

YOUR REF:
Our Ref: CH
This matter is being dealt Clifford Hart
by:
Direct line: 020 8489 2920
Fax no: 020 8489 2660
Email: clifford.hart@haringey.gov.uk

14 February 2011

To: All Members of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board

Dear Member,

Alexandra Palace and Park Board - Tuesday, 15th February, 2011

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

7. GOVERNANCE UPDATE (PAGES 1 - 8)

Report of the Interim General Manager – Alexandra Palace

8. REGENERATION WORKING GROUP - UPDATE & FEEDBACK (PAGES 9 - 20)

Report of the Interim General Manager – Alexandra Palace

Yours sincerely

Clifford Hart
Committee Manager

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda item: 7

Alexandra Palace & Park Board**on 15th February 2011**Report Title: **Governance Update**Report of: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager, Alexandra Palace & Park Charitable Trust****1. Purpose**

- 1.1 To report back on progress, following previous resolutions of the Board in the area of Structural changes to streamline processes and systems - the review of the APP Statutory Advisory Committee (APPAC) and Consultative Committee (APPCC).
- 1.2 To seek the Board's consideration of proposals for changes arising from the above review and its approval for implementing the joint recommendations of the two committees' Working Groups.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Board notes the joint recommendations and comments of the two Working Groups and the resolutions of the APPAC at its meeting 25 January 2011 and the APPCC at its meeting on 8 February 2011.
- 2.2 That the Board approves the proposal to hold two joint meetings of both Committees with the first such meeting on 5 April 2011, as proposed by the joint recommendation 1 of the two Working Groups.
- 2.3 That the Board delegates to the Chair, with the assistance and advice of the Interim General Manager, the initial review of the joint meetings and that the Chair should liaise with the Chair of the APPAC as deemed appropriate.
- 2.4 That the Board approves in principle the adoption of a two-stage process with stage one the immediate implementation of a joint APPCC/APPAC Committee (Model 1) and stage two a reconstituted APPAC (Model 2).
- 2.5 That the Board instructs the Interim General Manager to investigate the practicalities of having a single Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee and to seek legal and Charity Commission advice in order to advise the Board further on this matter.
- 2.6 That the Board resolves to receive further reports on this matter at future meetings and after the two trial meetings referred to above have been held.

Report Authorised by: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager**

Contact Officer: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager, Alexandra Palace & Park, Alexandra Palace Way, Wood Green N22 7AY Tel No. 020 8365 4340.**

3. Executive Summary

- 3.1 This report updates the Board on progress towards a combined and more effective stakeholder forum following the work done by both the APPAC and the APPCC in reviewing their relative effectiveness.
- 3.2 Both Committee's Working Groups have met on several occasions and held a joint meeting on 14 January 2011.
- 3.3 A report approved by the Chairs of both Working Groups was considered by the APPAC on 25 January 2011 and by the APPCC on 8 February 2011.
- 3.4 The above report recommends a two-stage process to move to a single 'reconstituted' APPAC, which would effectively incorporate the APPCC.
- 3.5 This report details the process of the Review and informs the Board that both Committees are in accord with the proposed next steps, the first of which is to hold two joint meetings of both Committees, followed by a review after each meeting.
- 3.6 The first such joint meeting is proposed for 5 April 2011.

4. Reasons for any change in policy or for new policy development (if applicable)

- 4.1 Resolutions made by the Board on 29 June 2010, 6 September 2010, 14 October 2010 and 30 November 2010.

5. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 5.1 N/A

6. Description

- 6.1 At its meeting on 6 September 2010 the Board resolved to adopt an 'interim' model for structural change, including the appointment of Independent Advisors to the Board and a review of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee and Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee as the most appropriate phased approach towards the longer term aspiration of legal/financial independence.
- 6.2 At its meeting on 21 December 2010 the Board received an update on the remaining key tasks associated with developing the Governance of the Trust. Since that date there has been progress in the review of the APP Statutory Advisory Committee (APPAC) and Consultative Committee (APPCC).
- 6.3 It is recognised that whilst the APP Statutory Advisory Committee (APPAC) is constituted in an Act of Parliament, there could be means of enhancing its current remit/membership. Both Committees were requested by their Chairs to consider holding an inaugural joint meeting at which both groups need to agree a process for 'holding a mirror to themselves', as the Trustees have done, and identify actions to streamline their processes and improve effectiveness; including consideration of the necessity of having two separate groups.
- 6.4 The APPAC at its meeting on 7 September 2010 resolved to create a Working Group comprising four members of the Committee to explore the proposals and to consider how the Committee might operate more effectively. The Working Party arranged to meet on 29 November 2010 and it elected a Chair, David Liebeck. Subsequent discussions were held with a view to formalise recommendations for the next APPAC meeting on 25 January 2011.

