
1. RECREATION MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY TEAM REPORT (A11412/RMM)

Proposal

1. The report of the Recreation Management scrutiny team is presented for Members' consideration.

2 RECOMMENDATION:

That:

- 1. Members consider and discuss the Recreation Management scrutiny team's recommendations given in Annex 1, section 3, 1-18**
- 2. Management Team be invited to respond to the recommendations and bring back to the October Committee a response and a draft Action Plan with deadlines for implementation where appropriate**
- 3. Actions and deadlines for implementation agreed as part of the Action Plan be monitored through future progress reports to the Audit and Performance Committee**
- 4. The Committee decide (in accordance with the Scrutiny Guidelines) if a report needs to be submitted to a future Authority meeting**
- 5. Members of the scrutiny team be thanked for their work**

Policy/Legal Background

3. Members approved the Scrutiny Guidelines in April 2006 (minute ref: 16/06). At the Authority meeting in July 2007 (minute ref: 74/07) two scrutiny teams were established to look at Recreation Strategy and Recreation Management. The Recreation Management scrutiny team is chaired by Geoff Nickolds and includes Jacque Bevan and Colin McLaren. Claude Fearn was also involved until his sad death.

Key Issues

4. The progress report of the scrutiny team is an independent Member report and is presented in full at Annexes 1 – 3 (attached).

APPENDIX

Background

1. The guidelines for scrutiny explain that through the process the Authority is trying to achieve:
 - Improved performance through performance review within a culture of continuous improvement
 - A strategic role for members that allows them to bring a level of objectivity and constructive challenge (the role of a critical friend) to how the corporate outcomes are delivered
 - A deeper embedding of the 'evaluate, review and scrutiny' stage of the performance management framework at all levels in the organisation
 - Better joined up thinking across traditional departmental barriers and more consistent delivery of cross-cutting issues
 - Enhanced understanding and trust between staff and members

Resources

2. In the Management Team response more analysis will be given on the historic and planned trends on expenditure on Rights of Way and Access (including the implementation of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act) to help to inform any future view on resources.
3. The scrutiny process is a demand on Member and staff time and is resourced from within existing resources. When topic areas are chosen for scrutiny the effect on staff time needs to be identified and has to be planned into work programmes. Support is available from the Democratic Services team but again needs to be prioritised against other demands on time in that team.

Risk Management

4. The risks are associated with not achieving the objectives of the process as given in paragraph 1 above. As the scrutiny process is a relatively new process to the Authority, we continue to review the effectiveness of the guidelines and performance improvement outcomes of scrutiny teams.

Human Rights, Equal Opportunities, Health & Safety

5. There are no issues to highlight.

Consultees

6. The scrutiny team and officers have been consulted on the content of the Annexes as part of the scrutiny team's discussion. The Chair of the scrutiny team, Head of Field Services and the Management Team have also been consulted on this covering report.

Enclosures

7. Annex 1: Report of the scrutiny team on Recreation Management

Annex 2: The Current Situation

Annex 3: Rights of Way Expenditure in the Peak District National Park 2002-2008

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

8. None

Report Author

9. Ruth Marchington
Annexes produced by Scrutiny Chair, Geoff Nickolds

Publication date

10. 10 July 2008