



Haringey Council

NOTICE OF MEETING

ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 2010 AT 19:30HRS – THE PANORAMA ROOM,
ALEXANDRA PALACE, PALACE WAY, WOOD GREEN, LONDON N22.

MEMBERS: Councillors Egan (Chair), Hare, Peacock, Scott, Stewart, Strickland (Vice-Chair) and Williams

NOMINATED MEMBERS:

Alexandra Palace Amateur Ice Skating Club	Mr M. Tarpey
Alexandra Palace Allotments Association	Mr C. Mahoney
Alexandra Palace Angling Association	Mr K. Pestell
Alexandra Palace Organ Appeal	Mr R. Tucker
Alexandra Palace Television Group	Mr J. Thompson
Alexandra Residents' Association	Ms C. Hayter
Alexandra Palace Garden Centre	Mr S. Hopking
Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Mr C. Marr
Bounds Green and District Residents' Association	Mr K. Ranson
CUFOS	Mr J. Smith
Friends of Alexandra Park	Mr G. Hutchinson
Friends of the Alexandra Palace Theatre	Mr N. Willmott
Hornsey Historical Society	Mr J. O'Callaghan
Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association	Ms D Feeney
Muswell Hill Metro Group	Mr J. Boshier
New River Action Group	Miss R. Macdonald
Palace View Residents' Association	Ms V. Paley
The Grove Café	Mrs C. Amoruso
Vitrine Ltd - The Lakeside Café	Mr A. Yener
Warner Estate Residents' Association	Prof. R. Hudson

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. MEMBERSHIP

To note the Consultative Committee membership of the following Alexandra Palace and Park leaseholders:

- i. **CUFOS** (represented by Mr James Smith)
- ii. **The Grove Café** (represented by Mrs Carol Amoruso)
- iii. **Vitrine Ltd - The Lakeside Café** (represented by Mr Ahmet Yener)

The Alexandra Palace and Park Board approved the above groups' applications for membership at its meeting on 14th October 2010.

3. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee are invited to disclose any interest they may have in any of the items appearing on this agenda.

5. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 36)

- i) To approve the draft minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee held on 14th September 2010 (attached).
- ii) To note the minutes of the Advisory Committee held on 7th September 2010 (attached).
- iii) To note the draft minutes of the meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 6th September (attached) and 14th October (tabled).

6. ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD

Members of the Board to report back to the Committee on any relevant matters.

7. PRESENTATIONS BY INTERESTED GROUPS

To receive presentations by the following interested groups on the Committee:

- i. New River Action Group – Rachael MacDonald **(to follow)**
- ii. Hornsey Historical Society – Jacob Callaghan **(to follow)**

8. FORTHCOMING EVENTS (PAGES 37 - 40)

To receive the report of the Managing Director, Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) advising the Consultative Committee on forthcoming events to the end of the financial year.

9. GENERAL REPORT ON PALACE BUILDING (PAGES 41 - 52)

To note the update on the external fabric condition of Alexandra Palace.

10. MATTERS RAISED BY INTERESTED GROUPS

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Tuesday 8th February 2011
Tuesday 12th April 2011

Ken Pryor
Deputy Head of Local Democracy and
Member Services
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Natalie Cole
Committee Co-ordinator
Tel: 020-8489 2919
Fax: 020-8489 2660
E-mail: Natalie.cole@haringey.gov.uk

Monday 8th November 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

UNRESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE - TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010

Nominated Members:

Alexandra Palace Amateur Ice Skating Club		Mr. M. Tarpey
Alexandra Palace Allotments Association		Mr C. Mahony
Alexandra Palace Angling Association	*	Mr. K. Pestell
Alexandra Palace Garden Centre	*	Mr. S. Hopking
Alexandra Palace Organ Appeal	*	Mr R Tucker
Alexandra Palace Television Society	*	Mr J. Thompson
Alexandra Residents' Association	*	Ms. C. Hayter
Bounds Green and District Residents' Association		Mr K. Ranson
Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	*	Mr C. Marr
Friends of Alexandra Park	*	Mr G. Hutchinson
Friends of the Alexandra Palace Theatre	*	Mr. N. Willmott
Hornsey Historical Society	*	Mr.J.O'Callaghan
Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association	*	Ms D. Feeney
Muswell Hill Metro Group	*	Mr J. Boshier
New River Action Group	*	Miss R. MacDonald
Palace View Residents' Association	*	Ms V. Paley
Warner Estate Residents' Association	*	Prof. R. Hudson

Appointed Members:

*Councillor P. Egan (Chair)
 Councillor B. Hare
 Councillor S. Peacock
 *Councillor N. Scott
 Councillor J. Stewart
 *Councillor A. Strickland
 Councillor N. Williams

*Members present.

Also In Attendance:

Andrew Gill – General Manager, Alexandra Palace
 Mark Evison - Park Manager, Alexandra Palace
 Rebecca Kane - Managing Director, Alexandra Park Trading Company (APTL)
 Simon Fell – Events Manager APTL
 Ian Holt - London Borough of Haringey Nature Conservation Officer
 Natalie Cole - London Borough of Haringey Clerk
 Colin Richell – Friends of the Alexandra Palace Theatre
 And 6 members of the public/press

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
APCC12.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
	Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bob Hare and James Stewart and James Smith (CUFOS (observer)). An apology for lateness was received from Rebecca Kane, Managing Director Alexandra Palace Trading Company (APTL).	

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

<p>APCC13.</p>	<p>WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p>The Chair invited attendees to introduce themselves.</p>
<p>APCC14.</p>	<p>MEMBERSHIP</p> <p>The Committee noted the membership of Stuart Hopkins, Capital Gardens Ltd to the Consultative Committee.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the Committee that Alexandra Palace and Park leaseholders were entitled to be represented on the Consultative Committee.</p>
<p>APCC15.</p>	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Stuart Hopkins declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 7, Planning Proposal by Capital Gardens Ltd, as he was the Capital Garden's Ltd leaseholder and a member of the Consultative Committee. He remained to answer the Committee's questions and left the room during deliberations.</p> <p>Councillor Scott declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 10 – Update on the provision of a track betting licence for the Ladbrokes World Darts Championships at Alexandra Palace, as he was a member of Haringey's Licensing Committee; he left the room during consideration of this item.</p>
<p>APCC16.</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>i) <u>Consultative Committee – 22nd June 2010</u></p> <p><u>APCC06</u> (page 4 of Agenda Pack) “uk” would be removed from the reference to the Friends of Alexandra Park website www.friendsofalexandrapark.org .</p> <p><u>APCC07</u> The last sentence in the third paragraph would be amended to read: “One member expressed the need for flexibility and sensitivity to users of the Park and the Little Dinosaurs facility but the general consensus of the Committee was in support of enforcement action.”</p> <p>RESOLVED that subject to the amendments above the minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee held on 22nd June 2010 we agreed.</p> <p>ii) <u>Advisory Committee meeting - 8th June 2010</u></p> <p>RESOLVED to note the minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting held on 8th June 2010.</p> <p>iii) <u>Alexandra Palace and Park Board - 7th June & 29th June 2010</u></p> <p><u>29th June minutes:</u> Jacob O'Callaghan (Hornsey Historical Society) expressed disappointment that the terms of reference of the Master Planning Working Group mentioned in</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>APB27 (resolution v.) had not been subject to any consultation with the Committee.</p> <p>RESOLVED to note the draft minutes of the meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 7th June and 29th June 2010.</p>
<p>APCC17.</p>	<p>PRESENTATIONS BY INTERESTED GROUPS</p> <p>i. <u>Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association (MHFGA)</u></p> <p>The Committee received the presentation from Denise Feeney, member of and webmaster for the MHFGA Residents' Association. The Association met 6 times each year and produced regular newsletters for its members including events at the Alexandra Palace and Park, local news and comments and planning matters.</p> <p>The Association's new website was: www.mhfga.1to1.org</p> <p>In response to a Committee Member's question about late night concerts being held at the Palace, Ms Feeney stated that in the past there had been isolated incidents where Association members have complained that the events were too noisy, however, more recently events have been well managed.</p> <p>ii. <u>Friends of Alexandra Palace Theatre</u></p> <p>The Committee received the presentation from Nigel Willmott of Friends of Alexandra Park Theatre and noted the challenge of restoring the theatre to regular use. The Friends of the Theatre group was waiting to meet with English Heritage to discuss the future of the theatre.</p> <p>In response to questioning it was noted that future use of the theatre could be mixed. English Heritage contacts were keen to restore the stage and scenery and use the space as a theatre and the auditorium had been used by the Trading Company for a number of events and could be further utilised for educational and community activities. It was recognised that with improved technology there were many possibilities for the use of the theatre.</p> <p>In response to a Member's questioning, the General Manager – Alexandra Palace explained that whilst there was no formal process for interested groups to feed into the development of the Palace, he planned to meet with individual groups to ascertain their objectives for the Palace in order to feed into the Regeneration Working Group. It was noted that a Member of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board of Trustees was also a Member of the Friends group and so there was a formal link to the Board.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Ms Feeney and Mr Willmott for their presentations.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