- 6.5 The APPCC at its meeting on 16 November 2010 resolved to create a Working Group comprised of four members of the Committee. The Working Group met on 8 November 2010 and it elected Colin Marr as its Chair. Arrangements were made for liaison with the APPAC Working Party.
- 6.6 The APPAC Working Party submitted the draft findings of the Working Party (the contents of which were subject to further discussion between the two Working Groups) to the Chair of the Board and the IGM in December 2010, followed by a meeting at Alexandra Palace on 6 December to discuss the findings of the two Working Groups.
- 6.7 A meeting between the two Working Groups took place on 14 January 2011 and a large measure of agreement was reached on the way forward. The Chairs of the both Working Parties submitted a report to the Chair of the Board on 19 January 2011, the contents of which had been agreed by the Chairs of both Working Groups. The report is appended to this report at Appendix 1.
- 6.8 Board members will be familiar with the content of the report and its recommendations, although they may wish to refresh their memories in particular in respect of the comments, consensus and observations.
- 6.9 The IGM advised the Chair of the Board that the appropriate way forward was for the report and its recommendations to be considered by both Committees at their impending meetings on 25 January and 8 February.
- 6.10 The APPAC considered the report at its meeting on 25 January 2011 and it resolved;
- i That Model 1, a Joint Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee, be supported and that two trial meetings take place, the first one taking place on 5th April 2011, the next scheduled meeting.
 - ii That Model 2 be supported in principle and that Alexandra Palace Officers be asked to investigate the practicalities of having a single Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee and seek legal and Charity Commission advice (after the Consultative Committee meeting on 8th February 2011) before reporting back to the Advisory Committee.
- 6.11 The APPCC considered the report at its meeting on 8 February 2011 and it resolved to support the recommendations in the report, and that the Board should ask the IGM to investigate the practicalities of having a single Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee and seek legal and Charity Commission advice.
- 6.12 The Board will note that a number of logistical and practical issues may need to be addressed in order for the joint meetings to proceed smoothly and it will be necessary for the discussions to be focussed through effective chairmanship and officer support.
- 6.13 Arguably, any additional effort necessary to ensure that the joint meetings are effective may be offset by the reduced number of meetings and associated attendance and officer support.
- 6.14 It is proposed that there should be a review after each joint meeting and that the Board delegates the reviews to the Chair, assisted and advised by the Interim General Manager. The Chair will liaise with the Chair of the APPAC and other members of the Working Groups as he deems appropriate.
- 6.15 While the Working Groups have progressed quickly and their members have worked hard to deliver joint recommendations to the Board, the timing of the joint meetings of the two committees will mean that it will not be possible to seek the approval of Full Council at its April 2011 meeting for any formal changes to the Alexandra Palace Committee structure.

- 6.16 The Interim General Manager will submit a revised timescale for this and the remaining tasks arising from the Board's Governance Review to a future meeting of the Board.

7 Consultation

- 7.1 There has been no specific consultation on this report beyond the liaison with the APP Statutory Advisory Committee and APP Consultative Committee described in previous reports to the Board.

8 Recommendations

- 8.1 That the Board notes the joint recommendations and comments of the two Working Groups and the resolutions of the APPAC at its meeting 25 January 2011 and the APPCC at its meeting on 8 February 2011.
- 8.2 That the Board approves the proposal to hold two joint meetings of both Committees with the first such meeting on 5 April 2011, as proposed by the joint recommendation 1 of the two Working Groups.
- 8.3 That the Board delegates to the Chair, with the assistance and advice of the Interim General Manager, the initial review of the joint meetings and that the Chair should liaise with the Chair of the APPAC as deemed appropriate.
- 8.4 That the Board approves in principle the adoption of a two-stage process with stage one the immediate implementation of a joint APPCC/APPAC Committee (Model 1) and stage two a reconstituted APPAC (Model 2).
- 8.5 That the Board instructs the Interim General Manager to investigate the practicalities of having a single Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee and to seek legal and Charity Commission advice in order to advise the Board further on this matter.
- 8.6 That the Board resolves to receive further reports on this matter at future meetings and after the two trial meetings referred to above have been held.

