Councillors Cooke* (Chair), Egan* (Vice-Chair), Dogus*, Hare*, Oakes*, Peacock*, and Williams

Non-Voting Ms V. Paley*, Mr M. Tarpey*, Mr N. Willmott Representatives:

Observer: Mr D. Liebeck* *indicates Members present

Also present:

Mr D. Loudfoot Mr I. Harris	-	General Manager Alexandra Palace Trust Solicitor
Mr M. Evison Ms J. Parker	- -	Park Manager Alexandra Palace Director of Corporate Resources – LB Haringey
Mr C.Hart	-	Clerk to the Board – Cttee Manager – LB Haringey

MINUTE NO.

SUBJECT/DECISION

APBO01	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY		
	Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Dogus, and Oakes.		
	Applogies for lateness were received on behall of obtinitions bogus, and bakes.		
	NOTED		
APBO02.	URGENT BUSINESS:		
	The Clerk to the Board – Mr Hart, advised the Board that whilst there were no items of urgent business the General Manager had TABLED an amended Appendix II to Item 8 on the agenda.		
	NOTER		
	NOTED		
	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS		
	There were no declarations of interests.		
	NOTED		
APBO04.	MINUTES:		
	 a. Minutes of the meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board - 10 March 2008, and special meetings held on 26 February, and 19 March 2008 		
	RESOLVED		
	That the minutes of meetings of the Alexandra Balace and Bark. Beard		
	That the minutes of meetings of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 10 March 2008, and the special meetings held on 26 February,		

	and 19 March 2008 be agreed as an accurate record of the proceedings.
b.	Minutes of the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee – 12 February 2008
	RESOLVED
	That the minutes of meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee held on 12 February 2008 be agreed as an accurate record of the proceedings.
C.	Minutes of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee 18 March 2008 (attached), and 8 July 2008 and to consider any recommendations contained therein
	i. 18 March 2008
	RESOLVED
	That the minutes of meeting of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory held on 18 March 2008 received and noted.
	ii. 8 July 2008
	The Clerk to the Board – Mr Hart – advised that the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Committee – although in draft form, were awaiting clearance and therefore had not been circulated. However there were circulated the Advisory Committee recommendations of 8 July 2008 which had specifically requested that the Board consider this evening.
	The Chair thanked the Clerk for his brief explanation and referred the Board to the circulated deliberations of the Advisory Committee which related to its deliberations – firstly on 8 July 2008, and secondly of 5 February 2008 of which in particular the Board had been as yet unable to express a view or give a clear response. The Chair advised that he wished the Board to respond on both sets of resolutions and give responses at this point in the proceedings.
	The Chair then asked Mr Liebeck – the Chair of the Advisory Committee to advise the Board of the resolutions for the Board to consider.
	 Mr Liebeck advised the Board that the circulated decisions of the Advisory Committee gave a clear view of how the Advisory Committee felt in respect of its concerns of how it was viewed, and that it would appear that the resolutions of the Advisory committee of 5 February 2008 had been ignored at a subsequent 3 Board

meetings;that with regard to the current development situation and the

on-going and protracted process the Advisory Committee were concerned at the lack of information forthcoming in relation to progress The Advisory Committee had not had sight of documents that it requested in respect of the draft lease and the Board's failure to disclose That the consultation process embarked upon by the Charity Commission had been inadequate, hence the resultant Judicial Review, and that there was a need to ensure that future consultation was reflective of the previous inadequacies That the Advisory Committee felt that the Board was not abiding by the requirements of the 1985 to use its best endeavours aive effect such to to reasonable recommendations of the advisory Committee and that it was not sufficient just to note the expressed concerns or requests as agreed by the Advisory Committee for the Board to consider; That the Advisory Committee was not being obstructive in its expressions of concern but wished to work in conjunction with the Board to ensure that all views and concerns were taken account of and clear responses given; In thanking Mr Liebeck for his summary the Chair advised that he did have a number of suggested responses for the Board to consider. In respect of the issue of the Board seemingly ignoring the Advisory Committee's expressed views on 3 separate occasions it was the case that they had not been ignored but that the Board was simply not in a position to respond on the issues until such time that it had considered its position with regard to its preferred partner. In apologising to the Committee that it had been under the impression that it was being ignored the Chair commented that it was the case that there was no further progress on the negotiations with the Firoka group which could be publicly divulged – there were discussions in relation to both legal and commercially sensitive matters and that the Board would at a future meeting be considering its options as regards the current situation. Once the Board had deliberated upon a number of factors and then had reached a decision then at that time the Advisory Committee would be informed. In relation to the six resolutions of the Advisory Committee of 5 February 2008 as detailed below the Chair felt that the Board should deliberate on each of the said resolutions in turn.

