

2025/26 Corporate Risk Register – Q4 year end

Any changes to risk entries at year-end are **highlighted**

2025/26 Corporate Risk Reference Table

Overall risk level	Risk factor	Likelihood	Impact	Q4 (year end) update
Red	Obj E: Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees (ref: 22/23E updated start of year 24/25).	High	High	
Red	Enabling Delivery Aim: Operational Risks (Ref: 25/26B)	High	High	
Red	Aim 1: Influencing ELMs/Area of NP land safeguarded (ref. 20/21B updated start of year 24/25)	High	High	
↑ Red	Aim 2: Inconsistent and unclear direction for 'upland farming' (ref: 24/25S)	High	↑ High	Impact rating increased
Amber	Aim 1: Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan (ref. 20/21D updated start of year 24/25)	Medium	High	
Amber	Aim 2: Sustainable Moorland Management (ref: 23/24I)	Medium	High	
Amber	Obj D/E: UK Government department & agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes (ref: 24/25E)	High	Medium	
Amber	Obj G: LURA "Duty to seek to further" risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery (ref: 24/25F)	High	Medium	
Amber	Enabling Delivery Aim: Legislation & Regulatory Risks (Ref: 25/26A)	High	Medium	
Amber	Aim 2: ELMs Test and Trial outcomes (ref: 24/25I)	High	Medium	
Amber	Aim 3: Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding (ref: 24/25L)	High	Medium	
Amber	Aim 3: Influence of 'user management' in the National Park (ref: 24/25M)	High	Medium	
Amber	Aim 2: National scale new infrastructure Impact - CO2 Pipeline (ref: 24/25P)	High	Medium	
Amber	Obj D: DEFRA Targets and Outcomes Framework based performance monitoring (ref: 24/25D)	Medium	Medium	
Amber	Obj D: Programme and project (externally funded) bid management (ref: 24/25 G updated start of year 25/26)	Medium	Medium	
Amber	Aim 2: Private finance for landscape and nature recovery (ref: 24/25N)	Medium	Medium	
Amber	Aim 4: East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities (ref: 24/25K potential impact on all NPMP Aims)	Medium	Medium	
↓ Amber	Obj D: DEFRA grant agreement and funding (ref: 24/25C) (see also 24/25D)	↓ Medium	↓ Medium	Likelihood and impact ratings both reduced
↓ Green	Aim 4: Control of affordable housing policy via legal agreement (S106) (Ref: 24/25 T)	↓ Low	Medium	Likelihood rating reduced and risk deescalated to service register

2025/26 Corporate Risk Matrix

IMPACT	High	<p>Aim 1: Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan (Ref: 20/21D updated start of year Q2 24/25)</p> <p>Aim 2: Sustainable Moorland Management (Ref: 23/24I)</p>	<p>Obj E: Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees (Ref: 22/23E updated start of year 24/25).</p> <p>Enabling Delivery Aim: Operational Risks (Ref: 25/26B)</p> <p>Aim 1: Influencing ELMs/Area of NP land safeguarded (Ref: 20/21B updated start of year 24/25)</p> <p>↑ Aim 2: Inconsistent and unclear direction for 'upland farming' (Ref: 24/25S)</p>	
	Medium	<p>Obj D: DEFRA Targets and Outcomes Framework based performance monitoring (Ref: 24/25D)</p> <p>Obj D Programme and project (externally funded) bid management (Ref: 24/25G updated start of year 25/26)</p> <p>Aim 2: Private finance for landscape and nature recovery (Ref: 24/25N)</p> <p>Aim 4: East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities (Ref: 24/25K potential impact on all NPMP Aims)</p> <p>↓ Obj D: DEFRA grant agreement and funding (Ref: 24/25C) (see also 24/25D)</p>	<p>Obj D/E UK Government departments and agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes (Ref: 24/25E)</p> <p>Obj G: LURA "Duty to seek to further" risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery (Ref: 24/25F)</p> <p>Enabling Delivery Aim: Legislation & Regulatory Risk (Ref: 25/26A)</p> <p>Aim 2: ELMs Test and Trial outcomes (Ref: 24/25I)</p> <p>Aim 3: Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding (Ref: 24/25L)</p> <p>Aim 3: Influence of 'user management' in the National Park (Ref: 24/25M)</p> <p>Aim 2: National scale new infrastructure impact CO2 Pipeline (Ref: 24/25P)</p>	
	Low	<p>↓ Aim 4: Control of affordable housing policy via legal agreement (S106) (Ref: 24/25T)</p>		
		Low	Medium	High
LIKELIHOOD				