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 The Trust's Solicitor comments are;

"Board members have recently been re reminded of the origins, roles and terms of reference of the Statutory Advisory Committee (SAC) and Consultative Committee (CC) The SAC, as a creature of statute (the 1985 Act) can only be subject to change, either as regards membership or functions, by a change in the law. Such change could only be made in a limited way. Paragraph 14 of Schedule 1 of the 1985 Act provides as follows:

"Where it appears to the trustees and to the Advisory Committee expedient for the purpose of assisting the continuation of the Advisory Committee-

(a) to make such amendments to sub paragraphs (a) to (f) of paragraph 2 of this Schedule as appear to be appropriate in the light of any alterations made or to be made in the names or areas of the wards therein mentioned or

(b) to amend the provisions of paragraphs 4 to 13 of this Schedule

then with the approval of the Charity Commission expressed in writing or of the Chancery Division of the High Court expressed by order, they may by resolution of the Trustees and of the Advisory Committee make such amendments."

In respect of the amendments above referred to, those in sub paragraphs (a) to (f) of paragraph 2 are the names of the wards to be represented and those in paragraphs 4 to 13 are essentially constitutional matters.

These provisions could permit changes to membership and constitution.

The Act does not contain any provision for amendment to the functions or terms of reference of the Committee.

If such changes were to be proposed, the Charity Commission might be prepared to permit them by a Charities Act Scheme. This could be a slow process and will almost certainly entail wide public consultation. Details would of course be considered with the Commission in accordance with recommendation 2.5 of the Report."

9.2 The LBH Head of Legal Services was consulted in the preparation of this report.

10 Financial Implications

10.1 It is anticipated that cost of obtaining the necessary legal advice on implementing Model would be contained within the Trust's existing budget allocations.

10.2 The LBH Chief Finance Officer was invited to comment on this report.

11 Use of Appendices/Tables/Photographs

11.1 APP Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee's Working Groups
Report of joint meeting on 14 January 2011
(Previously published in the agenda pack for the Consultative Committee meeting on 8 February 2011).

APPENDIX 1

APP Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee's Working Groups

Report of joint meeting on 14 January 2011 DRAFT 19 JANUARY

Purpose of the meeting:

To review the effectiveness of the Consultative Committee (CC) and the Statutory Advisory Committee (SAC), their working relationship with each other and the Board, and to make recommendations.

Attendance:

SAC Working Group: Denis Heathcote, David Liebeck (chairman) and Cllr Monica Whyte. Apology for absence from Cllr Pauline Gibson.

CC Working Group: Gordon Hutchinson, Jacob O'Callaghan, Colin Marr (chairman), Colin Richell and Nigel Willmott.

Natalie Cole acted as scribe.

Discussion:

The discussion ranged over the origins of the two committees, the meaning of the 1985 Act, the Constitution that defines the role of the Consultative Committee and the Schedule and Constitution relating to the Advisory Committee, and the relative degrees of freedom of each.

There was general agreement that reforms were necessary to improve the effectiveness of how the committees operate. Also, that there was a reluctance to see any closure or further diminution in the roles of the committees. Furthermore, to recognise that the SAC was a statutory body that could not be got rid of.

In considering the effectiveness of the committees it was agreed that the process they were engaged in was important, as was the resolutions they approved, since they were not executive bodies. It would be important to retain the powers to appoint non-voting members to the Board (possibly at an AGM of the Joint Committee and Stakeholders) – in the case of the SAC this means the chairman (as an observer) and for the CC the three members appointed at each annual meeting.

Further discussion centred on the report from the CC's working group and its specific recommendations – see report dated 6 December 2010. The agreements here are summarised in the following section - conclusion and recommendations

Conclusion and recommendations:

1. It was agreed that the parent committees (CC and SAC) and subject to their approval, the Board itself, should be recommended to adopt on a trial basis what is described as "Model 1 – a Joint SAC/ CC". This model comprises:
 - Joint meetings of the combined membership of the existing SAC and CC.
 - Meetings in two parts, the first under an independent chairman (to be determined at the meeting) and the second part (probably shorter) under the chairman of the SAC. This

would allow all members to address agenda items of common interest in the first plenary part, with the SAC chair taking over the second part for SAC members to decide at the end on any resolutions and items for advice to the Board.