N.B The following is a summary of discussions of the Board and not a verbatim minute of the proceedings

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 5 FEBRUARY 2008

that in respect of a number of recommendations put to the Board by the Advisory Committee on 16th October 2007 (and the subsequent

response of the Board to those recommendations on 30th October 2007) (see attached marked A) the Advisory Committee request the Board to respond to the following points of clarification in a clear and considered manner giving reasons for either accepting or rejecting the Advisory Committee's advice:

Resolution 1

i. that the decision of the Board on 30th October 2007 not to review and/or reconsider the Board's responses of 14th November 2006 (as per attachment B), and deferring such consideration until the Charity Commission had indicated its position, was in the view of the Advisory Committee, unacceptable and that it appeared to this Committee that the Board was thereby failing to act in accordance with the 1985 Act;

Resolution 2

ii. that in view of the Judicial Review Decision of 5th October 2007 that the consultation process carried out by the Charity Commission was flawed; when the Charity Commission publishes its statement on how it intends to carry out a further consultation the Advisory Committee be provided with the relevant documents (unredacted) in order to enable the Advisory Committee to consider the proposals and express their view and tender advice to the Charity Commission and to the Board;

The Board discussed resolution (i) & (ii) in detail as to whether the Advisory Committee would be in a position to receive the full terms of the lease in un-redacted form and sign a 'non disclosure agreement' in terms of confidentiality.

Mr Liebeck commented that in terms of the findings of the Judicial that Charity Review it had commented the Commission's consultation had been guided somewhat by the views expressed by the Board and the preferred bidder and that the Charity Commission accordingly carried out its consultation based on such views. It was paramount that there be as much disclosure as there could possibly be and that the Board, as a public body needed to be sure that in any further consultation it ws not being dictated to in any way and that it needed to be able to give clear direction as to what it felt should be available to the public.

In clarification to points raised , the Trust Solicitor – Mr Harris stated that it would only be possible for the Board to disclose information contained within a draft lease **only** at the express permission of the Board, the Charity Commission, and the proposed lessee, given that its contents had both clearly

	sensitive commercial/financial, and legal information that was of a confidential nature which could not be exposed, as indeed stated in the Judicial review judgement, and therefore publication in an un-redacted form was not possible,(although some documentation could be redacted). the Chair summarised and in relation to resolutions (i) & (ii) the Board's response to the Advisory Committee would be as follows:
	RESPONSE
	i. that in view of the Judicial Review Decision of 5 th October 2007 that the consultation process carried out by the Charity Commission was flawed; when the Charity Commission publishes its statement on how it intends to carry out a further consultation the Advisory Committee be provided with the relevant documents (minimally redacted) in order to enable the Advisory Committee to consider the proposals and express their view and tender advice to the Charity Commission and to the Board;
	ii. That the Board accepted, as did the High Court, that the Charity Commission consultation was flawed and further accepts the principle that in any further consultation by the Commission the maximum number of relevant documents be produced with the minimal redactions possible, to recognise both the indications in the judgement of Mr Justice Sullivan that some key commercial information could be redacted, and the views of the Charity Commission, the Board and the prospective lessee.
of the Pu	bint in the proceedings, due to a disturbance caused by a Member blic, the Board agreed to adjourn for a period of 10 minutes. The journed at 20.35hrs and reconvened at 20.45hrs.

