

MINUTES OF MEETING Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee HELD ON Tuesday, 30th November, 2021, 19:30-20:40

PRESENT:

Councillors: Anne Stennett, Elin Weston and Bob Hare

ALSO ATTENDING:

Jacob O'Callaghan (Consultative Committee Member), Gordon Hutchinson (Consultative Committee Member), Nigel Willmott (Chair) (Consultative Committee Member), Duncan Neill (Consultative Committee Member), Jason Beazley (Consultative Committee Member), Annette Baker (Consultative Committee Member)

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Dana Carlin and Mr Richard Hudson.

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None were declared.

51. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

52. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

Ms Rachael Macdonald had stated that she would not be a member as noted on page 2 of the minutes.

Ms Annette Baker was not present on the list of attendees.

At the last Alexandra Palace TV Group meeting, Ms Rachael Macdonald was appointed as Deputy.

RESOLVED: That, subject to the above changes, the minutes of the Consultative Committee meeting on 4 October 2021 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

The Committee considered the minutes of the Joint Statutory Advisory Committee and Consultative Committee held on 4 October 2021.

The Committee noted that Mr Duncan Neill needed to be listed as present at the meeting as a Member of the Consultative Committee (not the Statutory Advisory Committee). The

Committee also noted that Ms Liz Richardson and Councillor Scott Emery had sent their apologies for the meeting.

Mr Jacob O'Callaghan's comments on 7a (traffic enforcement) should also include thanking AP Staff for taking prompt action in relation to joyriders which were a problem and he appreciated that urgent action needed to be taken.

In relation to point I (Park Lighting), the action was to be taken by Ms Natalie Layton and the issue had been placed on the agenda for 13 December 2021 on the Alexandra Palace and Park Board.

On Point J (Black History Month), a reference should be changed to read 'Si Grant's' name as 'Cy Grant'.

RESOLVED: That the Joint Statutory Advisory Committee and Consultative Committee held on 4 October 2021 be noted.

The Committee considered the draft minutes of the meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 11 October 2021.

In relation to the Mast Lighting Policy, it appeared that the report did not certify that the item had been subject to consultation to the Consultative Committee or the Statutory Advisory Committee or with other interested groups.

The Committee noted that the Board would be happy for the item to be brought to the Consultative Committee for future consultation as policies and issues were regularly reviewed.

RESOLVED: That the draft minutes of the meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 11 October 2021 be noted.

53. CEO'S REPORT

The Committee commented that:

- In relation to the major events being discussed on page 20 of the agenda papers, the times of the events would be included in future reports. Independent noise consultants are employed for large events with amplified music to monitor sound levels and also monitor in response to complaints during the events.
- Congratulations were in order regarding the Theatre hosting the BBC Earthshot Awards. In response to questioning about the Earthshot team's donation of trees and shrubs, it was noted that the Park Manager had approved the acquisition.
- It was important to acknowledge the Green Heritage Site Accreditation.
- The community payback scheme was working very well.
- The Committee noted the amount of rubbish (100 tonnes) collected on site since 1 April 2021.
- The festoon lighting applied for as part of the Outdoor Beer Garden Improvements planning application would have involved fixing to the historic fabric.

- The lighting around Dukes Avenue had not received any recent complaints. The Committee noted that the bus stop lights had been dealt with. Any issues should be noted with the location and referred accordingly to see if remedial work could be done.
- Some of the lighting in the park was not working. This was covered in the report. Attempts were underway to get remedial fixes in place. As this was potentially quite costly, a solar solution was being trialled. In the meantime, feedback on what was and what was not working was useful and attempts would be made to fix any lighting, but attempting to make old infrastructure work creates additional problems and delays in fixing.
- The Salix lighting project scheme was an interest free loan, calculated on payback over a period of time. This loan is paid back from the money saved on energy usage. . The total cost was around £500,000 and the payback would be under five years. However, the savings would take a longer period if energy costs kept going up
- The use of weedkiller had been reduced. The Park team had been challenged to come up with a solution avoiding its use. Manual removal of weeds is not taking place. The Trust welcomes volunteers to assist in controlling the weeds Members of the public will need to get used to seeing more weeds on site and are encouraged to consider them to be pavement plants.
- The provision of creative learning had changed during the coronavirus crisis. There had been a reduction in terms of volume of beneficiaries reached but there was a greater need for a targeted and wider range of delivery methods. On future funding streams, the team continue to apply for appropriate funding to support effective delivery and impact in combination with paid for activities.
- The family area had been congested during the Palace's Fireworks event and the speakers appeared to be loud for a family area. This would be taken into consideration by the team for future planning. Some of the congestion at the event was due to the wi-fi outage that had occurred as people walked around to find available wi-fi so they could download their NHS Covid passes. However, ticket holders were encouraged to download their passes before they arrived at the premises.
- The Palace had not been notified regarding the Haringey Council Controlled Parking Zone consultation that affected some streets surrounding the palace.