- Board members of the CC and the Board chair would be expected to attend and all attendees would be expected to be there for the duration of the meeting, which should be no longer than the current maximum of two hours.
 - Meetings would be held in advance of Board meetings, so as to provide inputs to them and at other times as necessary.
2. The adoption of this model should be done quickly on a trial basis for two meetings to follow those currently scheduled for the SAC on 25 January and the CC on 8 February.
 3. To avoid creating a too large and cumbersome committee more thought needs to be given to limit duplication of membership (e.g. from residents associations) and 'streamlining' the involvement of lessees and some other groups through another form of stakeholder forum. Further consideration needs to be given on how to agree what items are presented to - and excluded from - the agenda of the committees for discussion.
 4. Meetings of the Joint meetings of the two Committees should be time limited as currently to two hours. Time could be conserved by distributing copies of officer's reports in advance of meetings and going straight into discussion of these without the need for detailed presentations.
 5. A further review needs to take place in the light of experience of working with Model 1, or whatever arrangement is adopted after the trial period. Consideration could then be given to what is described by the CC working group as Model 2 - a reconstituted single Statutory Advisory and Consultative Committee (JSACC). It was recognised that this might take a year or so to bring about. More details of this model are given in the CC working group's report dated 6 December 2010.

End. 19 January 2011

David Liebeck and Colin Marr

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda item: 8

Alexandra Palace & Park Board**on 15th February 2011**Report Title: **Regeneration Working Group Update**Report of: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager, Alexandra Palace & Park Charitable Trust****1. Purpose**

- 1.1 To report back on progress made by the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group (APPRWG) since the last report to the Board on this matter on 21 December 2010.
- 1.2 To provide the Board with more details of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study currently being undertaken by Locum (Colliers International).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Board notes the recent and proposed work of the APPRWG as outlined in this report.
- 2.2 That the Board notes the procurement and selection process that resulted in the appointment of Locum to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study.
- 2.3 That the Board requests that the APPRWG provides a synopsis of the Communications Strategy for circulation to members of the Board.
- 2.4 That the Board agrees that the Chair and/or Vice Chair are authorised to speak publicly on behalf of the Board concerning the Regeneration Project.
- 2.5 That Board Members agree to refer any media enquiries to the Chair via the Alexandra Palace normal communications handling agency.
- 2.6 That the Board requests the Chair of the APPRWG (or his nominated representative) to present the findings of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study to the Board's meeting on 28 April 2011.
- 2.7 That the Board instructs the Interim General Manager to inform the Chair of the APPRWG of its resolutions on these matters.

Report Authorised by: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager**

Contact Officer: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager, Alexandra Palace & Park, Alexandra Palace Way, Wood Green N22 7AY Tel No. 020 8365 4340.**

<p>3. Executive Summary</p> <p>3.1 This report updates the Board on progress made by the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group (APPRWG) since the last report to the Board on this matter on 21 December 2010.</p> <p>3.2 This report provides the Board with more details of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study currently being undertaken by Locum (Colliers International) including the procurement and selection process that resulted in the appointment of Locum to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study.</p> <p>3.3 The Communications Strategy for the Regeneration Project is at advanced draft stage and its primary aim is to undertake effective stakeholder engagement, through clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively, manifested in a two-way conversation with a range of stakeholders.</p> <p>3.4 Pending its consideration of the Communications Strategy for the Regeneration Project this report seeks the Board's approval for the Chair/Vice Chair to act as spokespeople on behalf of the Board and for the handling of media enquiries.</p>
<p>4. Reasons for any change in policy or for new policy development (if applicable)</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>5. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</p> <p>5.1 N/A</p>