<p>APCC18.</p>	<p>PLANNING PROPOSAL BY CAPITAL GARDENS LTD</p> <p>Stuart Hopkins declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he was the Capital Garden's Ltd leaseholder and a member of the Consultative Committee. He remained to answer the Committee's questions and left the room during deliberations.</p> <p>The Committee received the report on proposals for developments to the Garden Centre Ltd (and tabled photographs and two architects drawings, which were to scale and showed the boundaries and dimensions) including converting old sheds into a retail area and constructing a pergola to shelter bedding plants. It was noted that previous plans to remove the existing Alder tree would no longer go ahead and the tree would remain.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns that the development did not grow in boundary and height at later stages of the planning application and that the information presented was vague.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that members of the Consultative Committee emailed further comments on the proposals directly to the Park Manager and the General Manager reminded members that comments could also be made during the public consultation which takes place as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the report be noted and the proposals supported in principle. ii. That the Committee's concerns about the height, materials used, colour and character of the development be considered when the final application was submitted for planning permission. iii. That the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee. <p><i>Clerk's note: Stuart Hopkins returned to the meeting room.</i></p>
<p>APCC19.</p>	<p>PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE A LOCAL NATURE RESERVE</p> <p>The Committee received the report consulting on the initial proposal for Alexandra Park to be declared as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Committee members raised concerns as to whether LNR status would affect events held in the Park and noted that it was not necessary to declare the entire Park as a LNR.</p> <p>In response to its questions about the implications of the proposals the Committee noted that the Park already met the criteria for LNR status which required demonstrating a commitment about how the Park will be managed and conserved (contained in the Park's management plan). Benefits of the proposals could be access to additional funding from national bodies.</p> <p>The Committee noted the Park Manager's comments including that as the Park had already reached a similar level of management to what was required there</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>would not be a great difference if LNR status was achieved. The Park, however, would be better protected under Unitary Development Policy (policies used to make decisions on planning and other applications).</p> <p>Some Committee members stated that LNR status may make the Park a more attractive visitor attraction and many activities in the Park already supported the potential LNR status.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the proposals to designate sections of Alexandra Park as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) be supported. ii. That the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee particularly in relation to inappropriate designation of LNR status for the entire park, which could affect events being held in the Park.
APCC20.	<p>REVIEW OF ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE BYELAWS</p> <p>The Committee received the report of the Park Manager recommending that the Alexandra Park and Palace byelaws be reviewed.</p> <p>Two Committee Members suggested that with current important projects taking place within the Park and Palace (such as the governance review) this was not the right time for a review of byelaws. The General Manager highlighted that the process of reviewing the byelaws was not time consuming itself but the process of adopting them (and getting Secretary of State approval) may take some years to complete. The Committee noted issues such as bar-b-qs and filming and photography were prohibited under current byelaws and that the Park and Palace security contractors were tasked with enforcing the byelaws, therefore the review was relevant.</p> <p>Other members of the Committee supported the review of the byelaws and the Chair suggested that further comments by Committee Members be emailed to the Park Manager.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be noted and the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee.</p>
APCC21.	<p>PROPOSED VARIATION TO ALEXANDRA PALACE TRADING LIMITED BETTING (TRACK) PREMISES LICENSE</p> <p>Councillor Scott declared a prejudicial interest in this item as he was a member of Haringey's Licensing Committee; he left the room during consideration of this item.</p> <p>The Committee received the report updating on the intention of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) to move the existing track betting licence from the Panorama Room to the Great Hall for the World Darts Championships between 16th December 2010 and 3rd January 2011.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>In response to Committee members' comments officers explained that there were measures in place to deal with any maintenance issues in the Great Hall ceiling; the West Hall would still be used for the actual matches ; beer supplies usually stored in the Panorama Room would be kept in the Great Hall vicinity under the new proposal which keeps the area outside the Phoenix bar clear.</p> <p>Two Committee Members highlighted the controversial nature of the charity obtaining the original betting licence as well as concerns that part of the Palace would be closed to visitors over the Christmas period. Officers confirmed that similar restrictions to accessing the betting area would remain in force as in previous years.</p> <p>Colin Marr (Alexandra Palace and Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee) commented that although having the World Darts Championship at the Palace was good news and recognised the need to publicise the event itself, but suggested that Ladbrokes be asked to tone down their own banners and corporate advertising that in the past had been too prominent around the Palace over the Christmas period.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be noted and the comments of the Consultative Committee (above) be noted by the Alexandra Palace and Park Board.</p> <p><i>Clerk's note: Councillor Scott returned to the meeting.</i></p>
<p>APCC22.</p>	<p>FORTHCOMING EVENTS</p> <p>The Committee received the Forthcoming Events report, introduced by Rebecca Kane, Managing Director – APTL, who highlighted that the “Secret Cinema” event had been very successful and that 4 concerts had been confirmed for the forthcoming year. Most of the events had been confirmed and other future events including weddings were also booked.</p> <p>The Committee was informed that the YMCA would be erecting a small temporary marquee in Redston Field for the Y-Toddle Event on 26th September 2010.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Forthcoming Events report be noted.</p>
<p>APCC23.</p>	<p>GOVERNANCE AND FUTURE VISION</p> <p>The Managing Director of APTL provided a verbal update on the reports presented to the Board of Trustees (on 6th September) on the Alexandra Palace and Park Governance and Future Vision, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That, to strive for eventual financial independence, the focus of the Palace in the short term should be on fund raising (APPCT), regeneration (Working Group) and improving commercial income (APTL). • The Board agreed to adopt the ‘interim model’ and work towards the ultimate model of independence. This would include the recruitment of independent advisors to the Board, which would require approval by Haringey’s Full Council. • The Regeneration Working Group, to consider the master plan for Alexandra Palace and Park, would meet in October and a process would

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>be put in place to maintain a dialogue with Stakeholders. It was noted that if members did not get the opportunity to feed into the Stakeholders Focus Group held in August 2010 their views could still be submitted to the General Manager - Alexandra Palace.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the update be noted.</p>
<p>APCC24.</p>	<p>JOINT MEETING OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK & PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE</p> <p>The Committee was invited to consider a joint meeting with the Statutory Advisory Committee to discuss how both committees would work in the future.</p> <p>The Chair reported that Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee had agreed to conduct a review into the effectiveness of its own role and would then consider how it should link in with the Consultative Committee. It was noted that the Advisory Committee was a statutory committee and would require an act of parliament in order to amend its remit.</p> <p>Committee Members highlighted: that membership of the Statutory Advisory Committee could be widened by the application of a Charity Commission scheme; that, whilst it was recognised that the duplication of committee meetings was inefficient, there would still be a requirement to divide the considerations of the Advisory Committee and the Consultative Committee if they were to join in future.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Consultative Committee wait until the Advisory Committee had conducted the review of its own role; Consultative Committee members would welcome the opportunity to informally feed into this review. Once feedback from the Advisory Committee review is available either a joint meeting could be held to consider the matter further or the Consultative Committee can discuss it independently at a future meeting. Meanwhile it should be noted that the Consultative Committee would not attempt to impose on the role of the Statutory Advisory Committee. It was recognised that a joint meeting would be quite large.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Consultative Committee consider the issue further once feedback from the Statutory Advisory Committee on the review of its remit was received.</p>
<p>APCC25.</p>	<p>MATTERS RAISED BY INTERESTED GROUPS</p> <p>The Committee received proposals (pages 73 – 76 of the agenda pack), presented by Mr Clive Carter, Local resident, for the Alexandra Palace and Park Board to apply for UNESCO World Heritage Site recognition.</p> <p>The Chair and other members thanked Mr Carter for the time he had spent on drafting the proposals.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the amount of officer time that would need to be</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>dedicated to such a project.</p> <p>The General Manager – Alexandra Palace advised that the application would take years of officer dedicated time (assuming the building was in a good state of repair) and could even be refused, which might impact the Palace’s reputation.</p> <p>The Managing Director – Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) reported that another known site had spent 20 years applying for UNESCO World Heritage Site recognition, which had been deferred for the second time despite its buildings being in a better state of repair than Alexandra Palace. She stated that whilst the Palace was worthy of such status there was no proof that it would generate additional funding or visitors to the Palace and Park and there might be more efficient ways to bring the Palace worldwide recognition.</p> <p>Committee members suggested the establishment of a Heritage Working Group. The General Manager of Alexandra Palace emphasised that this would require servicing by officers and such resources were not available due to other priorities such as repairs to the Palace buildings.</p> <p>RESOLVED that Mr Carter be encouraged to build support for the proposal for the Alexandra Park and Palace Trust Board to apply for UNESCO World Heritage Site recognition.</p>
<p>APCC26.</p>	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>APCC27.</p>	<p>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>The dates for future meetings were noted:</p> <p>Tuesday 8th February 2011 Tuesday 12th April 2011</p>

The meeting ended at 22:00 hrs

COUNCILLOR PAT EGAN

Chair

ATTACHMENT B

ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE DRAWN FROM ITS MEETING ON

14th SEPTEMBER 2010

PRESENTED TO THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD MEETING ON 14th OCTOBER 2010
COMPLETED WITH THE BOARD'S ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION AND REASONS WHY AS APPROPRIATE