Authority Plan Delivery Risks

Objective	Detail
A Planning	To achieve national performance standards for planning applications by type dealt with in a timely manner.
B Access	To achieve timescales and follow processes for the statutory functions under Countryside and Rights of Way Act and Town and Country Planning Act.
C People	To have highly engaged, healthy and inclusive staff and volunteers.
D Financial Resilience	To be financially resilient and provide value for money.
E Assets	To have best practice arrangements in place for the Authority's assets.
F Governance	To have best practice governance arrangements in place.
G Information and Performance	To have best practice IT access controls, security arrangements, performance and risk arrangements in place.
H Climate Change	To reduce the Authority's greenhouse gas emissions.
Enabling delivery (ED)	The Authority is inspiring, pioneering and enabling in delivering the National Park vision

Obj (A-H or ED)	Risk Text colour indicative of overall risk rating	Risk description A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."	Existing controls Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
E	Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees (Ref: 22/23E updated start of year 23/24). Service plan action: Ash die back scheme of works to address it.	If we do not allocate sufficient staff time and financial resources to surveying and managing PDNPAs in-hand woodlands and trees , which include high numbers of dangerous trees infected with Ash Dieback disease fungus (<i>Hymenoscyphus fraxineus</i>), we are at risk of being liable/uninsured for Injury/Loss of life & property damage due to unsafe trees	5-year survey cycle assesses condition of in-hand woodland, which actions remediation work for unsafe trees. Reactive closure of public access to sites at risk in bad weather / storms.	HxH	Programme of works under way to address ash dieback infected trees to meet our legal obligations and insurance requirements.	HxH	HxH	HxH	Refer to Woodland Management Plan and Woodland Ash Die Back Works plan.	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Ongoing survey and inspection work	One remaining remedial work bloc to be completed, following which regular inspection schedule will be reestablished.
D	DEFRA grant agreement and methods of funding (Ref: 24/25C)	The 25/26 DEFRA grant funding was cut by 8.2%. If, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 3-year DEFRA grant settlement is cut by 15-20%, or a proportion is allocated as capital funds; or there is a reallocation of funding across Protected landscapes, or performance monitoring is used to reduce grant, or move towards more competitive bids for grant elements. e.g. Access for All (see also DEFRA Targets and Outcome based performance monitoring 24/25D); then there is a risk that the Authority will need to reduce headcount of staff, may not be able to meet targets, deal with the refreshed legislation (LURA) currently in the pipeline and may not be able to spend capital funding in the required timeframe. Capacity and capability to successfully complete competitive bids is also an area of risk to be considered (investment of time/effort with chance of no return).	Continuous review of service budgets & org structure to ensure budgets balance (including MFFP). Regularly monitor inflation rates & interest costs. Utilisation of reserves for Authority critical spend as required. Pay award was given at 3.2% which proactively reduced staff costs.	HxH	Internal preparation for low grant agreement including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish income targets to maximise income streams; Review and update MFFP to monitor potential deficits in future; Commence full team stop/go decision making on bids to reduce costs invested into non strategically important bids; Closer monitoring of material projects to redistribute resources across projects as required for success; Full vacancy control. 	HxH	HxH	↓↓ MxM	Set FY26/27 budget by March 26 Authority meeting. Updates in line with monitoring meeting timeframes. Review risk status in Q4 25/26.	Finance Manager (Section 151 Officer)	Monitoring via resources committee.	Letter of assurance received aligned to best-case scenario modelled. Due to proactive measures the likelihood and impact of this risk has reduced for year end.
D	DEFRA Targets and Outcomes Framework based performance monitoring (Ref: 24/25D)	If the Authority cannot meet the requirements of the new targets and outcome framework then there is a risk to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reputation the National Park grant access to additional DEFRA funding 	Peak District Strategy and Performance Team is part of a data checking group with reps from other NP which is proactively reviewing data for Defra and providing feedback.	MxH	Reactive actions based on flow of information from DEFRA on the framework. S&P will use PLTOF to inform development of	MxH	MxM	MxM	Action ongoing due to awaited further updates. Report to Members at May 2026	Head of Resources	Flow of comms via CEO and NP Data Group from DEFRA. Quarterly NPMP Delivery Group	No change as still awaiting further updates from DEFRA.