6. Description

- 6.1 At its meeting on 12 January 2010 the Board resolved to abandon its former strategy to award a long lease to a single developer, with a view to adopting a new Strategy for the regeneration of AP&P.
- 6.2 At its meeting on 6 September 2010 the Board resolved to approve the terms of reference and proposed membership of the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group (APPRWG) and to create that Working Group to oversee and give direction to the design, formulation and adoption of a sustainable regeneration strategy for Alexandra Park and Palace that will include the delivery of a strategic master Plan which will provide an integrated framework for future commercial and development delivery.
- 6.3 At its meeting on 21 December 2010 the Board was informed that that the APPRWG considered it vital that the Board clearly sets out its Vision for AP&P in order to set the parameters for the Master Planning process. This is important because the Vision is a very clear public statement of what the Board of Trustees wants to achieve for AP&P and for whom. The Mission Statement (essentially the Alexandra Park and Palace Act 1985) sets out what is in effect the object of the charity which is the purpose the Board must try to achieve.
- 6.4 The Board was also informed at its meeting on 21 December 2010 that the APPRWG had appointed a sub-group chaired by the Vice Chair of the APPRWG to review the work previously done in this area, including the stakeholder liaison and one-to-one meetings undertaken by Harrison:Fraser as part of the Future Vision Review during 2009 and early 2010.

- 6.5 The sub-group comprised of senior officers from Alexandra Palace and Haringey Council (including the Interim General Manager). It engaged the pro bono support of Harrison; Fraser to ensure that in considering a draft Mission Statement and Vision this work was clearly grounded in the quotes, phrases and aspirations of the stakeholders and Board Members as expressed during the extensive one-to-one interviews held last autumn (2009).
- 6.6 Therefore, both the Mission Statement and the Vision were influenced by feedback from stakeholders and interested parties during the Governance and Future Vision review conducted during late 2009 and 2010 and the Board accordingly approved the proposed Mission Statement and Vision.
- 6.7 The sub-group of the APPRWG was tasked with the next stage in the project plan which was to deliver an Options Analysis and Feasibility Study of Alexandra Palace and Park, which will identify suitable uses for the various parts of the site. The study will inform a subsequent master planning exercise which will in turn assist the Board in determining its future strategy for Alexandra Park and Palace.
- 6.8 The sub-group, assisted by officers from Haringey Council's Planning Regeneration Unit, has met several times to deal with the brief to consultants, the tender process and selection and appointment of the consultants to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study.
- 6.9 The brief to consultants is appended to this report at Appendix 1.
- 6.10 The procurement process was undertaken fully in accordance with Haringey Council's procurement procedures and overseen by the Head of Strategic and Physical Regeneration. Several compliant bids were received and the bid documents were read and evaluated by the members of the sub-group and scored on relevant criteria compared to the Brief.
- 6.11 The tasking of senior officers with such procurement activity (advised by procurement professionals from Haringey Corporate Procurement Unit) is common practice in local government and the work is clearly within the terms of reference of the APPRWG.
- 6.12 The bidders were invited to be interviewed and to give a brief presentation on their approach to the work. The sub-group selected Locum Consulting as the successful bidder and the contract was awarded by Haringey Council as approved by the Director of Urban Environment.
- 6.13 The APPRWG met on 2 February 2011 when it received a presentation by Locum on the methodology of the study. All involved unequivocally understand that that study must meet the requirements of the Vision and that the study will include the park and the Palace buildings.
- 6.14 There are 6 key work stages involved in the study;
- Stage 1 Inception and Review (complete)
 - Stage 2 Site Analysis (complete)
 - Stage 3 Consultation – Internal and External¹
 - Stage 4 Analysis and Viability
 - Stage 5 Draft Report
 - Stage 6 Final Report

¹ Locum will not engage with any external stakeholders, potential operators or funders at this stage without the permission of the APPRWG and/or the Board.

The target date for Stage 5 is 1 April with a view to presenting the final report to the Board at its meeting on 28 April 2011.

6.15 The Communications Strategy for the Regeneration Project is at advanced draft stage and its objectives are to;

- Present the Options & Feasibility Study (within the context of the wider Master Planning process) and its findings in a clear and transparent way
- Minimise misinformation, speculation and myth
- Present regeneration in a positive way, emphasising its economic benefits

6.16 Key to all of the above objectives is the imperative for clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively, manifested in a two-way conversation with stakeholders.

6.17 The Board will be provided with the final draft of the Communications Strategy and meanwhile it is asked to note that it will be asked to approve that the Chair and/or Vice Chair are the key spokespeople who will front all key meetings and speak for the Board to the media. Board members are also asked not to comment directly to the media but to refer all enquires to the Chair via the Alexandra Palace PR agency.

6.18 The Board will receive further reports on the Regeneration project at future meetings and at its meeting on 28 April 2011 it will receive a report and a presentation on the findings of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study.

7 Consultation

7.1 The APPRWG recognises that it will need to communicate to stakeholders and interested parties what it is doing and the Communications Strategy outlined above is designed to ensure that there is a two-way conversation with stakeholders underpinned by clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively.