RESOLVED:

1. That the update be noted.

54. PROPOSAL TO PILOT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHANGES

The meeting heard a variety of views including that:

- Some members were in favour of the proposals in the paper as it was evident that the current structure of the Committee was not the most representative group of residents in the borough and not the best way of representing stakeholders. However, it would be useful to confirm what the objectives of the forum actually were. In the past public meetings such as the licensing proposal in 2017 had worked well with members of the

public giving and discussion giving their views. One of the strengths of the Committee was that it had Board trustees as members.

- There appeared to be a risk that the Committee may become a question and answer session and this may not be productive.
- The reports, such as CEO reports, being submitted to the Committee three to four times a year was a good way to keep up to date and the Committees would like to see this practice continue for the open forum.
- It would be useful if the regular routine reports, which were available on the Council's website, were also made available to anybody who wanted them on the AP Website perhaps by linking to the Council's committee pages.
- Although the report considered the need for more community proportionate representation, it did not appear to represent the beneficiaries of the Charity. There were specific matters which needed to be referred to the Statutory Advisory Committee by law and some matters to the Consultative Committee due to the Council's constitution. There were many items that were put before the Board that did not come before either the Statutory Advisory or the Consultative Committees. The Board advertised any proposed decision one week before the meeting. The proposed forum stated that the public needed to provide two weeks' notice before submitting a question, but it would not be technically possible to do this as the papers to the Board were only published one week before. It was clarified that only items for including on the agenda should be requested with 2 weeks' notice.
- The proposal had only been published for about a week. The legal advice stated that there were no issues with the proposals for the pilot as long as the structure was unchanged, but it appeared that the proposal would change the structure. The proposals should not be agreed until a specially convened meeting of the Consultative Committee so that all interested parties including people from different organisations could attend it and provide their suggestions.
- It was possible to consider not agreeing to abolish the Consultative Committee but still have an open forum and have a positive pilot scheme. The forum could meet two times a year. This would help to examine how well the proposed processes would work.
- A discussion needed to be held on what an open forum would look like, how people would be brought into the conversation and a meeting could be held regarding the processes of the open forum.
- It needed to be clarified that the Consultative Committee could only be abolished by the Council.
- Solely advertising on social media would likely miss much of the target audience, particularly those who did not use social media. Other methods of advertising were necessary such as the use of posters in community centres, places of worship and local areas. Residents were more likely to become aware of the arrangements if signposting in those areas were used.
- It was difficult for the Consultative Committee to provide their views on ongoing issues if it was not meeting often enough.

- It would be disappointing to see the Committee not move forward with any proposed changes as there was at least some agreement amongst everybody that some form of a change was required. The Committee could at least see how the changes would take effect and facilitate a feedback loop.

The Chair stated that he had deep philosophical objection to the proposed model of governance and that it was premature to make a decision to approve the proposals as put forward at this point. There needed to be more discussion and the Consultative Committee should meet without Councillors to examine views at a greater depth. An initial trial period of 12 months had been proposed, however, during a conversation with senior council officers, the suggestion of a two-year pilot was put forward as their experience revealed that one year was quite a short timeframe to establish a wider understanding.. There was a big difference between a properly constituted council committee and an open forum. Consideration needed to be given as to what would happen if the Consultative Committee was lost, some members felt that the Statutory Advisory Committee and Consultative Committee were likely to be taken more seriously and be more constructive if separated.

The proposals needed to be taken to the next Consultative Committee so that a more full discussion could be held.

The Committee agreed that as an action, the proposals would be discussed at the next Consultative Committee, but also agreed to start the process of the idea of an open forum in principle. This was so that officers could be tasked with taking action so that some progress could be made.

The Chair stated that Ms Louise Stewart would be leaving in the new year and wished to express the Committee's thanks for her work in the last six years as she had left an admirable legacy and played a key role on how Alexandra Palace operated and oversaw improvements in governance and management structure.

Ms Stewart thanked her team and support from stakeholders.

RESOLVED:

- 1 That the proposals be submitted and discussed at the next Committee.
- 2 That initial work be started on the processes of an open forum.

55. MATTERS RAISED BY INTERESTED GROUPS

There were none.

56. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

57. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

9 March 2022. Meeting of the Joint Statutory Advisory Committee and the Consultative Committee.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date