Obj (A-H or ED)	Risk Text colour indicative of overall risk rating	Risk description A risk should be expressed as: <i>If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> overall NP Authorities and Teams over the long term 			next NPMP in consultation with NE or guidance.				Authority along with NPMP AMR. May take 12-18 months for a full reporting cycle to fully understand the implications of new framework on Authority.		with partner delivery teams to maintain collaboration and momentum.	
D	Programme and project (externally funded) bid management (Ref: 24/25G updated start of year 25/26)	<p>If programme and project externally funded bids are not prioritised via appropriate bid management processes, there is a risk to the authority of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lost opportunities Impact on wider Authority project development Impact on 'business as usual' if bid successful Internal project / funding conflicts Impact on bottom line aspirations Reputational risk 	<p>Ongoing communication with SMT, wider management team, members to support bid management process.</p> <p>In line with standing orders, committee scrutiny dependent on financial level.</p> <p>Continue to work with consultant bid writer to project managing large opportunities.</p> <p>Foundation Director regularly sharing project pipeline with SMT.</p>	MxM	Review of standing orders and financial regulations will commence now team is fully resourced.	MxM	MxM	MxM	Actions are ongoing with no current timelines.	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Match funding for external bids monitored using tracker at monthly RMM.	Further changes in resources and still under capacity to carry out additional mitigation action.
D/E	UK Government departments and agencies' capacity to support Protected Landscape purposes (Ref: 24/25E)	If the capacity pressure on UK Government departments and agencies continues or gets worse, leading to indecision or bad decision making, then there will be a risk that the Authority will not be able to carry out its statutory purposes as a National Park.	Engage with National Parks England, PLP, NPP and other fora to influence Government and policy.	HxM	Actively engage with departments and agencies as opportunities arise.	HxM	HxM	HxM	Ongoing	CEO	CEO and Chair to actively take part on NP comms group	<p>Appointment of PLP chair may support capacity for Government advocacy through PLP.</p> <p>Further reduction in Natural England capacity due to change in strategy.</p> <p>Ongoing trial of earned autonomy for National Park Authorities could reduce impact of low central capacity.</p>
G	LURA 'duty to seek to further' risk to partnership working and NPMP delivery (Ref: 24/25F)	<p>If the LURA is not;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognised as legislation intended (i.e. to further the purpose of designation) fully embraced by relevant authorities (RAs) supported by clear non-compliance consequences, <p>then, there is a risk that RAs will seek to weaken the aspirations of the NPMP to make their delivery less onerous which could impact the successful delivery of the Plan.</p>	<p>Before update on regulations is shared, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to forge closer working relationships with all relevant authorities through NPMP Partnership Group. 	HxM	<p>Once update on ministerial regulations is received, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek internal legal advice on how best to implement changes to duty across Authority. Ensure we comply with DEFRA 	HxM	HxM	HxM	Awaiting update	Head of Resources	<p>CEO part of the NP comms group.</p> <p>Annual NPMP Partnership Group with senior leaders of RAs to maintain</p>	<p>Campaign for National Parks are gathering evidence of uses of LURA to support advocacy for it to remain in place and be used appropriately.</p>