7.2 Locum will be engaging with selected stakeholders as part of their work on the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study and letters will be sent within 48 hours of this Board meeting to invite Trustees and Stakeholders to consultation workshops.

8 Recommendations

8.1 That the Board notes the recent and proposed work of the APPRWG as outlined in this report.

8.2 That the Board notes the procurement and selection process that resulted in the appointment of Locum to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study.

8.3 That the Board requests that the APPRWG provides a synopsis of the Communications Strategy for circulation to members of the Board.

8.4 That the Board agrees that the Chair and/or Vice Chair are authorised to speak publicly on behalf of the Board concerning the Regeneration Project.

8.5 That Board Members agree to refer any media enquiries to the Chair via the Alexandra Palace normal communications handling agency.

- 8.6 That the Board requests the Chair of the APPRWG (or his nominated representative) to present the findings of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study to the Board's meeting on 28 April 2011.
- 8.7 That the Board instructs the Interim General Manager to inform the Chair of the APPRWG of its resolutions on these matters.

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 The Trust solicitor's comments have been taken into account in preparation of this report.
- 9.2 The LBH Head of Legal Services was invited to comment on this report.

10 Financial Implications

- 10.1 The cost of the Options Appraisal Feasibility Study will not impact on the Trust's directly controlled budget.
- 10.2 The LBH Chief Finance Officer commented as follows; "The cost of this work is being covered by the sum allocated by the council for masterplanning work"

11 Use of Appendices/Tables/Photographs

- 11.1 Brief for an Options Analysis and Feasibility Study for Alexandra Park and Palace (Brief to consultants).

This page is intentionally left blank



Brief for an Options Analysis and Feasibility Study for Alexandra Park and Palace

Background

Alexandra Park & Palace is an iconic, cultural and leisure destination for domestic and international visitors. Its' rich historic background and unique setting have resulted in both the palace and grounds being protected by heritage listings and parliamentary acts, preserving the status of this important Haringey and London landmark.

Haringey Council currently provides an annual funding packaging of over £2 million revenue support to the Trust which operates the venue on its behalf. Additionally, around £0.5m p.a. is raised by the Trust's trading arm (Alexandra Palace Trading Limited) through commercial activity within the Palace. It is estimated that the annual maintenance costs for the building (if 100% operational) are approximately £4 million per annum. APTL trades within c. 50% of available space.

The Palace is in a poor state of disrepair and it is estimated that within 12 to 24 months major infrastructural failings will occur to the fabric of the building. This will have a further detrimental impact on the cultural, commercial and community activities that take place within the building and grounds.

At present approximately 50% of the available space within the Palace building itself is in use. The remaining areas including the Theatre, basement area and former BBC studios are either underused, derelict, or in need of significant investment in order to bring them back into a usable condition.

By identifying suitable uses for the various parts of the demise, this study will inform a subsequent Masterplanning exercise.

The budget available for this work is between £30,000- and £35,000

1. Roles and Responsibilities

The **mission** statement for Alexandra Palace is

"To uphold, maintain and repair the Palace and to maintain the said Park and Palace as a place of public resort and recreation and for other public purposes" Alexandra Park and Palace (Public Purposes) Act 1900

The recently adopted **vision** for its future is:

"To regenerate Alexandra Palace and Park, in the pioneering spirit of our founders, creating a proud, iconic London destination with global appeal - a successful, valuable and sustainable asset for all, including the local community and stakeholders."

The options appraisal and feasibility must therefore recognise and work to and within the purpose ascribed to the trustees and within the spirit of the vision whilst also outlining viable and credible usage/content options that address the following:

- customer demand
- brand alignment and recognition
- sustainable commercial viability
- heritage and iconic building and park status

Any options developed must remain within the physical constraints of the site, the various Acts of Parliament that determine its use and, any relevant planning policies that apply to the overall site. The various options must demonstrate a synergy that will allow the multiple uses of the demise to 'feed off' each other from a customer appeal and commercial point of view.

A number of studies have previously been undertaken on the site and will be made available to inform the project - this includes a recent assessment by The Princes Regeneration Trust of previously developed models.

The final report must be a set of clear options for the various demise areas that demonstrate a mix and scale of robust and feasible uses for the site that conform to the above criteria. Additionally proposals must assess the capital costs, development timeframes and potential 'developers' or content providers that could be potential future partners. The detail should be sufficient enough to produce a 'sales document' to enable Alexandra Palace to approach potential funders and developer/operators.