	Advice and Recommendations	Comments
1.	<p>Agenda Item 4 – Minutes</p> <p>i) <u>Consultative Committee minutes - 22nd June 2010</u></p> <p>RESOLVED that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.</p> <p>ii) <u>Draft Advisory Committee minutes - 8th June 2010</u></p> <p>RESOLVED that the minutes be noted.</p> <p>iii) <u>Draft Alexandra Palace and Park Board - 7th June and 29th June 2010</u></p> <p><u>29th June Board minutes:</u> Jacob O'Callaghan (Hornsey Historical Society) expressed disappointment that the terms of reference of the Master Planning Working Group mentioned in APB27 (resolution v.) had not been subject to any consultation with the Committee.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the minutes be noted.</p>	<p>Noted by the Board</p>
2.	<p>Agenda Item 7 – Planning Proposal by Capital Gardens Ltd</p> <p>Stuart Hopkins declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as he was the Capital Garden's Ltd leaseholder and a member of the Consultative Committee. He remained to answer the Committee's questions and left the room during deliberations.</p>	<p>Noted by the Board</p>

<p>The Committee received the report (Attachment 1) on proposals for developments to the Garden Centre Ltd including converting old sheds into a retail area and constructing a pergola to shelter bedding plants. It was noted that previous plans to remove the existing Alder tree would no longer go ahead and the tree would remain.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns that the development did not grow in boundary and height at later stages of the planning application and that the information presented was vague.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that members of the Consultative Committee email further comments on the proposals directly to the Park Manager and the General Manager reminded members that comments could also be made during the public consultation which takes place as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the report be noted and the proposals supported in principle. ii. That the Committee's concerns about the height, materials used, colour and character of the development be considered when the final application was submitted for planning permission. iii. That the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee (above). 	<p>Noted by the Board</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8 – Local Nature Reserve Proposal</p> <p>The Committee received the report (Attachment 2) on the proposals for Alexandra Park to be declared as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Committee members raised concerns as to whether LNR status would affect events held in the Park and noted that it was not necessary to declare the entire Park as a LNR.</p> <p>In response to its questions about the implications of the proposals the Committee noted that the Park already met the criteria for LNR status which required demonstrating a commitment about how the Park will be managed and conserved (contained in the Park's management plan).</p>

	<p>Benefits of the proposals would be access to additional funding from national bodies.</p> <p>Some Committee members stated that LNR status may make the Park a more attractive visitor attraction and many activities in the Park already support the potential LNR status.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the proposals to designate sections of Alexandra Park as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) be supported. ii. That the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee particularly in relation to inappropriate designation of LNR status for the entire park, which could affect events being held in the Park. 	
4	<p>Agenda item 9 – Park and Palace Byelaws</p> <p>The Committee received the report (Attachment 3) of the Park Manager recommending that the Alexandra Park and Palace byelaws be reviewed.</p> <p>Two Committee Members suggested that with current important projects taking place within the Park and Palace (such as the governance review) this was not the right time for a review of byelaws. The General Manager highlighted that the process of reviewing the byelaws was not time consuming itself but the process of adopting them (and getting Secretary of State approval) may take some years to complete. The Committee noted issues such as bar-b-qs and filming and photography were prohibited under current byelaws and that the Park and Palace security contractors were tasked with enforcing the byelaws, therefore the review was relevant.</p> <p>Other members of the Committee supported the review of the byelaws and the Chair suggested that further comments by Committee Members be emailed to the Park Manager.</p>	Noted by the Board Page 11

	<p>RESOLVED that the report be noted and the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be asked to note the comments of the Consultative Committee (above).</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Agenda Item 10 – Update on the provision of a track betting licence for the Ladbrokes World Darts Championships at Alexandra Palace</p> <p>Councillor Scott declared a prejudicial interest in this item as he was a member of Haringey’s Licensing Committee; he left the room during consideration of this item.</p> <p>The Committee received the report (Attachment 4) updating on the intention of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) to move the existing track betting licence from the Panorama Room to the Great Hall for the World Darts Championships between 16th December 2010 and 3rd January 2011.</p> <p>In response to Committee members comments officers explained that there were measures in place to deal with any leaks in the Great Hall ceiling if it rained and that the Panorama Room (where the betting activity was usually conducted) also had similar issues when it rained; the Great Hall could not be used for the darts match (rather than the West Hall) as it was not easily blacked-out; beer supplies usually stored in the Panorama Room would be kept in the VIP area under the new proposal.</p> <p>Two Committee Members highlighted the controversial nature of the charity obtaining the original betting licence as well as concerns that part of the Palace would be closed to visitors over the Christmas period. Officers confirmed that a contained area at the bottom of the west corridor would be enforced and the licence used for only three weeks in the year.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be noted and the comments of the Consultative Committee (above) be noted by the Alexandra Palace and Park Board.</p>	<p>Noted by the Board</p>

	<p><i>Clerk's note: Councillor Scott returned to the meeting.</i></p> <p>Agenda Item 14 – Matters raised by Interested Groups</p> <p>The Committee received a proposal from local resident, Clive Carter, for the Alexandra Park and Palace Trust Board to apply for UNESCO World Heritage Site recognition. (Attachment 5)</p> <p>The General Manager – Alexandra Palace advised that the application for UNESCO World Heritage would take years of officer dedicated time (assuming the building was in a good state of repair) and could even be refused, which might impact the Palace's reputation. The Managing Director – Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTl) stated that whilst the Palace was worthy of such status there was no proof that it would generate additional funding or visitors to the Palace and Park and there might be more efficient ways to bring the Palace worldwide recognition.</p> <p>RESOLVED that Mr Carter be encouraged to build support for the proposal for the Alexandra Park and Palace Trust Board to apply for UNESCO World Heritage Site recognition.</p>	
6		Noted by the Board
		Page 13

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

PRESENT: * denotes attendee

NOMINATED BY LOCAL RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS

*Mrs J. Hutchinson	:	Alexandra Residents' Association
*Mr K. Ranson	:	Bounds Green and District Residents' Association
*Mr D. Heathcote	:	Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association
*Ms J. Baker	:	Palace Gates Residents' Association
*Ms L. Richardson	:	Palace View Residents' Association
*Mr. D. Frith	:	The Rookfield Association
*Mr. D. Liebeck	:	Warner Estate Residents' Association
		1 vacancy

APPOINTED MEMBERS

*Councillor D. Beacham	:	Alexandra Ward
*Councillor J. Christophides	:	Bounds Green Ward
Councillor M Davies	:	Fortis Green Ward
*Councillor M. Whyte	:	Hornsey Ward
*Councillor J. Jenks	:	Muswell Hill Ward
*Councillor P. Gibson	:	Noel Park Ward
Councillor J. Ejiofor	:	Council Wide appointment
*Councillor R. Watson	:	Council Wide appointment

Also in attendance:

Mr Andrew Gill – Interim General Manager – Alexandra Palace
 Mr Mark Evison – Park Manager – Alexandra Palace
 Ms Rebecca Kane – Managing Director, Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL)
 Mr Stephen Garner – HEAD OF Events & Leisure (APTL)
 Mr Ian Holt – London Borough of Haringey – Nature Reserve Officer
 Mrs Natalie Cole – Clerk to the Committee

Public Gallery:

Councillor Pat Egan – Chair of the Alexandra Park & Palace Consultative Committee and Alexandra Palace and Park Board
 Councillor Bob Hare – Member of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board
 3 members of the press & public

**MINUTE
NO.**

SUBJECT/DECISION

APSC14.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
	An apology for absence was received from Councillor Matt Davies and apologies for lateness were received from Liz Richardson (Palace View Residents Association) and Councillor Richard Watson.