Resolution iii

iii. that the Board be asked to consider the points previously made in respect of the lack of disclosure of the proposed Lease and Project Agreement to the Advisory Committee, and to comment on the view of this Committee that, had proper disclosure been made, the outcome of the Judicial Review may have been different;

The Board briefly discussed the issue of lack of disclosure of the proposed Lease and Project Agreement to the Advisory Committee, and to comment on the view of this Committee that, had proper disclosure been made, the outcome of the Judicial Review may have been different, and following discussion the Chair summarised the Board's response to the Advisory Committee would be as follows;

RESPONSE

That the comments of the Advisory Committee that had there been disclosure of documentation the outcome of a judicial review application may have been different or no such application might have been made, be noted

Resolution iv

iv. that the Board should confirm that in respect of this Committee it will in future adopt the policy, principles and objectives of the London Borough of Haringey and central Government in relation to the consultation process concerning the Firoka proposals.

The Board discussed the resolution and commented that in respect of the issues of the consultation process whilst the Board sympathised with the views expressed the actual consultation process was something that was formulated and undertaken by the Charity Commission and therefore a process that the Board itself was unable to comment upon as it was neither the Board's or the Borough's consultation procedures. However the Chair commented that the Advisory Committee may wish to advise the Charity Commission of its views as to how it feels the Charity commission should conduct any future consultation.

The Chair then summarised the Board's response to the Advisory Committee would be as follows;

RESPONSE

The Board could not provide this confirmation because the consultation was by the Charity Commission and it is a matter for the Commission to decide upon the appropriate process. The Advisory Committee may wish to advise the Charity Commission of its views as to how it feels the Charity commission should conduct any future consultation.

Resolution v

v. that the Board agrees to respond in detail to the Advisory Committee's advice in future and provide the reasons for either accepting or rejecting such advice;

The Board discussed the resolution and commented that the Board will respond in detail to the Advisory Committee's advice in future and provide the reasons for either accepting or rejecting such advice.

The Chair then summarised the Board's response to the Advisory Committee would be as follows;

RESPONSE

that the Board will respond in detail to the Advisory Committee's advice in future and provide the reasons for either accepting or rejecting such advice.

vi. that the Board be requested to explain why the Board had not notified the Committee of the proposed Licence agreement to be entered into with the Firoka Group by APTL in May 2007, and the consequences of such arrangements on the finances of APTL

RESPONSE

That this was not a matter within the remit of the Advisory Committee

vii. that the Advisory Committee did not wish to be seen as being obstructive in its requests but was merely seeking to be properly equipped to fulfil its duties under the 1985 Act and to act in the best interests of the charity.

The Chair then summarised the Board's response to the Advisory Committee would be as follows:

RESPONSE

That the request of the Advisory Committee be noted. The Board's responses were detailed in the above responses.

The Chair then referred to the resolutions of the Advisory Committee of 8 July 2008 and asked that the Board consider the resolutions and respond accordingly.

In relation to the resolutions the Chair advised that its was the case that the resolutions of the Advisory Committee marked (A) had been responded to and, following a brief discussion it was summarised:

Resolution (i)

The Advisory Committee notes with considerable concern that the Board has yet to respond to the resolutions of the Advisory Committee of 5 February 2008 (see attached, marked (i)) despite the Board meeting on three separate occasions , namely on 26 February, and 10 and 19 March 2008;

Response

That the Board notes the concerns of the Advisory Committee and that the Advisory Committee be advised that the Board has considered the resolution of the Advisory Committee of 5 February 2008 as detailed above.

Resolution (ii)

That Board be requested without fail, to give due and proper consideration to the above resolutions of 5 February 2008 at its forthcoming meeting on 22 July 2008, and provide a detailed response thereto

Response

That the Board has considered the resolution of the Advisory Committee of 5 February 2008

Resolution iii

That the Board be asked to note the Advisory Committee's concern at the brevity and lack of any meaningful information imparted by the General Manager in relation to the future of the asset at its meeting on 8th July, 2008, against, in the wider context of the lack of consultation in respect of other issues affecting the Palace during the past year, including the terms of the proposed Agreements with, and Lease to, Firoka, the matter of the licence agreement entered into with Firoka, and the granting of an on-premises gaming licence for the World Darts Championships.