Obj (A-H or ED)	Risk Text colour indicative of overall risk rating	Risk description A risk should be expressed as: <i>If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
		Internally, the additional work to deal with legislation raises resource/capacity concerns as the emerging workload is not supported by additional grant funding and any opportunities resulting from LURA will require additional / reallocation of capacity to realise and maintain over short timescales.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reactively manage arising tensions where policy overlap occurs (e.g. MCA plans). Develop awareness on best practise and legal precedent from arising examples in other PLs. 		<p>guidance on the 'seek to further' duty once published.</p> <p>CEO to make submission to Campaign for National Parks evidence gathering process for positive cases.</p>						collaboration and momentum. Campaign for National Parks evidence gathering process.	S&P team will work with RAs in the NPMP development process which provides an opportunity to positively navigate LURA duty collaboratively with RA partners.
ED	Legislation & Regulatory Risk (Ref: 25/26A) (Aggregated corporate risk)	<p>This is an aggregated risk to monitor any significant changes to the legislative and regulatory environment which may negatively impact the PDNP or PDNPA.</p> <p>Upcoming legislative and regulatory changes may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reform to the National Planning Policy Framework which may carry a range of risks, including central government management of infrastructure development projects Planning and Infrastructure Bill (which may include removal of protected species requirements in planning process) Other changes to planning regulation (e.g. National Development Management Policy refresh) to meet housebuilding targets resulting in pressure for housing development in the National Park Introduction of a Land Use Framework which inadequately recognises Protected Landscapes Governance changes to NPAs (which may impact Defra agreements, roll of NPs, position of NPs in Defra family) Introduction of new Rights of Way or Open Access legislation resulting in increased recreational pressure in the landscape Changes to the Environmental Improvement Plan resulting from the Office for Environmental Protection review of environmental targets. <p>It is acknowledged that the Authority has little or no control over this risk, however if any significant changes are made to a piece of legislation/regulation, then there is a risk that the Authority may not have the capacity to deal with changes, and/or there is a direct risk to our purposes, duty and the special qualities.</p>	<p>SMT to monitor changes / announcements coming from Government.</p> <p>As and when changes are announced to a piece of legislation / regulation, this will be scrutinised to fully understand particular risks from specific change.</p> <p>Senior staff feedback on Government consultations.</p> <p>Working closely with NPE and PLP.</p> <p>Collective voice across NPs to scrutinise and respond to new legislation and regulation</p>	MxM	Aggregated risk currently accepted	MxM	HxM	HxM	Monitored monthly and discussed at SMT/WMT	CEO		<p>NPPF consultation response submitted.</p> <p>This risk will be disaggregated going into 2026/7 to better understand and manage different legislative and regulatory risks.</p>
ED	Operational Risks (Ref: 25/26B) (Aggregated corporate risk)	<p>This is an aggregated risk to monitor the risks associated with the significant operational changes which the Authority will need to make / is making based on political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental (PESTLE) factors. The operational areas which carry risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change from core funded to an externally funded project model Culture change (smarter objectives, monitoring employee time spent on externally funded capital projects, create project development process, improve project management process) 	Use existing project management reporting	MxM	<p>Updates to risk management process to ensure suitable allocation of resources to projects based on risk likelihood/impact</p> <p>Time management on externally funded projects.</p> <p>Financial management (visible financial draw</p>	MxM	HxH	HxH	<p>Monitored monthly and discussed at SMT/WMT/RMM</p> <p>Weekly discussions at SMT on capital element of financial risk</p>	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Assets & Enterprise undertaking audit of trial timesheets – report back by end Q4.	Pilot timesheet process was completed in D6 25/26 with some application where roles part-funded capital expenditure, but due to organisational change any further roll out is on hold.

Obj (A-H or ED)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of Arm's Length Company (VAT threshold on income generation activity) Revenue from rural rents (related to the BPS/SFI changes) Equality impact assessment (knock on from changes to funding) Operational role of Authority with future of Green Finance (starting with BNG) <p>If the Authority does not make appropriate changes to streamline operations in response to PESTLE factors, then there may be a risk to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputation as a National Park, Relationship with Defra/Government Financial implications Staff efficiency (capacity to deliver) Staff morale Relationships with Partners Lost opportunities due to operational issues 			down / allocation of funds)							<p>New risk management process to be adopted from start FY26/27.</p> <p>This risk will be disaggregated going into 2026/7 to better understand and manage different operational risks.</p>

Aim One: Climate Change

Objective	Detail
1	To lower greenhouse gas emissions significantly, focussing on the largest emitters within our influence.
2	To sequester and store substantially more carbon while contributing to nature recovery.
3	To reverse damage to nature, biodiversity, cultural heritage in particular built environments caused by a changing climate.