The report must include and be informed by a consultation with key stakeholders, including Haringey Council and the Trust, and refer to any relevant precedents.

The work must conclude with recommendations on:

- existing and future site usage
- product mix
- tenant mix
- socio-economic and commercial implications

2. Knowledge and Skills Required

- Demonstrable understanding and extensive experience of delivering high level options appraisals and commercial viability studies for high profile iconic sites.
- Excellent understanding of heritage assets and the related constraints and opportunities of such buildings.
- Critical understanding of linkages between brand values, public perception, commercial viability and public assets.



- Significant experience of undertaking public consultation and working with local communities and stakeholders from all backgrounds
- Experience of undertaking projects in both the public and private sector with a demonstrable understanding of the leisure and tourism sector
- Co-operative approach to working and ability to work as part of a team.
- High level writing and presentation skills.

4. Procurement process

You must include with your returns a statement on the EU procurement process that maybe required and any implications this may have.

5. Scope of work

Submitted tenders must account for and include the key elements of work listed below. The scope of work should also be clearly reflected in the pricing matrix along with written responses to the quality method statement.

Key work elements

- Review of related (existing) information including studies and recent reviews. Familiarisation of related policy frameworks, legislation and local strategies.
- Site inspection, review and analysis of Palace and Park. This should include commercial assessment of existing uses, suitability of location within the site footprint and potential financial cost of redundant areas.
- Key stakeholder consultation (local group and key Haringey officers)
- Market research, commercial viability analysis, socio economic implication and sustainable suitability of commercial options to include potential income yields.
- Draft report with illustrations analysis of initial options on commercial uses and tenant mixes together with an initial proposal of potential partner/developers for commercial opportunities presented.
- Agreed final report and presentations to client group.

6. Outline Timeframe

- Work is intended to commence on notification of award of contract
- First draft to be delivered by 14 March 2011
- Final draft to be delivered by 1 April 2011

7. Information required

- Company name, contact name and full contact details.
- A method statement of addressing the criteria below.
- A list of the project team and CV's.



- A timetable for delivery of this contract, including key milestones of no more than 2 pages. This should include details of individuals working on the project and associated tasks.
- A statement of knowledge and skills of no more than 2 pages referring to recent projects delivered and related examples
- Names and contact details of 3 referees.
- A statement of cost to deliver the contract, including a completed pricing matrix.

The submission (including method statements) should not exceed 12 pages.

8. Further information

- The employer has assessed the balance between price and quality. For the purposes of this evaluation the weighting of the main criteria will be
 - Quality 60%
 - Price 40%
- The tenderer with the lowest submitted total price will receive the maximum price score of 40%. Prices of the other Tenderers will be score based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest submitted total price}}{\text{Tenderer's submitted total price}} \times 40\%$$

9. Method Statement

The table below sets out the main criteria for assessing submitted bids with the associated weighting. Bids will be assessed on the basis of an 80% and 20% split – 80% allocated to tenders submitted and 20% for interviews (from those that are short listed).

Criteria	Weighting -
Please state how you will undertake the stakeholder consultation/workshops and the methods you will use to collate relevant information	25%
Please state your approach and methodology to undertaking commercial viability analysis and how you will assess suitability and economic sustainability.	25%
Knowledge & Skills statement	20%
List of project team & CVs	10%

Questions of clarification can only be put in writing on the attached query sheet and emailed to:



mark.hopson@haringey.gov.uk

The last day for queries will be on the 10th December 2010.

The closing date for bids is noon on Thursday 16th December.

Shortlisting will take place on the afternoon of **Friday 17 December**.

Short listed bidders will be invited to present and interview on **Tuesday 4 January 2011** at Alexandra Palace with Members from the Regeneration Working Group.

The winning bidder will be notified by close of play on **6 January 2011** to commence the delivery of work to the timescales indicated above.

The appointed Agency will be expected to present their final reports and findings to the Alexandra Palace Regeneration Working Group shortly after the deadline for the delivery of the final draft.

The successful agency chosen for the contract will be required to sign off any necessary confidentiality agreements and agree that all intellectual property rights in relation to the work will belong to the London Borough of Haringey.

Any award will be subject to financial, insurance and health & safety checks by Haringey Council.