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

<p>APSC15.</p>	<p>MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE</p> <p>i. <u>Resignation of Monica Myers</u></p> <p>The resignation of Monica Myers, Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association, was noted and members recognised and thanked Ms Myers for the many years of service that she had dedicated to the Statutory Advisory Committee.</p> <p>ii. <u>Residents Association Vacancy on the Advisory Committee</u></p> <p>The Chair proposed that Harry Aspden, Warner Estate Residents' Association, be invited to fill the Residents Association vacancy.</p> <p>RESOLVED that Harry Aspden, Warner Estate Residents' Association be nominated to fill the Advisory Committee vacancy.</p>
<p>APSC16.</p>	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>i. Councillors Beacham and Christophides declared prejudicial interests in item 5, Planning Proposal by Capital Gardens Ltd, as they were members of Haringey's Planning Committee and left the meeting room during discussion of this item.</p> <p>ii. Councillor Jenks declared a personal interest as he was a Member of the Warner Estates Residents' Association.</p>
<p>APSC17.</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>i) <u>Advisory Committee - 8th June 2010</u></p> <p><u>Minute APSC09 – Forthcoming events</u></p> <p>The Committee asked for an update on the ice-rink and it was noted that work on the permanent ice rink had been delayed due to a greater extent of permafrost than originally anticipated. Additional funding was required from L.B. Haringey through prudential borrowing. The work would be complete in December 2010 and the ice-rink was scheduled to re-open on 4th January 2011.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the minutes of the Advisory Committee held on 8th June 2010 be agreed as an accurate recorded of the meeting.</p> <p>ii) <u>Consultative Committee - 22nd June 2010</u></p> <p><u>APCC09 – Matters Raised By Interested Groups: Alexander Palace Building</u></p> <p>The General Manager reported that a structural survey of the east wing of the Palace had been commissioned. The results, expected on 16th September, would give an idea of the work required to bring the exterior in to good order.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the draft minutes of the Consultative Committee held on 22nd June 2010 be noted.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>iii) <u>Alexandra Palace and Park Board - 7th June & 29th June 2010</u></p> <p><u>29th June 2010 – APBO29 – Fireworks Event 2009</u> The Chair drew the Board's attention to the fact that the Firework Event on 6th November 2010 had been cancelled due to lack of funds.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the draft minutes of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board meetings held on 7th June & 29th June 2010 be noted.</p>
<p>APSC18.</p>	<p>PLANNING PROPOSAL BY CAPITAL GARDENS LTD</p> <p>Councillors Beacham and Christophides declared prejudicial interests as they were members of Haringey's Planning Committee and left the meeting room during discussion of this item.</p> <p>The Committee received proposals for the development of the Garden Centre including converting old sheds into a retail area and constructing a pergola to shelter bedding plants.</p> <p>Committee Members expressed concerns about the extension and the loss of a tree and requested clearer drawings including a site plan showing elevations and more detail particularly about the scale of the proposals.</p> <p>RESOLVED that further consideration of this the planning proposal by Capital Gardens Ltd be deferred until the next meeting of the Advisory Committee on 2nd November 2010.</p> <p><i>Clerk's note: Councillors Beacham and Christophides returned to the meeting room.</i></p>
<p>APSC19.</p>	<p>PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE A LOCAL NATURE RESERVE</p> <p>The Committee received the tabled Executive Summary of Haringey's Biodiversity Action Plan and a map of local nature conservation access in Haringey.</p> <p>Ian Holt (L.B. Haringey's Nature Conservation Project Officer) introduced the report about the possibility of Alexandra Park being declared a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) by Haringey Council.</p> <p>The Committee asked the opinion of the Park Manager who stated that he welcomed the proposal, recognising that it would provide additional protection for the Park and increase the potential for funding as well as Green Flag status and would demonstrate a commitment about how the Park will be managed.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the final area of the LNR would be subject to consultation with Natural England.</p> <p>It was not envisaged that any activity currently conducted within the Park would be precluded by the potential LNR declaration, however, events would have to be in accordance with the Park's management plan.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>RESOLVED that the proposal to designate Alexandra Park as a Local Nature Reserve be noted and supported by the Advisory Committee.</p>
APSC20.	<p>REVIEW OF ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE BYELAWS</p> <p>The Committee received the report of the Park Manager following the Board's resolution that that the Alexandra Park and Palace byelaws be reviewed. It was noted that the byelaws were out of date and that amendments would need to be approved by the Secretary of State before adoption by Alexandra Park and Palace.</p> <p>The Committee suggested that other legislation should be considered as any recent changes might be relevant and noted that issues such as bar-b-qs and roller-skating might need to be included in the byelaws. It was noted that byelaws could not include matters covered by primary legislation.</p> <p>In response to its questions the Committee noted that in the past three years there had been no prosecutions for the breaching of the Park's byelaws and that the work of the Park's Security Team included enforcing the byelaws, requiring them to be reviewed.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the issue of Alexandra Park and Palace Byelaws be considered at a future meeting of the Advisory Committee. ii) That the Advisory Committee also considers Kenwood Park's byelaws (reviewed in 1997 and issued in 2004) and provide comments in relation to Alexandra Park and Palace byelaws.
APSC21.	<p>PROPOSED VARIATION TO ALEXANDRA PALACE TRADING LIMITED BETTING (TRACK) PREMISES LICENSE</p> <p>The Committee received the report updating on the intention of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) to move the existing track betting licence from the Panorama Room to the Great Hall for the World Darts Championships between 16th December 2010 and 3rd January 2011.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the move would mean the betting area would be further away from other public areas and more easily controlled.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be noted.</p>
APSC22.	<p>FORTHCOMING EVENTS</p> <p>The Committee received the Forthcoming Events report and noted that in addition to the events listed in the report there were many smaller rooms booked within the Palace for meetings and other events including filming and conferences.</p> <p>The Chair expressed concern about whether event bookings would continue considering the problems with funding to repair the Palace building. The Managing Director – Alexandra Palace Trading Company (APTL) explained that the building would be maintained at the appropriate level, although the dilapidations were</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>challenging and increased investment in the building would enable more events to be delivered. It was noted that APTL's turnover had remained static and new events bookings had been made.</p> <p>In response to a Committee Member's question it was reported that the Secret Cinema event had been renamed and not advertised due to the secret nature of the event, organised by Future Shorts and held every three months. The location and film being shown remains a secret until nearer to the date and is attended by 5000 people each day.</p> <p>The Chair recognised the good work being done to increase APTL's turnover and the challenges faced due to the building dilapidations.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be noted.</p>
<p>APSC23.</p>	<p>GOVERNANCE & FUTURE VISION</p> <p>The Committee noted that the Alexandra Palace and Park Board had received an update on the Alexandra Palace and Park Governance and Future Vision at it's Board meeting the previous day (6th September 2010), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the financial focus for the organisations in the Palace should be. • The models of governance previously presented to the Board and the Advisory Committee. The Board agreed to adopt an interim model until the ultimate model of independence was achievable. • Work was taking place to see how the stakeholder forums could be more effective and proposals would be presented to the Council. <p>The Committee noted that the Regeneration Working Group, to consider the master plan for Alexandra Palace and Park, would have met by November. The Working Group would be chaired by the Council's Director of Urban Environment and would include 7 or 8 members who were Council or APTL officers and possibly other specialists. The terms of reference and membership would be presented to the Council.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the update be noted.</p>
<p>APSC24.</p>	<p>JOINT MEETING OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK & PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE</p> <p>The Committee was invited to consider a joint meeting with the Consultative Committee to discuss how both committees would work in the future.</p> <p>Committee members were referred to the element of the duplication of work conducted by both the Advisory and Consultative Committees (and related officers) and that the Advisory Committee was a statutory group and had restricted powers, whereas the Consultative Committee had none.</p> <p>It was agreed that a review of the Advisory Committee itself should be conducted before considering amalgamating with another group. The findings of the recent Stakeholder Event at Alexandra Palace (as part of the Governance Review) could be used to assist the review.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>The concern that the Chair of the Consultative Committee might be presented with a conflict of interest if the Committee's were amalgamated (as he was also the Chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board) was noted.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>i. That a small working group (consisting of the Statutory Advisory (Urgency) Sub-Committee Members) be established to consider the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee and the Terms of Reference of the Consultative Committee.</p> <p>ii. That the working group report back to the Advisory Committee outlining the results of the review and how it should link in with the Consultative Committee.</p>
<p>APSC25.</p>	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p><u>Enforcement Action in relation to Little Dinosaurs</u></p> <p>The Committee noted that planning enforcement action was being taken in respect of the Little Dinosaurs building in the Grove, Alexandra Park.</p> <p>David Frith, The Rookfield Association, expressed concern that the Advisory Committee had raised concerns at its meeting on 16th June 2009 regarding the boundaries for the site and how the play area would be extended to the outside area at a later stage.</p> <p>It was noted that within 6 months of the start of the lease a planning enforcement notice had been served on the tenant due to the lack of planning permission for changes to facilities on the site.</p> <p>The Committee's comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matter of enforcement notice being served on Little Dinosaurs should have been brought to the Advisory Committee for consideration. The Park Manager reported that the Committee would only be consulted again if a planning application is radically different from the original proposal. • Any alterations to a site leased in the Park should be approved by the Trust Board. <p>Officers noted the concerns raised by Committee Members and highlighted that the leaseholder was appealing the enforcement notice.</p> <p>RESOLVED that a report on the enforcement notice served on the Little Dinosaurs site would be considered by the Advisory Committee on 2nd November. The Committee's comments would then be shared with the Alexandra Palace and Park Board.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

APSC26.	DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS The following dates were noted: Tuesday 25 th January 2011 Tuesday 5 th April 2011 The meeting ended at 21:30 hrs
----------------	---

David Liebeck

Chair

Signed by the Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

**UNRESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

*Denotes attendance

** for part of the meeting only

Councillors Egan** (Chair), Strickland** (Vice-Chair), Hare**, Peacock*, Scott**, Stewart*, and Williams **

Non-Voting Val Paley*, Mike Tarpey, Nigel Willmott*
Representatives:

Observer: David Liebeck

Also present:

*Mr A. Gill – Interim General Manager – Alexandra Palace

*Mr I. Harris – Trust Solicitor

*Mr M. Evison – Park Manager – Alexandra Palace

*Ms H. Downie - Head of Finance – Alexandra Palace

*Ms R. Kane – Managing Director – Alexandra Palace Trading Limited

*Mr J. Barnett – Interim Facilities Manager - Alexandra Palace

**Ms J. Parker – Director of Corporate Resources – LB Haringey

*Mr G. Oliver – Financial Manager – LB Haringey

*Mr T. Mitchison – Legal Services – LB Haringey

Mr C. Hart – Committee Manager (Clerk to the Board) LB Haringey

**MINUTE
NO.**

SUBJECT/DECISION

APBO40.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
APBO41.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>The Chair advised that there were no items of urgent business relating to the agenda, and confirmed with the Clerk to the Board that as this was a special meeting only those items listed on the agenda sheet would be considered.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
APBO42.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS</p> <p>The Clerk to the Board – Mr Hart advised the Board that those members who sat as Directors to the Board of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited were required to declare a personal interest and prejudicial interest with regard to agenda item 8 – Approval of written resolutions of the Board of APTL and to leave the proceedings for Item 8.</p> <p>Councillors Egan, Hare, Scott and Strickland respectively declared a personal</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>interest and prejudicial interest with regard agenda item 8 - as Directors to the Board of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited .</p> <p>Ms Parker – Director of Corporate Resources – LB Haringey also declared an interest in Exempt Item 8 as Director of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited., and employee of LB Haringey.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
<p>APBO43.</p>	<p>GOVERNANCE UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.</p> <p>The Managing Director of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited, in her capacity as Project Manager for the Governance and Future Vision informed the Board that the purpose of the report was to report back on progress, following the decisions taken at Board on 29 June, and the subsequent actions arising for Project Steering Group (PSG) in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Financial Independence b) Structural changes to streamline processes and systems c) Timeframe and process mapping d) Master planning and the future of AP <p>The report also sought endorsement of the financial focus recommended by PSG across Alexandra Palace, together with a proposed ‘interim’ model proposed by PSG for structural change and seeking the Board’s guidance on the terms of engagement, job description and recruitment process for the Independent Advisors. Ms Kane also referred to the reported updated key milestones for governance reform and those changes requiring Full Council of LB Haringey for approval.</p> <p>Ms Kane also advised that following the Board’s decision to create a “master planning” working group, it was necessary to seek the Board’s approval for the terms of reference and membership of the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group. A revised version of pages 9-12 had been re-circulated and should be referred to during discussion of the item.</p> <p>Ms Kane also tabled the notes of the question and answer session that was held on 24 August 2010 with stakeholders on the issues outlined as ease of reference. (A copy will be interleaved within the minutes)</p> <p>Ms Kane commented that in terms of the three areas for discussion, the first was Financial Independence and this had been agreed as a longer term aspiration of the Board. In the meantime, the following immediate focus was recommended by PSG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APTL: increase profit and drive commercial activity • APPCT: fundraise • Master Plan: identify untapped investment sources/funding (to include

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

quick wins as well as longer term investment)

The Chair felt that each section should be commented upon separately and asked that Members comment.

Ms Kane referred to the Question and Answer Session of 24 August 2010 Q.s 1 & 2 which stated:

Question 1: Does this really represent real progress? The 'interim' model, due to be considered by Trustees on 6 Sept, is almost identical to the model tabled at the Stakeholder Forum in October 2009. Have the trustees gone far enough?

Question 2: What is the timeline for SAC and CC reform?

Councillor Stewart asked how many attended on 24 August and Ms Kane responded that the session had been attended by 15/16 individuals.

Members raised the following points of clarification

- Concerns of the attendees at the Stakeholder Forum at the length of time the whole issue of the future of the Palace was taking and the need for the Board to look itself at this as detailed in question 1. Ms Kane responded that the reason given had been it was hoped that stakeholders would take comfort from the fact that the interim model being considered by Trustees was almost identical to the one mooted in the autumn of 2009 and therefore reflected that the Board had listened to stakeholders and not created totally different models. There had been a lot of work behind the scenes and further engagement with stakeholders, plus bringing newly appointed trustees up to speed with the changes to ensure 100% support and understanding. The Board had also adopted an aspiration of total independence in the longer term which was what the majority of stakeholders requested.
- the issue of governance and future vision did not only centre on changing the function and capability of the current Alexandra Palace and Park Board and that by changing the Board set up this did not automatically alter how the palace would be run. The issue of the function of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee (APPA), and Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee (APPC) also required review as to whether there could some form of merging. The Stakeholders Forum had been informed that the reform would commence once the APPA and APPC had held forthcoming meetings (7 and 14 Sept respectively) and agreed the process for reviewing themselves. An update to the Board was expected on 5 October 2010 but not anticipating the work will have been completed at this stage.

Independent Advisors

Reference to question 5 from the Stakeholders Forum asking how Independent Advisors would be recruited. The question had been 'How will the independent advisors be selected? What skills will they have? They must be appointed with

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

ability to challenge/lead the Trustees rather than just do their bidding’.

Ms Kane advised that the response given was to the effect that there would be a clear recruitment and selection process, and that the Advisers would not be the same as paid consultants and would be chosen for their relevant skills sets to assist the delivery of a new vision. Ms Kane advised that it had been further suggested that the Independent Advisors should be “Shadow Trustees”. Stakeholders had been invited to send suggestions for recruitment to the Interim General Manager.

Discussions then centred on the issue and role of the Independent Advisors – the main points being:

- Clarification was sought as to how to attract the Independent Advisors and the criteria for expertise and skills;
- possible advice from the Charity Commission as to how other Charities had progressed the recruitment of specialist advisors
- attracting advisers with particular historic interest or ability to fund raise and an understanding of commerciality/fund raising, or high profile nationally
- the need to not limit the number of advisors but this be dependent on the specific criteria and skill set e.g. advisers similar to those used for the development of St Pancras or Tate Modern or other such large scale development
- that the criteria for expertise could fall into 3 main categories – fund raising, heritage, hospitality
- that the Independent Advisors would not receive any monetary stipend for the role but would be able to claim reasonable expenses
- the possible interest as a museum site and attracting notable persons in the museum world
- the overriding need to ensure that any recruitment drive pitched itself to ensure that it attracted a sufficient level of interest and that there were concerns that in attracting expertise it then hopefully did not turn out that overall there is no achievement
- that whether the strategy for the future of the Palace and Park needed to be clearly defined in order to attract the most suitable advisors and rather than create a role this would naturally develop by the skills and expertise brought by those recruited
- that the Independent Advisors would be seen in an ambassadorial role with a whole range of abilities and that their function be a meaningful one
- the need to re-approach the BBC given the site’s historic position as the birth of television and their support for a Museum/TV Heritage site
- the recruitment process be along the lines similar to that used the previous year for the recruitment of NED’s of APTL by using external agencies for the purpose
- the need for obtaining the view of current employees at the palace as to their views as to the future development and expertise required

(Ms Downie arrived at 18.59hrs)

Structural Changes to streamline processes and systems

Ms Kane referred to the structural changes as detailed in the report which had been recommended by the PSG with an 'interim' model proposed for adoption by the Board. The main features of the model were:

- Combined and more effective stakeholder forum: SAC and CC
- Appointment of independent advisors to the Board

Ms Kane advised that the PSG had concluded that the organisation was too far removed from the ultimate solution of legal and financial independence but that both should remain longer term aspirations of the Board. It was recommended that the 'interim' model would provide a phased approach in the meantime.

Ms Kane referred to the meeting that took place with the Chair of the Board, the Chair of the APPAC, Mr Liebeck, Mr Gill and herself where proposals were explored and the following agreed:

- APPAC and APPCC to be requested to hold an inaugural joint meeting at which both groups to agree a process for 'holding a mirror to themselves', as the Board had done, and identify actions to streamline their processes and improve effectiveness; including consideration of the necessity of having two separate groups. Pending approval by the APPB to the 'interim' model proposed, this action would be tabled for approval at both the APPAC (7 Sept) and the APPC (14 Sept) forthcoming meetings.
- It was recognised that whilst APPAC was constituted by an Act of Parliament, like the APPB, there could be means of enhancing its current remit/membership and that this should not be ruled out without thorough investigation.
- The SAC would also be asked, via the Park Manager for APPCT, to undertake a review of the AP byelaws.

Ms Kane referred to the questions 6 & 7 raised at the Stakeholders meeting on 24 August 2010 and the responses given as follows:

With regard to question 6 'How will the SAC / CC review be conducted and will it provide an opportunity for other interested parties to suggest new members etc?' Ms Kane commented that the response given had been similar to her earlier comments in that the SAC and CC needed to consider at their forthcoming meetings the process and methodology for conducting the review. Officers would feed back to both chairs that others (currently not members of either) would like to have an input. It was also important to note that the comment had been that the concept of the People's Palace remained a strong tenet of the future of AP&P.

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

With regard to question 7 'How can we be certain that the Trustees will listen to stakeholders in the future? In the past the SAC and CC have been ignored on many occasions' Ms Kane advised that the response had been along the lines that one of the main reasons the Board had asked that the APPAC and APPCC reviewed themselves was to ensure that the stakeholder forum become as efficient and effective as possible. This was a clear objective that emerged from both the trustee and the stakeholder forum sessions held in the autumn 2009. This would hopefully aid better communications and a constructive dialogue in the future. The Board had also committed, by virtue of the NCVO code that they had adopted, to open and transparent processes and effective engagement of a myriad of stakeholders. Ms Kane also advised that several present at the meeting had commented that the relationships and communications between the respective committees had improved recently.

The Chair asked if there were any particular comments or views.

Councillor Hare commented that in his view it was an effective process, given that the Board had examined its Governance and had considered the NCVO model it was only fair that it ask the APPAC & APPCC to look at their functionality and effectiveness in accordance with the NCVO guidelines. Councillor hare asked if officers would support this proposal. Mr Gill responded that officers would provide support to this process. Ms Kane advised that it should be acknowledged that a considerable amount of work had been progressed by the Board through consultation with stakeholders and that this was an on-going process.

At this point there was an interruption from a Member of the public present in the public seating area. The Chair advised that whilst the meeting was a public one, it was not for public participation and therefore advised that questions or clarification from the public was not allowed, and ask that such interruptions desist.