Obj (1-3)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
3	Influencing ELMs/Area of NP land safeguarded <i>(Ref. 20/21B updated start of year 23/24)</i> CC.1 Influence design, payment rates and delivery of the Environmental Land Management schemes annually between 2023-25 CC.11 Target area to be determined as the ELM scheme detail becomes clearer – 2023-24. (NPMP & Special qualities Risk)	If we fail to influence the coverage, targets, design and payment levels of the new ELM schemes (Sustainable Farming Incentive, Countryside Stewardship mid/higher-tier, capital works and Landscape Recovery) We may: 1. See no increase or a reduction of the areas entered into the ELM schemes resulting in damage to biodiversity and heritage features (dry stone walls) 2. Fail to achieve the climate change outcomes in the NPMP 3. See specific losses to grassland habitats	National influencing by representing English Protected Landscapes at stakeholder meetings. Support and encourage other stakeholders to have a shared collective voice which delivers for the PDNP. Foster interest in and support for farmers and land managers. Engage in transitional arrangements, stakeholder events and workshops etc. Delivery of the FiPL programme which supports farmers towards entering ELMs.	HxH	Additional promotion of the service, working with agencies e.g. NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC, Defra. Enhance comms with farmers & land managers (e.g. ELM tests & FiPL) Continued lobbying to take forward lessons learnt from FiPL into national schemes	HxH	HxH	HxH	Actions ongoing – see FiPL delivery plan for more detailed timelines Aiming for pilots of national rollout of ELMs from April 26 (subject to change)	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will transfer to Head of Planning & Conservation)	Annual NPMP Monitoring Report in May 2026 Aim 2 update report to Authority in March 2026	FiPL project has received funding extension for 1-3 years will support continued engagement on ELMs. Awaiting NPE Future Farming and Land Management policy paper.
3	Failure to deliver the PD Nature Recovery Plan <i>(Ref. 20/21D updated start of year 23/24)</i> CC.14 Complete and share the One Nature Recovery Plan - 2023-24 Service Plan Action: Implement the One PD NRP Corporate, NPMP, Special qualities risk	If we fail to lead the further development and delivery of the Peak District Nature Recovery plan we will: 1. Not meet one of the key aspirations in the DEFRA Grant Agreement 2. Be at risk of DEFRA grant recovery 3. Fail to deliver both NPMP partnership and Authority Action Plan actions 4. Suffer reputational risk 5. Risk the loss of natural capital assets, wildlife enhancement, loss of priority/key habitats such as grassland (Failure to sustain the area of non-protected species-rich grassland through retention, enhancement and creation)	National influencing of agri-environmental policies and support systems Local communications across the farming & land management industry Promote EIA guidance NPMP partnership work FiPL delivery	MxH	Promote and support understanding and interest in public payment for public goods. Enhance comms with examples of practical delivery with farmers & land managers e.g. ELM test, WP practical field trials, supporting more native woodland creation and mitigation of Ash Dieback, FiPI. Establish Nature Recovery Plan Delivery Group and integrating into NPMP development process. Create spatial mapping of targets to support delivery partners to appropriately engage.	MxH	MxH	MxH	Delivery group and spatial mapping established by June 2026.	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will transfer to Head of Planning & Conservation)	At planned liaison & LNRS meetings Annual update for Aim 2 to full Authority in March 2026 NPMP programme delivery group	The Nature Recovery Plan has been used in consultation on multiple LNRSs to support delivery through this mechanism.

Aim Two: Landscape and Nature Recovery

Objective	Detail
4	To be a place where nature recovers and biodiversity flourishes
5	To understand, appreciate and enhance the cultural heritage and in particular built environments of the National Park as part of an ever changing landscape.
6	To protect and enhance the natural beauty of the Peak District National Park's contrasting and ever evolving landscapes.