The Chair reiterated the earlier comments expressed in relation to the future of the asset, and that following detailed comment in respect of the resolution the Chair summarised and the following response was agreed:

RESPONSE

That the Board notes the concerns of the Advisory Committee and advises that the General Manager was unable to comment further on the current negotiations with the preferred bidder due to their delicate and critical state and the complex legal issues involved upon which further advice is awaited and that until such discussions had been concluded and detailed advice received and then considered by the Board in a further Special meeting there was no further information to be imparted to the Advisory Committee in respect of progress at this stage.

In relation to the resolutions the Chair advised that it was the case that the resolutions of the Advisory Committee marked (B) in relation to the Alexandra Park Club, the matter would be discussed during the exempt part of the proceedings. However he asked that the Trust Solicitor give a brief outline of where the Committee was in relation to negotiations.

Mr Harris advised the Board the cricket club had entered in to a lease in the summer of 2003 at rental set for review in 5 years. The lease was now up for review and the Trust was obliged in accordance with the terms of the 1985 Act to let at the best rent that could reasonably be obtained. The trust was therefore in negotiation with the Club as to the likely level of rent and negotiations were currently progressing. The principles for the rent review were clearly defined and the Trust was operating within those principles.

Mr Liebeck commented on the reports within the local press of the dramatic increases in the rent levels which could easily prevent the Club from continuing its operation and that surely it was a matter of principle on the part of the trust to ensure that rent level as were at an affordable level to ensure continued local community use. Councillor Oakes commented that it may be the case that a number of the circulated rumours of likely increases may have been triggered by the Club itself.

In response to further points of clarification Mr Harris reminded the Board that it was obliged as a charity to obtain the best possible rent and would be in breach of trust if it did not do so.

In response to the resolutions the Chair summarised and in respect of the following resolutions the response were as indicated:

Resolution (i)

The Board notes the concerns of the Advisory Committee at rumours circulating of the likely level of the increase of the rent

Response

The Board notes the concerns of the Advisory Committee at rumours circulating of the likely level of the increase of the rent.

Resolution ii

That the Board be urged to set a rent which was at a reasonable and affordable level, to ensure the continued existence and operation of the Cricket Club

Response

Whilst the Board notes and is mindful of the concerns of the Advisory Committee to ensure that the Board sets a rent which was at a reasonable and affordable level, to ensure the continued existence and operation of the Cricket Club, the Advisory Committee be advised of the principal duty of the Board as Charitable Trustees to set a rent at a level that is the best rent reasonably obtainable subject to use; to the extent that there is a difference between a reasonable and affordable rent and the best rent, if the Board were to set the former it would be acting in breach of trust and this advice must therefore be rejected.

Resolution iii

That the Board consider agreeing a variation to the terms of the existing Lease to permit the possible subletting of the Cricket Club facilities to other (cricket) users. for example, during weekdays, to ensure it remains a viable entity

Response

That the Board have authorised officers to negotiate on this aspect of the Alexandra Park Club's desires