Time Frame and Process mapping

Ms Kane referred to the adopting of the interim model and the timetable as detailed in para 6.3 of the report and asked if there were any points of clarification. Ms Kane referred to the political group meetings of the LB Haringey in early October and the need to firm up the likely dates.

The Chair commented that the timetable was aspirational and likely to encounter some slippage in the coming weeks, and suggested some further discussion outside of this meeting.

Master Planning and the future of Alexandra Palace and Park

Ms Kane referred to the appendices circulated (as amended for pages 9-12 of the report) in respect of the draft terms of reference of the Alexandra Palace and Park Regeneration Working Group which set out the key activities of the body. As outlined in the report the primary purpose of the Working Group would be to develop, manage and co-ordinate an integrated regeneration strategy and master plan for the palace and surrounding park.

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

Ms Kane referred to questions 4 and 8 at the Stakeholders Forum and the responses given:-

With regard to question 4 'Will anything happen whilst LBH is in charge? The LBH councillors have no vision, as evidenced at Hornsey Town Hall. Another 5 years could be spent talking about plans and delivering nothing', Ms Kane advised that the response to the question had been that the Board had been considering their vision for Alexandra Palace and Park and had abandoned the previous strategy of finding a single developer for the site. Stakeholders had been involved in that process, with draft brand values created to underpin that vision, and the suggestion of some independent advisors being invited onto the APPB to swell the skills sets and experience to be drawn upon. The stakeholders were also advised that the proposed Regeneration Working Group would formulate ideas and recommendations for the Trustees and draw on a wide range of expertise. The building was driving the timescales, and there no time for lengthy debate and procrastination. The building would not survive if action was not swift.

With regard to question 8 'Can we be assured that there is no hotel coming into the main building? And that the trustees won't lease parts of the building?', Ms Kane advised that the response to the question had advised that nothing would be ruled in or out at this stage. The role of the Regeneration Working Group would be to assess the best use of the building and make recommendations to the APPB. It was further advised that a hotel had long been viewed by many as a necessity for Alexandra Palace and Park and planning permission had been granted in the past for the site. The APPB had committed to not seeking to grant a long lease to a sole operator, though the Chair of APPB did not rule out that if a body like English Heritage wished to manage the Palace that might be appropriate.

Ms Kane then referred to the draft terms of reference of the Alexandra Palace and Park Regeneration Working Group as detailed and stated that the role of the Chair of the Working Group and the actions of the group were clearly defined.

The Chair referred to the revised terms of reference as drafted by the Interim General Manager – Mr Gill and asked that he give a brief explanation of those proposed revisions.

Mr Gill responded that he had not been in attendance at the PSG meeting when the draft had been agreed due to being on annual leave. As the amendments showed in bold in the addendum to the circulated report it was a fact that the role of the Regeneration Working Group was in an advisory capacity and this body was not empowered to take decisions on behalf of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board. Therefore the terms of reference required amendment to reflect this, with the amendments clearly showing that the Working Group would not be responsible for taking any decisions. Mr Gill explained to the Board the rationale and implications of each his proposed amendments.

The Trust Solicitor – Mr Harris also referred the Board to his circulated note regarding the proposed original terms of reference as agreed by the PSG. Mr Harris advised that the further Terms of Reference circulated on 1 September

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

2010 by the Clerk to the Board on behalf of Ms Kane appeared to give decision making power to the group, with its stated role being “delivery of a strategic master plan which will provide an integrated framework for future commercial and development delivery.” Mr Harris commented that his advice to the Board was that it should ensure amendments to the proposed terms of reference were made so that it was convened as an advisory group; with the Board retaining the ultimate decision making function. The legal rationale behind this advice was that it was for the Alexandra Palace and Park Board alone to make key decisions about the charity. The Board was able to delegate matters but not such a key one as this, and to seek to delegate such a matter would be contrary to charity law and also in breach of the recently adopted Code of Governance.

The Chair thanked Mr Gill, Mr Harris and Ms Kane for their comments and asked if there were any comments from the Board.

Councillor Hare commented that his concern regarding the amendments to the terms of reference of the Regeneration Working Group could mean that the working group may feel hampered or held back by the need to refer all matters to the Board for decision. He also sought clarification as to if there was a budget allocation to progress this work. In response Mr Gill advised that £50K had specifically been allocated for this purpose – held by the LB Haringey.

Councillor Hare referred to the scope of work that the Working Group would undertake and the likely slowing of the timetable given the small number of scheduled Alexandra Palace and Park Board meetings. He felt that if the amendments to the terms of reference were agreed there would be a need for special Board meetings to be convened at regular intervals to take required decisions. Councillor Hare expressed his concerns at the issue of timescales and the need for additional Board meetings as and when required and asked that these concerns be noted.

Councillor Scott commented that in terms of the Working Group it should clearly be established in a non decision making capacity and in his view the working group’s main tasks would be to draw up the strategy and master plan for adoption by the Board and that the Board would meet on a regular basis in order to consider issues as and when required.

Councillor Hare referred to the role of the Interim General Manager in that issues for consideration by the Board from the Working Group would be passed to the Board following consideration/vetting by the Interim General Manager, and subject to the Interim General Manager’s agreement or rejection of matters to be considered by the Board. Councillor Hare felt that when this was the case, the Board be given the opportunity to see the original proposals from the Working Group referred to the General Manager for consideration in order to ensure that the Board was aware of any issues being blocked (for any reason) by the Interim General Manager.

The Chair asked Mr Gill if he had any response to give in respect of Councillor Hare’s suggestion. Mr Gill advised the Board that in his opinion Councillor Hare’s suggestions did not warrant a response.

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

Councillor Stewart sought clarification from Ms Kane as to whether she was broadly in support of Mr Gill's proposed amendments.

In response Ms Kane commented that the Working Group would need to move fast in order to expedite and drive through the development, management and co-ordination of an integrated regeneration strategy and master plan for the palace and surrounding park. In terms of the time line the Working Group needed to have the ability to progress effectively and the amendments would in her view hamper this. Ms Kane commented that the original terms of reference did have enough clauses to protect the position of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board and there were reassurances of this protection within those un-amended terms of reference.

Councillor Stewart asked if in Ms Kane's views, the amendments could limit the function of the Working Group, and Ms Kane responded that that potentially yes the amendments would do so.

The Chair referred to the membership of the Regeneration Working Group and expressed his concern that there was only one representative of the Trust on the Working Group and asked whether the Board felt that it was sufficient or whether there should be some Board representation.

Mr Willmott commented that in his view as it was a working group of officers and as there were built in processes for reporting to the Alexandra Palace and Park Board he felt that whilst the Working Group was officer lead, should there be some Board members sitting on the Group.

In response to further clarification from the Chair and Councillor Hare as to the Working Group's membership, the Director of Corporate Resources LB Haringey – Ms Parker advised that once the Group was established its membership could be varied if it was felt necessary, and the membership could be reviewed as time progressed.

Ms Kane sought clarification as to the £14K spent on the previous NED's recruitment to APTL and given this amount spent would there be sufficient funds available for the recruitment of Independent Advisers. Mr Gill responded that there was a budget allocation for this purpose and there would be no need to seek Board approval on this point.

The Chair then summarised the discussion and it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That support be given to the financial focus in the short term for APPCT, APTL and the Regeneration Working Group;
- ii. That the proposed 'interim' model for structural change, including 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 be endorsed.

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>iii. That the terms of engagement, job description and recruitment process for the Independent Advisors be endorsed based on the steer outlined during discussion of the item and in the following terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attracting advisers with particular historic interest or ability to fund raise and an understanding of commerciality/fund raising, or high profile nationally • the need to not limit the number of advisors but this be dependent on the specific criteria and skill set e.g. advisers similar to those used for the development of St Pancras or Tate Modern or other such large scale development • that the criteria for expertise could fall into 3 main categories – fund raising, heritage, hospitality • that the Independent Advisors would not receive any monetary stipend for the role but would be able to claim reasonable expenses • that the Independent Advisors would be seen in an ambassadorial role with a whole range of abilities and that their function be a meaningful one <p>iv. That the key milestones be noted and it be agreed that the Board Trustees will act as champions for these, in a bid to help secure Full Council approval;</p> <p>v. That approval be given to the amended draft terms of reference and proposed membership of the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group as shown in pages 13-15 of the report;</p> <p>vi. That in respect of the recommendations arising from the work of the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group requiring consideration by the Alexandra Palace and Park Board it be noted that special meetings of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board will be convened as and when required to consider such issues; and</p> <p>vii. That the full Council of LB Haringey be requested to delegate to the Alexandra Palace and Park Board the recruitment, selection and appointment of the independent advisers to the Board.</p> <p>(Ms Parker left the proceedings at 19.30hrs due to her attendance at another meeting at the LB Haringey)</p>
<p>APBO44.</p>	<p>PARK AND PALACE BYE-LAWS</p> <p>The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.</p> <p>The Park Manager – Alexandra Palace – Mr Evison advised the Board that the purpose of the report was to seek approval to commencing the process of</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

considering whether the byelaws for Alexandra Park and Palace were fit for purpose and up to date. The Board, if minded to do so, were also asked to agree to a consultation exercise so relevant stakeholders could input into the review process.