Obj (4-6)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Sta rt	Q2	Q4				
6	Inconsistent and unclear direction for 'upland farming' (Ref: 24/25S)	The 'pause' to SFI and Capital Grants due to the overcommitment of budget, the delay of the launch of the new Higher Tier, and the lack of consistent/clear messaging about the 'direction of travel' for upland farming/land management by the UK Government generates a risk to the Authority in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of trust in Government being extended to PDNPA Reduced engagement with nature recovery from farmers / land managers Possible increase in farming practices that are detrimental to the place (i.e. increased grazing intensity) Knock on effect to success of Authority programme / projects to restore nature. 	Engaging at national, regional and local stakeholder events. Team Nature, NPE discussions ongoing.	HxM	Include an ask for revised and clear messaging from Government. Engage at a PL and Environmental NGO level – work to influence a reversal of the removal of SFI options in the 2026 offer. Explore opportunities for NPA advisors to be involved in farm advise pilots.	HxM	HxM	HxH	Waiting for further Government guidance – no timeframe	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will transfer to Head of Planning & Conservation / Head of Assets & Enterprise)	SFI offer for 2026 has removed some options which are highly impactful in upland areas, resulting in less support for environmental farming in the uplands. As a result, impact rating has been increased. Bilateral meeting between English NP authorities and NT took place in February. Revised EIP released in December 2025	
4	Sustainable Moorland management (previously Moorland Management Group) (Ref: 23/24) Convene the development and implementation of Moorland Management Group Corporate, NPMP, Special qualities risk	If we fail in our convening role in both the delivery of the Moorland Management Group (MMG) and its integration with the other moorland interest groups, we will suffer reputational and operational harm in delivering landscape management as a result of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to influence the development of consensus between stakeholders, landowners and key interest groups Failure to demonstrate commitment to reduce the incidence and severity of Moorland Fires Failure to demonstrate commitment to restoring breeding populations pairs of birds of prey to the numbers in the 1990s 	Continue the refreshed approach to the Moorland Management Group including hosting MMG meetings. Partnership working to fund casual seasonal fire rangers. Continue to lead the Fire Operations Group (FOG).	MxH	Maintain high level CEO support for all existing actions CEO to support Rob Kenning in engagement with FOG and MMG.	MxH	MxH	MxH	Provisional meeting date for MMG meeting in Autumn 2026.	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will transfer to CEO)	Aim 2 report to Authority (March 2026) NPMP delivery process	There is ongoing good engagement in the MMG, which met in Oct 25 and Feb 26, and FOG. Investing in this process to foster relationships should continue.
6	ELMs Test and Trial outcomes (Ref: 24/25)	If we fail to influence and our recommendations are not taken into consideration there is a risk that the Authority role in ELMs does not include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Acting as local convenor Providing 'bespoke' options and flexibility Working effectively in partnerships with ALBs and eNGOs Advocating for long term land management good practice 	Continued sharing of outcomes from Test & Trials in updates to ELMs	HxM	Proposal for revised policy paper for NPE for future of farming and land management in English NPs which will use Test & Trial outcomes – yet to be agreed	HxM	HxM	HxM	Proposed policy paper in 2026	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will transfer to Head of Planning & Conservation)	Aim 2 report to Authority (March 2026)	Through Test & Trial involvement, PDNPA have been invited to participate in DEFRA working groups for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing new approaches to networking, collaboration and farm advice.