APBO05.	QUESTIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS ; TO CONSIDER ANY QUESTIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS RECEIVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART FOUR, SECTION B 29 OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION There were no questions, deputations or petitions.
	NOTED
APBO06.	AUDITORS TO THE PALACE
	The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.
	The General Manager, with reference to the current auditors (Deloitte and Touche) to the Board and the services of the Senior Partner Mr Framjee, informed Members that Mr Framjee would be leaving this firm at the end of 2008. The report before the Board recommended that the Board continue with the existing auditors for the audit of the 2008/09 accounts and then consider options for review and a tendering process to be embarked upon.
	The Chair asked if there were any points of clarification.
	Councillor Hare commented that there has been some considerable debate when the accounts had been considered during the February and March meeting cycles with regard the appropriateness of considering a change and the seeming resistance to such proposals despite concerns given at the familiarity of the current auditor that whether there was a fair and independent assessment of his findings. He also questioned the difficulties that would occur in changing auditors at a certain stage in the current assessment process.
	The Chair reminded the Board that it had confirmed the appointment of Deloitte and Touche as its Auditors for 2007/8 and that this process would continue. The Board was being notified that it was the intention of the Board to review the future arrangements of external auditors commencing from 2009/10.
	In response to further points of clarification from Councillor Hare, the LB Haringey's Director of Corporate Resources – Julie Parker, advised that the auditing would continue with Deloitte and Touche and indeed the Board did consider appointments on a yearly basis. Given the amount of activity in terms of the previous accounts there was considerable understanding of how the accounts were put together by the current auditor. On balance it was reasonable to tender for the Auditor for 2009/10.
	On a MOTION by the Chair it was:
	RESOLVED
	That approval be given to the appointment of Deloitte and Touche as the Trust's external auditors to carry out the 2008/09 audit of accounts, and that the General Manager be authorised to commence the tender process for the selection of external auditors for 2009/10.

APBO07.	BANKING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CHARITY:
	The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.
	The General Manager - Mr Loudfoot advised of the background to the banking arrangements in that in respect of the trustee's bank account as detailed within the circulated report. Since 2002 the arrangement settled upon was that the Charity's current account would be maintained at a constant cleared overnight balance with a bi-directional sweep carried out by the bank on a daily basis.
	Mr Loudfoot reported that LBH had recently changed its banking provider from the Co-Operative Bank to the Royal Bank of Scotland and the facility for sweeping of the account was not possible 'inter-bank'. This had led to the need for the Local Authority treasury department to manually process a balancing transaction on a daily basis. The automated sweep service did not attract a cost to either organisation whereas the manual processing currently being undertaken resulted in a charge.
	In addition to the greater efficiency of the automatic sweep, the new provider also offered an enhanced level of service and facilities in respect of account control and this additional service would benefit the Charity in the operation of it's banking arrangements.
	In proposing the change in bank account, the opening or closing of a Charity bank account would require the specific resolution of the charity trustees.
	In respect of the account signatory arrangements Mr Loudfoot advised that the existing signatories from the charity to the account were one officer and two trustees. The Local Authority also had two signatories but under the agreed protocol they did not authorise any transactions beyond the sweep arrangements. The authorisation limits currently applicable had not been reviewed or updated for many years, the existing mandate was for one signature for amounts up to $\$5,000$ and for any two signatures for amounts over $\$5,000$. Mr Loudfoot felt that it may be prudent at this time to review the mandate at the same time as the proposed change of provider.
	The Chair asked if there were any specific points of clarification.
	Mr Tarpey, in commenting that the main reason for the proposed change was due , in the main, to the sweep arrangements, sought clarification as to whether Alexandra Palace Trading Ltd were also required to change their banking arrangements. Mr Loudfoot responded that the banking arrangements for APTL were a matter for APTL and were unaffected by the proposed arrangements.
	The Board briefly discussed the issue of the currently applicable mandate and concluded that it did not wish to vary the arrangements.
	The Chair then MOVED and it was:
	RESOLVED