Mr Evison commented that the existing Byelaws had been made on 31 May 1929 under what was then Section 18 of the 1900 Act, subsequently repealed by the 1966 Order which effectively transferred Alexandra Palace to the Greater London Council (GLC) with Paragraph 8 of the 1966 Order stipulating that any Byelaws in force shall have effect as if they had been made by the GLC. That particular paragraph survived the 1985 change and appears in schedule 3 to the 1985 Act, which sets out the provisions from the earlier legislation that remain in force

Mr Evison advised that the Board was not asked at this point to consider the particular details of the existing byelaws but to decide whether or not the 1929 Byelaws should be reviewed and possibly updated in view of both the change of circumstances over the last 80 odd years and perhaps more particularly the change in language. Mr Evison further advised that a review of the byelaws could include relevant details relating to traffic and car parking in light of the potential to enact a car park charging scheme in the future. Mr Evison concluded that the Board would retain the final decision making power and in essence what was being sought from the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee and Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee was advice though the Board may or may not accept that advice.

The Chair thanked Mr Evison for his succinct summary and asked if the LB Haringey's Legal representative – Mr Mitchison had any comment to add.

Mr Mitchison responded that whilst it was appropriate to review existing byelaws it was the case that there were no guarantees of them actually being revised. Though it would be for the Board to agree any such changes it was ultimately a decision of Central Government though he could not see any major issue arising that would cause difficulty.

In response to clarification of points from Councillor Scott the Trust Solicitor Mr Harris advised the Board were Trustees appointed by the Council and although the Board were in the position to review the byelaws these were actually byelaws belonging to the LB Haringey.

There being no further points of clarification the Chair summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That approval be given to review the palace and park byelaws;
- ii. That the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee and the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee and other stakeholders be requested to consider the byelaws and give their advice on updates or amendments; and
- iii. That the advice of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee and the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee and other

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	stakeholders be reported to the Board at a future meeting.
APBO45.	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS</p> <p>That the press and public be excluded the from the meeting for consideration of Items 7 - 9 as they contain exempt information as defined in para 3 of Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985); namely information relating to the business or financial affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).</p> <p>At this point in the proceedings (19.35hrs) the Chair moved an adjournment for a period of 5 minutes which was agreed nemine contradicente.</p> <p>The Board adjourned at 19.35hrs and reconvened at 19.40hrs.</p> <p>The Chair announced that the order of business would be varied to consider agenda item 9 after agenda item 7.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>SUMMARY OF EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDINGS</u></p>
APBO46.	<p>THE LEASE FOR THE OLD STATION BUILDING</p> <p>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>At this point in the proceedings the Chair reminded the Board that it would next consider agenda item 9.</p>
APBO47.	<p>INTEGRATED FACILITIES MANAGEMENT CONTRACT</p> <p>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>At this point in the proceedings (20.10hrs) Councillors Egan, Hare, Scott and Strickland withdrew from the proceedings having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 8 – Approval of written resolutions of the Board of APTL Accounts. The Managing Director of APTL did not leave the proceedings.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
APBO48.	<p>APPROVAL OF WRITTEN RESOLUTIONS OF THE BOARD OF APTL ACCOUNTS</p> <p>The Clerk to the Board – Mr Hart advised the Board that as the Chair and Vice-Chair had withdrawn from the proceedings it would be necessary to elect a Chair for the remainder of the proceedings. Mr Hart sought nominations for the Chair.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2010**

Councillor Peacock nominated Councillor Stewart as Chair for the remainder of the proceedings. Councillor Williams seconded the nomination.

There being no other nominations it was resolved nemine contradicente that Councillor Stewart take the Chair for the remainder of the proceedings.

COUNCILLOR STEWART IN THE CHAIR

AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS

There being no further business to discuss the meeting ended at 20.33hrs.

COUNCILLOR PAT EGAN

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda item: No.

Alexandra Park and Palace Consultative Committee

On 16 November 2010

Report Title: **Forthcoming Events**Report of: **Rebecca Kane, Managing Director, Alexandra Palace Trading Limited****1. Purpose**

1.1 To advise the Consultative Committee of the forthcoming events to March 2011.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee notes the report.

Report Authorised by: **Rebecca Kane**

Date 21/10/10

Contact Officer: **Rebecca Kane, Managing Director APTL 0208 365 2121****3. Executive Summary**

3.1 N/A

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

4.1 N/A

5. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

5.1 Further information about this report can be obtained from Rebecca Kane, Managing Director, Alexandra Palace Trading Limited, Alexandra Palace Way, Wood Green, London N22 7AY. Telephone number 020 8365 2121.

6. Description

6.1 Confirmed public events and first provisional options. 02 November 2010 to 31 March 2011

EVENT	DATE	AREA
Prospects Transitions Event	9 Nov	Panorama and Londesborough Room
LCD Soundsystem/Hotchip Concert (10K +)	10 Nov	Great Hall
Antique & 20 th Century Fair	14 Nov	Great Hall
Visit of Amma	16-18 Nov	Great and West Hall, Panorama Room, PCS
Indian Property Exhibition	20-21 Nov	Panorama Room
Asian Wedding Show	20-21 Nov	Great Hall
Bungee	20 Nov	Park (Beach Area)
Organ Concert & Dinner	24 Nov	Great Hall and Londesborough Room
Farmers Market	31 Oct	Paddock Car Park
Vampire Weekend Concert (10K +)	2 & 3 Dec	Great Hall
Farmers Market	5 Dec	Paddock Car Park
Farmers Market	12 Dec	Paddock Car Park
Ladbroses. Com World Championship Darts	18 Dec-2 Jan	West Hall
Farmers Market	19 Dec	Paddock Car Park
Farmers Market	2 Jan	Paddock Car Park
<i>Yoga Event</i>	<i>8 Jan</i>	<i>Great Hall</i>
Farmers Market	9 Jan	Paddock Car Park
Excursions Travel Trade Show	15 Jan	West Hall, Panorama and Londesborough Room, Palace Suite
Farmers Market	16 Jan	Paddock Car Park
Model Engineering	21-23 Jan	Great Hall, Palm Court, Palace Suite
Make Up Trade Show	29 & 30 Jan	West Hall, Panorama, Londesborough Room, Palace Suite
Farmers Market	30 Jan	Paddock Car Park
<i>Antiques & Collectors Fair</i>	<i>6 Feb</i>	<i>Great and West Hall, Panorama room</i>
Prospects Transitions Event	10 Feb	Panorama & Londesborough Room
Farmers Market	20 Feb	Paddock Car Park
<i>Motorcycle Show</i>	<i>26-27 Feb</i>	<i>West Hall, West Corridor, Panorama Room and Palace Suite</i>
RYA Dinghy Show	5 & 6 Mar	Great and West Hall, Panorama room

Woodworking Exhibition	11 & 12 Mar	Great Hall
Farmers Market	13 Mar	Paddock Car Park
London Festival of Railway Modelling	25-27 Mar	Great/ West Hall, Panorama, Palace Suite

Note: 1st Option Provisional Bookings are typed in Italic

*** Overnight event*

** 01:00 event finish*

7. Summary and Conclusions

7.1 N/A

8. Recommendations

8.1 The Consultative Committee notes the report.

9. Legal and Financial Comments

9.1 The Director of Finance and the Trust's solicitor have been sent a copy of this report.

10. Equalities Implications

10.1 There are no perceived equal opportunities implications in this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultative Committee Meeting**On 16th November 2010**

Report Title: **External Fabric Condition Update**

Report of: **Andrew Gill, Interim General Manager, Alexandra Palace & Park Charitable Trust**

1. Purpose

1.1 To update the Consultative Committee on the external fabric condition of Alexandra Palace.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The Consultative Committee is asked to note the progress report on the external fabric condition and the action being taken by the Trust to address the high priority items.

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



Contact Officer: John Barnett, **Interim Facilities Management Consultant, Alexandra Palace & Park, Alexandra Palace Way, Wood Green N22 7AY Tel No. 020 8365 4334**

3. Executive Summary

3.1 An asset management survey of the external fabric has been completed, which identifies high priority works that need to be undertaken.

3.2 A sum of £138k has been allocated during this financial year to address some of these items, notably the South Elevation adjacent to the Panorama Room.