Obj (4-6)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Sta rt	Q2	Q4				
		5. Providing support for continued maintenance and enhancement of habitats already previously supported by public money.										• The role of protected landscape Authorities in ELMs delivery.
6	Private finance for landscape and nature recovery (Ref: 24/25N)	If we fail to provide clear information for land managers as 'proof of concept' emerges for private finance opportunities and support exploration of early options then this could lead to: 1. Not meeting the EIP targets 2. Not accessing private funding required to deliver EIP/TOF nature targets 3. Not enabling private family farms to access funds Which could present a risk of projects going ahead that are not integrated with the full range of special qualities.	MorrIDGE Hill County Landscape Recovery Round 2 Pilot Project. Developing landscape recovery for the farmer-led Peatland Farmers Group in the White Peak.	MxM	Working with National Park Partnership Private Finance Leads to increase knowledge and understanding of appropriate staff. Share learning as models emerge via the Land Managers Forum. Develop Authority paper outlining approach to BNG. Share learning across NPA Landscape Recovery Leads.	MxM	MxM	MxM	MHC implementation application to be submitted in May 2026.	Head of Assets & Enterprise	Aim 2 report to Authority (March 2026) NPMP delivery process	
4	National scale new infrastructure impact - CO2 Pipeline (Ref: 24/25P)	If the proposal for two new CO ₂ pipelines goes ahead, we are at risk of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harm to Special Quality features (in particular, landscape character, archeology, wildlife/nature and farming economy). Impact on delivery of landscape and nature recovery targets, e.g. if pipeline impacts delivery areas funded by FiPL, PLTOF target areas. Increase in future mineral extraction plans due to grounds for more sustainable extraction and production. <p>However, the potential benefit of the pipelines is a key consideration.</p>	Continue positively engaging at the pre-application advice stage with a view to influence the development.	HxM	Make capacity available in the planning team (strategic planning manager role) to oversee such developments. Once development consent order is received, we will write local impact report and consider location and method to avoid sensitive features and influence restoration work. If proposal is extremely harmful, we may need to consider further action to effect outcomes e.g. LURA	HxH	HxH	↓ HxM	Waiting for development consent order which is TBC – no timeline	Head of Planning	Following development planning process steps	Reduction of impact rating due to down-scaling of plan from two to one pipeline across Peak District. A response has been submitted to the Environmental Impact Assessment scoping report – awaiting scoping opinion.

Aim Three: Welcoming Place

Objective	Detail
7	To encourage a sustainable visitor economy that supports local businesses, cares for the National Park's special qualities and respects the well-being of local communities
8	To create opportunities for young people and those from underserved communities to connect with and enjoy the National Park.
9	To promote the National Park as a place where there are opportunities for the improvement of physical and mental health and well-being

Obj (7-9)	Risk Text colour indicative of overall risk rating	Risk description A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."	Existing controls Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
9	Rights of Way deterioration and reduction in funding (Ref: 24/25L) Protected Area purposes, Special qualities risk	If the RoW funding remains static or declines further, in conjunction with more extreme weather, then we are at risk of not being able to maintain an acceptable/statutory standard of the priority RoW which the Authority has agreed to maintain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational risk Litigation from path users (damage / injury) Runaway damage to infrastructure with longer term/higher cost implications Negative impact special quality features / erosion of pathways Economic benefits 	Seek additional funding opportunities via LA, water companies funding, NPA core funding, specific Defra core funding pots e.g. Access for All, FiPL Appropriate use of Volunteers to maintain and restore RoW	HxM	Continue to maximise the limited people/monetary resources available to do this work. Ensuring restoration and priority rights of way are included in the wider landscape funding bids. Use success with Sheffield City Council to seek funding from LAs around Peak District fringes for RoW mitigation plans through Local Plans.	HxM	HxM	HxM	Resources allocated in 2025/26 service plan SCC Local Plan and CIL due end 2026 – learning can be carried forward from this	Head of Landscape & Engagement (Will move to Head of Assets & Enterprise)	Six monthly review of Authority Plan and risk register	Additional funding for FY26/27 secured through the Peak District Foundation from a private donor. Access for All and Active Travel funding will also support RoW works. Successful development of mitigation plan with Sheffield City Council around greenfield development plans. Ranger team review complete.
7	Influence of 'user management' in the National Park (previously People Management in the National Park) (Ref: 24/25M) Protected Area purposes, Special qualities risk	If 'user management' is not given appropriate focus and/or funding to address: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Local community impact Stakeholder impact Recreation Hubs, area management and hot spots Landscape/feature condition Rights of Way condition Behaviour change Carrying capacity Transport; then there is a direct risk to our purposes, duty and special qualities.	Ongoing assessment, evidence gathering, data and evidence synthesis regarding use of landscape. Communicate findings to Members annually Continue SMT focus CEO attending VPDD regular meetings and wider Partnership Dialogue with NPMP delivery groups to gain support / look for partnership solutions Approach partners to sign Tourist Charter.	HxM	Establish a trial at key hot spot area of Castleton/ Winnats/ Mam Tor and work in partnership to facilitate solutions within trial area. Local Plan review developing recreational policy to support development which increases capacity of visitor infrastructure Engage with Mayoral Combined Authorities to influence funding available in this area. Promote and signpost partners to National Park Centres, pop ups and Welcome Volunteers to support visitor engagement Develop Park & Stride plans through Active Travel funding.	HxM	HxM	HxM	Local Plan development to be completed by end 2026.	Head of Planning	NPMP Plan delivery monitoring Local Plan development and consultation process	Positive steps have been taken to develop a relationship with EMCCA and dialogue has been established around their regional growth plans regarding tourism. Ongoing work is identifying strategic sites for car park enhancement to reduce problem parking impacts of road safety and landscape. Further Active Travel funding has been assured for FY26/27. NPMP partners are feeding back on action from 25/26 including relating to visitor management; report to be published Q1 26/27.