 i. That the General Manager Alexandra Palace be authorised to open a new bank account with the Royal Bank of Scotland and when appropriate to close the existing accounts held at the Co-Operative bank; and ii. That the mandate applicable for the new account should be the same as for the existing account arrangements.
TWO MONTHS RESULTS TO THE END OF MAY 2008 AND FULL YEAR FORECAST 2008/09:
The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the circulated report.
The General Manager – Mr Loudfoot advised the Board of the 2 month result to the end of May 2008 and the forecast to the end of the year.
Mr Loudfoot TABLED a revised appendix II for Members to consider and apologised that the original had a printing error which had left out the figures for year end. (a copy of which will be interleaved with the minutes.) Mr Loudfoot advised that the Board that its meeting on 26th February 2008 had agreed to set its net budget estimate for 2007/08 at £1,681,826. This estimate reflected the activity of the charity (post the transfer of the ice rink into APTL) and mainly comprised the maintenance of the Palace building, the through road, the other buildings within the park and contracts for provision of building security, planned preventative maintenance services, legal and professional fees associated with the management of the Charity and the costs of the maintenance of the Park. Mr Loudfoot also advised that the Local Authority had agreed providing the necessary support to the charity and had made provision for the sum of £1.7 million for the current financial year.
Mr Loudfoot referred the Board to the TABLED Appendix II which summarised the projected end of year out-turn, forecast to be a deficit of £1.686 million. He added that expenditure at the 2 months point was broadly in line with budget with minor variances in income and compensatory savings between the various expenditure heads. Total deficit was £463K against a budget of £459K a current overspend of £4K or 1%.
There being no questions from Members, it was:
RESOLVED
 i. That the income and expenditure for 2 months to end of May 2008, summarised at Appendix I of the report be noted; and ii. That the projected year end out-turn summarised in the TABLED Appendix II be noted.

APBO09.	PROVISIONAL FULL YEAR 2007/08 OUTTURN :
	The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the circulated report.
	Mr Loudfoot advised the Board that the Accounts of the charity for the year ended 31 st March 2008 would have to be submitted to the Charity Commission by no later than 31 st January 2009. It was the case that the accounts of the Charity did not form part of the accounts of the London Borough of Haringey, however, a draft set of the accounts figures including draft notes to the accounts had been presented to the authority for use as an appendix to their accounts. The draft was attached for information at Appendix II of the report.
	With regard to the 2008 accounts the Mr Loudfoot advised that the Board would be asked to formally consider the year end management accounts alongside the final version of the audited accounts and this will be after the external audit has been completed, however, draft management accounts were accompanying the circulated report for reference and would be presented again together with a detailed narrative when considering the audited accounts. The tabulation at Appendix I of the report summarised the financial information for the year ending 31 st March 2008.
	Mr Loudfoot advised that work had commenced on the independent external audit of the groups accounts and the implementation of the board's resolution to fully adopt FRS 17 in relation to pension funding for the group accounts for the year ending 31 st March 2008. Once the bulk of the external audit had been completed a draft text of the trustee report for inclusion into the formal accounts, would be circulated in order for the trustees to have opportunity to comment on the contents prior to the finalisation of the text.
	In response to a number of points of clarification the Trust Solicitor – Mr Harris advised that in terms of submission of the accounts to the Charity Commission by 30 January 2009 there should be no slippage in terms of that date.
	In response to the comments of the Chair in respect of recent press coverage in terms of the Charity's accounts at a recent LB Haringey General Purposes Committee the LB Haringey's Director of Corporate Resources – Ms Parker advised that the General Purposes Committee had received the Council's accounts, which appended thereto were the Trust Accounts. The General Purposes Committee noted that the accounts relating to Alexandra Palace & Park were included as an appendix for information only, being the responsibility of the Alexandra Palace Board to approve. The Committee had agreed to add a note to the accounts, stating that those relating to Alexandra Palace were subject to formal audit in accordance with Charity Commission regulations. The