3.3 A further bid of £500k has been made to the Council for capital funding during 2011/12 to further address the external fabric of the building and replace the Fire Alarm and Evacuation systems

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

5. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

5.1 No specific background papers were used in compiling this report.

6 Progress Report

- 6 In 2005 a detailed condition audit of the site was commissioned by APPCT with King Sturge LLP as part of the proposal to let the Palace on a long term repairing lease. Inflating the reports findings by the RPI index (12%, Appendix 2) it was estimated that a sum in excess of £30 million would be required to put the buildings into a weather proof, structurally sound condition with the primary mechanical and electrical systems being fit for purpose. Thereafter the ongoing annual average maintenance cost would be on average £568k. Since this time few works have taken place to arrest the continuing deterioration of the Palace and the General Managers Facilities Manager team believe that the site now has less that two years in which to address these issues before it has a serious impact on the sites operation. During 2009/10 the Interim General Manager FM team struggled financially to address the basic areas of compliance within its allotted R&M budget and was forced to adopt a “Fix & Patch” policy when systems failed.
- 6.1 A capital grant from the Council was granted in 2010/11 of £500,000 to start addressing some of these issues. A contract has now been commissioned through the Council’s Framework Consultants to produce a detailed Asset Management Survey of the building external fabric. It was recognised that at the current time an investment such as that identified in the 2005 King Sturge survey was un-realistic. The objectives of this recent report were therefore to identify key areas of:-
- Health and Safety Risk. (Falling brickwork and masonry)
 - Security/Fire Risk (gaps in structure allowing access into the internal fabric)
 - Actions to arrest further deterioration of the fabric. (i.e. water ingress, weed growth)
- 6.2 The report which has recently been received prioritises and budget costs the minimum works that need to be undertaken to ensure the deterioration of the fabric is arrested. It is estimated a sum of £756k needs to be invested over the next 10 years with much of this expenditure within the next 2 to 3 years (Appendix 1). The priority 1 actions at a cost of £138k are currently being addressed and this sum has been allocated during this financial year. This will provide a minimal investment on the structure to keep it safe and water proof; these monies will not however address the severe fabric dilapidations in areas of the East wing (e.g. Theatre).
- 6.3 During this survey the area along the South terrace adjacent to the Panorama Room has been found to be in an extremely poor condition. Preliminary works have already been undertaken and structural engineers are devising the most economic solution for repair. The old channel steelwork that supports the arches has badly corroded and caused brickwork to fail. While it is believed that catastrophic failure is unlikely, there is an urgent need to get these repairs underway and this will be taking place over the next 3/4 months
- 6.4 Work is proceeding with a possible design solution of underpinning the arches with extra steelworks concealed from view by the decorative wooden

frontages. Discussions are in progress held with the Council's Design & Conservation Team and English Heritage before work proceeds.

- 6.5 An overview of the condition of the external building fabric is shown in a selection of the photographs in Appendix 3

7. 2011/12 Capital Bid to the Council

- 7.1 The capital bid to the Council in 2009 requested a sum of £1.0 million per annum for 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 to address dilapidations at Alexandra Place. The Council's Cabinet awarded a capital grant of £500k for 2010/11 and agreed in principle to the sum of £500k being available in 2011/12.

- 7.2 Whilst the £500k capital grant for 2011/12 was agreed in principle, the Trust still needs to submit a bid to release the funds.

- 7.3 An updated business case has therefore being submitted to the Council for the release of a further £500k for the 2011/12 financial year. The substantial part of these monies would be targeted at:-

Priority 1 Areas:

- Urgent repairs to the external fabric.
- Replacement of the fire and evacuation systems across the site.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Progress on capital and major revenue works are reviewed on a monthly basis at Facilities Meetings between senior management of the Trust and APTL.

- 8.2 Regular progress reports are submitted to the APPCT Board meetings throughout the year.

9. Legal and Financial Comments

- 9.1 The Head of Legal Services has been invited to comment on the report

- 9.2 The LBH Chief Financial Officer has been invited to comment on the report.

10. Equalities Implications

- 9.1 There are no perceived equalities implications in this report.

11. Appendices / Tables / Photographs

Appendix 1: Costed Asset Management Plan Produced During Summer 2010

Appendix 2: Space & Condition Analysis Derived from 2005 Survey

Appendix 3: Photographs of Condition from 2010 Survey

Appendix 1: Costed Asset Management Plan Produced During Summer 2010
--

Location	Yr 1	Yr 2-3	Yr 4-5	Yr 6-10	Totals
Elevations- South	£ 122,455.00	£ 67,513.00	£ 5,850.00	£ 21,493.00	£ 217,311.00
Elevations- West	£ 22,496.00	£ 12,286.00	£ 8,714.00	£ -	£ 43,496.00
Elevations- North	£ 25,000.00	£ 36,400.00	£ 20,270.00	£ 750.00	£ 82,420.00
Elevations- East	£ 13,260.00	£ 12,914.00	£ 2,057.00	£ -	£ 28,231.00
Elevations- Roof Level	£ 6,795.00	£ 19,550.00	£ 1,450.00	£ -	£ 27,795.00
Roofs	£ 33,900.00	£ 93,715.00	£ 106,800.00	£ 122,900.00	£ 357,315.00
Sub Totals	£ 223,906.00	£ 242,378.00	£ 145,141.00	£ 145,143.00	£ 756,568.00

Appendix 2: Space & Condition Analysis Derived from 2005 Survey

Level	Area	Classification of Area Use	Space Analysis				Total Space (M2)	Condition		Estimated Cost	Major Use at Present
			Income Generation Areas (M2)	Internal Operational Areas (M2)	Leased Areas (M2)	Un-Useable Areas (M2)		Condition	Main Works Identified in Condition Survey		
1	Basements	Restricted				3,726		Poor Condition	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£4,927,675	Restricted access only
1	Plant Rooms	Restricted		1,470				Satisfactory	General cleaning & redecoration	£13,490	Gas, water, fire, electrics, boilers
Sub Total:-			0	1,470	0	3,726	5,196			£4,941,165	
2	Palace Suite, Kitchen, Roman Bar	Events	3,726					Fair	Tired in need of redecoration and re-carpeting	£211,347	400 people maximum events
Sub Total:-			3,726	0	0	0	3,726			£211,347	
3	Lonesborough Room	Events	216					Fair	Tired in need of redecoration and re-carpeting	£107,172	200 people maximum events
3	Palm Court	Events	1,621					Fair	Roof and general fabric very tired and in need refurbishment	£597,317	Event Space
3	Great Hall	Events	6,558					Fair	Roof, internal drapes and general fabric very tired and in need refurbishment	£4,679,305	8250 people capacity
3	West Hall	Events	2,740					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£1,115,191	2500 people capacity
3	Panorama Room	Events	1,000					Poor	Temporary structure and in need of replacement	New Build	1000 people capacity
3	Phoenix Bar	Bar	220					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£41,970	Public bar with food
3	East Corridor	Events	567					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£429,438	Access
3	East Hall	Ice Rink	2,748					Under Refurbishment	New CAPEX Project 2010	£407,704	Ice Rink with new £2.0m refurbishment
3	East Entrance	Foyer	684					Poor	Roof and general fabric very tired and in need refurbishment	£765,195	Various events
3	East Hall Amenities (1st & Grd)	Amenities	966					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£333,822	Staff and support activities
3	East Hall Servery	Servery	511					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment		Snack Bar
3	Theatre Foyer	Events	215					Poor	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment		Various events
3	Theatre	Restricted				1,195		Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£1,633,065	Restricted access only
3	BBC Area	Restricted				1,961		Part Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£1,461,440	Derelict Structures
3	North West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£213,595	
3	South West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£213,595	
3	North East Tower	Operational		145				Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£213,595	
3	North Security / Hallmaster	Operational		626				Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£3,373	Security & Hallmaster
3	Other Void Space	Restricted				4,619		Part Derelict	Floor, walls and fenestrations in poor condition	£2,085,737	Derelict Structures
Sub Total:-			18,047	771	0	8,064	26,881			£14,301,513	
4	North West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict	Total reconstruction and refurbishment required	above	Derelict structures
4	South West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict		above	
4	North East Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict		above	
Sub Total:-			0	0	0	434	434			£0	

Level	Area	Classification of Area Use	Space Analysis				Condition		Estimated Cost	Major Use at Present	
			Income Generation Areas (M2)	Internal Operational Areas (M2)	Leased Areas (M2)	Un-Useable Areas (M2)	Total Space (M2)	Condition			Main Works Identified in Condition Survey
4	Palm Court 1	Meeting	10					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£2,000	Support Room
4	Palm Court 2/3	Meeting	48					Good	Refurbished 2009	£0	30 people meeting room
4	Palm Court 4	Meeting	36					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£2,000	20 people meeting room
4	Palm Court 5	Meeting	84					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£5,000	50 people meeting room
4	Toilets	Toilets	27					Fair	Generally tired and in need of refurbishment	£5,000	Toilets
Sub Total:-			204	0	0	868	1,073			£14,000	
5	North West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict	Total reconstruction and refurbishment required	above	Derelict structures
5	South West Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict		above	
5	North East Tower	Restricted				145		Derelict		above	
Sub Total:-			0	0	0	434	434			£0	
BBC	BBC Reception	Reception		145				Fair	Tired in need of redecoration and re-carpeting	£929,715	Used by AFPCT & APTL staff only
BBC	First Floor	Office		145							
BBC	Second Floor	Office		145							
BBC	Third Floor	Office		145							
BBC	Fourth Floor	Office		145							
BBC	Fifth Floor	Leased			145						
Sub Total:-			0	724	145	0	868			£929,715	
External	BBC Tower							Poor	Brick work and fenestrations urgently in need of repair and renovation	£135,652	
External	East Elevation							Poor		£2,584,725	
External	North & East Elevation							Poor		£783,931	
External	North Elevation							Poor		£341,003	
External	Palm Court North Elevation							Poor		£109,421	
External	Palm Court West							Poor		£104,924	
External	Service Yard							Poor		£1,874	
External	South							Poor		£1,115,940	
External	West Elevation							Poor		£443,678	
Other	Services							Poor		Time expired and in need of replacement	£5,422,691
Other	Miscellaneous									£333,822	
Sub Total:-										£11,377,659	
Grand Total:-			21,977	2,964	145	13,526	38,612			£31,775,400	£19.4million Priority 1. (These items were recommended for completion by 2010 when survey undertaken in 2005)









This page is intentionally left blank