Obj (7-9)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
					Continue car park enhancements to increase capacity in key strategic areas.							Visitor survey 2025 analysis underway.

Aim Four: Thriving Communities

Objective	Detail
10	To support sustainable communities by improving opportunities for affordable housing and connection to services.
11	To promote a flourishing economy that is in accord with nature recovery and climate change mitigation.

Obj (10-11)	Risk <i>Text colour indicative of overall risk rating</i>	Risk description <i>A risk should be expressed as: If (x were to happen) then (the consequence would be) or "failure to ..."</i>	Existing controls <i>Actions currently taken or controls in place that mitigate the risk e.g. standing orders</i>	Risk rating before mitigation L x I	Additional mitigating action (add to service plan)	Risk rating with mitigating action L x I (expressed as Red, Amber, Green)			Time frame of action	Lead officer	How monitored/ Indicator	Quarterly update (Q4)
						Start	Q2	Q4				
11	East Midlands Combined Councils Authority priorities (Ref: 24/25K) Protected Area purposes, Special qualities risk	If the Authority doesn't get included in critical decision making led by the new East Midlands Combined Council Authority, then there is a risk that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple spatial development strategies will emerge creating complexity across wider Peak district Urban/urban fringe issues will be prioritised Transport budget could be directed primarily into urban areas Reduced engagement with NPMP objectives Authority may have to use legal 'duty to further' power to enforce action 	CEO to continue building working relationship with EMMCA mayor Clare Ward. Actively engage in the Peak Partnership Summit	MxM	Continue to scan decision making environment within the new combined Authority to ensure PDNPA gets a 'seat at the table' on relevant issues/ decisions.	MxM	MxM	MxM	Plan for follow up meeting in Q1 FY26/27.	CEO	Included in appropriate decision making which may affect NP purposes	CEO and Chair along with Strategy and Performance team members have attending meetings to initiating relationship development with key EMCCA officers, awaiting quarterly follow up meeting. NPA has responded on the data sharing consultation from EMCCA looking to bring together/provide regional visitation + user economy data.
10	Control of affordable housing policy via legal agreement (S106) (Ref: 24/25T) Protected Area purposes, Special qualities risk	An affordable housing scheme in Bakewell (circa 40 homes) has been submitted including a significantly weakened S106 agreement which would undermine policy aims and affordable housing in perpetuity, which could create a risk to the National Park in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputation risk to the Authority if the scheme is refused Need to develop more of the adjoining landscape Relationship risk with Derbyshire Dales and other partners Affordable homes lost over time Knock on risk to further affordable housing sites / schemes in NP 	Negotiation/liaison with housing associations with applicant and DDDC. Not exclusively an issue affecting Peak District, learning from other NPs via comms of Heads of Planning.	MxM	Negotiations ongoing to ensure suitable S106 agreement.	MxM	MxM	↓ LxM		Head of Planning		Negotiations have successfully reduced the likelihood of this risk occurring with risk management now deescalated to Planning service risk register. Expected S106 agreement could be used for similar scenarios in future.