	General Purposes Committee would further consider the accounts in September 2008.	
	There being no further points of clarification, on a MOTION by the Chair it was:	
	RESOLVED	
	i. That the provisional income and expenditure for year ended 31 March 2008 be noted;	
	ii. that the annual external audit currently underway be noted, and that audited accounts would be presented to a future meeting of the Board in time to meet the Charity Commission deadline of 30 January 2009 for submission of accounts; and	
	iii. that it be noted that the detailed management accounts will be presented alongside the audited accounts to assist with the interpretation of the accounts.	
APBO10.	PARK UPDATE (ACTIVITIES):	
	The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.	
	The Park Manager – Mr Evison reported that following on from the previous Board meeting the a bench had been installed in the tree-line at Redston Field on a trial basis, and in order to address concerns that it may become a focal point for anti-social behaviour in the evenings the area would be monitored.	
	In terms of celebrating the successful completion of the HLF project a launch event would take place on Sunday 10 th August 2008, which would involve a tour of the park to look at the project elements. The tour would be lead by the Principle Landscape Architect for the project. A bird watching event had taking place the previous weekend to much success and other community, volunteer and charity events, and walks were planned in the ensuing weeks.	
	With regard to the Grounds maintenance contract which commenced on 1 st May 2008 the contract was running well, and staff had successfully transferred over to the contractor – John O'Connor.	
	The Board commented on the beauty of the Park at the current time and that the contractor be written to expressing the Board's appreciation. The Chair undertook to send the letter on behalf of the Board.	
	Mr Evison further advised that the Park had been awarded Green Flag status and that there would be a public announcement of this in the next few days.	
	The being no further comments it was:	

	RESOLVED
	That the report be noted.
APBO11.	PARK SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS:
	The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.
	The Park Manager – Mr Evison advised the Board that following the article by the Hornsey Journal in April 2008 which reported concerns about public safety in the skate park on its front page on it was felt necessary to give the Board a brief update on how the various agencies involved worked together to maintain security in the park.
	Mr Evison advised that Park security was be divided into four aspects:
	 Alexandra Palace Security Contract Haringey Council Parks Constabulary Alexandra Ward Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) Police 999 response
	Mr Evison highlighted the 24-hour security service for the palace and park, provided by Mitie Security (London) Ltd which included an on-site presence including 24-hour CCTV monitoring, security guards, and patrol vehicle. The guards locked/unlocked the lakeside and play area toilets and patrolled the lakeside area on a regular basis. The security vehicle regularly patrolled around the park at all hours of the day and night . The mobile patrol and palace guards also attended incidents responsively – either observed on CCTV, reported by staff or reported by the public, and if it was deemed necessary, the emergency services would be called.
	It was the case that 119 incidents were recorded in the last year, including incidents such as extinguishing of barbeques, advice to unruly youths, removal of abandoned vehicles and attendance at road traffic accidents.
	Mr Evison further advised that the Parks Police usually patrolled the park in pairs for four hours a day, Thursday to Sunday, and spent at least one hour a day patrolling Monday – Wednesday. However their duties also brought them through the park whilst travelling around the borough and they attend on a responsive basis at all other times. The Parks Police also provided additional patrols outside normal hours when need has arisen. The Parks Police had dealt with over forty incidents in the park. These ranged from fixed penalty notices for dog fouling and littering to returning truants to school and words of advice to unruly youths.
	Following points of clarification with regard to some of the reported incidents it was:

	RESOLVED
	That the report be noted.
APBO12.	NEW ITEMS OF UNRESTRICTED URGENT BUSINESS:
	There were no unrestricted items of urgent business.
	NOTED
APBO13.	EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC:
	RESOLVED
	That the press and public be excluded the from the meeting for consideration of Items 14-18 as they contain exempt information as defined in 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), and information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings
APBO14.	MINUTES: TO APPROVE THE EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 10 MARCH 2008, AND THE SPECIAL MEETINGS HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY, AND 19 MARCH 2008 (ATTACHED) RESOLVED
	Agreed minutes.
APBO15.	FUTURE OF THE ASSET:
	Agreed recommendations as moved by the Chair.
APBO16.	ALEXANDRA PARK CRICKET CLUB - LEASE ARRANGEMENTS:
	Agreed recommendations as moved by the Chair.
APBO17.	SECURITY CONTRACT PROVISION FOR APPCT:
	Agreed recommendations as moved by the Chair.
APBO18.	ENGINEERING CONTRACT EXTENSION FOR APPCT
	Agreed recommendations as moved by the Chair.
APBO19.	DATES OF MEETINGS OF THE BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2008/09: 21 October 2008 24 February 2009

APBO20. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS:

There were no items of exempt urgent business.

NOTED

The meeting ended at 22.40hrs

COUNCILLOR MATT COOKE

Chair