of the Authority Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee

6 other members appointed to reflect the three categories of members and drawn from the whole Authority membership

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic: Jim Dixon, Chief Executive

Rationale / Reasons for topic selection

The Authority is statutorily required to complete a Local Development Framework and to do so within a prescribed timetable agreed by Government Office. This work is one of the Authority's highest priorities as it a) provides the spatial expression of the National Park Management Plan and so is a key planning document, b) it creates the policies against which all development applications are decided and c) there are considerable financial and reputational risks associated with the failure to deliver this project.

Rationale/Reasons for Member involvement

The PRTT will, over the remaining period of work prior to submission at the end of 2009, guide the LDF work plan (which is delivered by a Project Board) and act as delegated authority where agreed by the Authority to approve text for consultation and policy development. Members will be expected to guide the content of the plan; oversee delivery of the project plan; act as a conduit for input by other members, communities and stakeholders; work towards a robust plan that meets tests of soundness; and ensure a degree of coherence and conformity with other key plans and strategies, especially the National Park Management Plan, other Community Strategies and the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Anticipated outcomes of Task Team process

a) delivery of the project plan for the delivery of the LDF, that is the Local Development Scheme, b) effective use of the Authority's time in considering significant issues not delegated to the PRTT, c) a sense of ownership of the LDF from the members; and d) coherence with other plans and strategies.

The likely time needed to complete the Task Team's work

The Plans Review task Team should be reviewed after the submission for examination of the Local Development Framework in 2009.

Likely resource implications None not already incorporated in the LDS Project Plan

Signed (Proposer) Jim Dixon on behalf of the Mgt Team

Date11 September 2008

Task Team Proposal

ANNEX 2h

Topic for Task Team: Losehill Hall Business Strategy Monitoring Group

The number of Members proposed to be involved: 4

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic: Director of Operations, Richard Campen

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for Task Team

The relevant corporate outcome is:

• Understanding of the National Park and its special qualities has increased so that people recognize its value, and have the opportunity to make a personal contribution to its sustainable management

The relevant corporate action (Level 1) is:

• Providing learning opportunities to key rural and urban audiences, particularly residents, young people and under-represented groups from surrounding urban areas

A Business Plan for Losehill Hall was approved (Audit & Performance Committee, January 2007; Services Committee, June 2007) and a Business Strategy Monitoring Group established (Audit & Performance Committee, January 2007). The latter currently comprises: Clr Gaddum, Prof J Herbert, Mr C Pennell and Mr L Rix be appointed to the Group.

Rationale/Reasons for Member involvement

Members will, individually, bring a range of business, marketing and strategic planning skills to the Group and also provide an internal 'critical friend' to the process of monitoring progress with the implementation of the Business Plan.

Anticipated outcomes of Task Team process

The Business Strategy, agreed by members, aims to 'achieve a defined shift in service provision over the life of the business plan towards core activities and trading activities with close links to the former and maximising all elements of the asset to achieve corporate outcomes' (Services Committee, June 2007).

A minimum of two monitoring meetings per year (Audit & performance Committee, January 2007).

The likely time needed to complete the Task Team's work

The Business Strategy was agreed over a five year time horizon (2008-2013).

Likely resource implications

No additional resourcing needs have been identified to date.

Signed (Proposer)	Date
Richard Campen	August 2008

Task Team Proposal

Topic for Task Team

Budget Monitoring

The number of Members proposed to be involved

4

Lead Director or Chief Executive for topic

Director of Corporate Resources.

Rationale / Reasons for proposal for Member Representative role/Task Team

The purpose of the Budget Monitoring Group is to note progress towards achieving the annual Budget agreed by the Authority in February, with monitoring and explanation of variances arising during the year.

The group comprises Management Team, Head of Finance and Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Services Committee and Audit & Performance Committee. Member involvement is appropriate (and has been requested in the past) as it relates to the roles of the Chairs and Vice Chairs of these Committees and is part of our risk management framework.

The group meets approximately 4 times a year, at key points in the annual budget cycle, to monitor performance against budgets, discuss reasons for any variances and agree any action that is required as a result. These key points are approximately: at the end of the first quarter (July); at Mid-Year review stage (October), at the end of the third quarter with forecast outturns (January), and at the time of the draft outturn (May).

The likely time needed to complete the Task Team's work

The group meets approximately 4 times a year with papers distributed in advance.

Likely resource implications

There are no extra resource implications

Signed (Proposer)	Date
Ruth Marchington	3 September 2008

ANNEX 2i