

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STATUTORY)

24 JANUARY 2006

Members present (indicated thus*)

NOMINATED BY LOCAL RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS

*Ms. J. Hutchinson	:	Alexandra Residents' Association
*Mr P. Wastell	:	Alexandra Residents' Association
*Ms. M. Myers	:	Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association
*Ms J. Baker	:	Palace Gates Residents' Association
*Mr. D. Frith	:	The Rookfield Association
Mr. F. Hilton	:	The Rookfield Association
*Mr. D. Liebeck (Chair)	:	Warner Estate Residents' Association
*Mr H. Aspden	:	Warner Estate Residents' Association

Appointed Members:

*Councillor D. Beacham	:	Alexandra Ward
Councillor B. Millar	:	Bounds Green Ward
Councillor S.Gilbert	:	Fortis Green Ward
*Councillor Q. Prescott	:	Hornsey Ward (arrived at 19.42)
Councillor J. Bloch	:	Muswell Hill Ward
Vacancy	:	Noel Park Ward
Vacancy	:	
*Councillor E. Prescott	:	(arrived at 19.42)

*Members present.

Also in attendance

Councillor Hare

Mr K. Holder - General Manager - Alexandra Palace
Mr D. Loudfoot - Facilities Manager Parks - Alexandra Palace
Mr C. Hart – Clerk to the Committee

At 19:30HRS the Clerk – Mr Hart advised those present that the meeting was inquorate, and in accordance with the rules of procedures there would be a 15 minute period in order to allow those members who were not present to arrive.

At 19:45HS Mr Hart advised that the meeting was now quorate and the meeting was able to commence.

032 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

There were no apologies given.

033 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

034 CHANGES TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Agenda Item 3)

The Chair advised the Committee of the resignation of Councillor Wayne Hoban (Alexandra Ward) from the Advisory Committee and the appointment of Councillor David Beacham (Alexandra Ward) to fill the vacancy, as confirmed at the Full Council meeting on 9 January 2006.

The Chair also advised the Committee of the resignation of Ms E Tulloch - Palace Gates Residents' Association from her position on the Advisory Committee and the appointment of Ms Jackie Baker to fill the vacancy.

On behalf the Advisory Committee the Chair welcomed both Ms Baker and Councillor Beacham as newly appointed Members of the Advisory Committee.

035 MINUTES (Agenda Item 4)

(i) Notes of the Inquorate Advisory Committee – 15 November 2005

The Chair asked if there were any points of clarification as to the notes.

Mr Aspden referred to the issue of the previous meeting of the Advisory Committee being inquorate and asked for clarification as to:

- the rules and procedures in this respect of Advisory Committee meetings being inquorate;
- the status of the notes of the inquorate meeting and whether they could be formally endorsed, together with whether the minutes that were put to that meeting could be considered and signed off;
- the notes of the inquorate meeting showed that 3 members were present at 19:45HRS before Cllr Hoban arrived.

The Clerk – Mr Hart, responded that in terms of inquorate/ quorate meetings, as detailed in the rules of procedures it was stated that should a meeting be inquorate at the commencement time a 15 minute period of time should be given to await the arrival of members. Should, after that time the member attendance still be inquorate then the meeting should be declared abandoned. The Committee was then able to have an informal meeting, the notes of which would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

Mr Hart advised that at the previous inquorate meeting the meeting was declared inquorate at 19.45HRS and although Councillor Hoban arrived at 19.58HRS the meeting could not then become quorate. Mr Hart further

advised that should members of the public have been present at the point 19:45HRs and had subsequently left due to the meeting being declared and then the meeting was declared quorate on a Member's arrival then this would be open to challenge by the members of the public who had left the proceedings with the impression that such proceeding were inquorate and that no decisions could be taken.

Mr Hart also advised that the notes of the proceedings were inaccurate as Cllr E. Prescott had not been present at all during the proceeding and should be amended thus. With regard to the status of the notes of the proceedings of 15 November 2006 it was the case that as the meeting was inquorate the notes had no legal stand as a formal record and therefore could not be acted upon. With regard to the minutes of the meetings held on 14 June 2005 and 6 September 2005 these would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee for its approval.

Following further comments and points of clarification from Mr Aspden in terms of regulating the rules and procedures the Chair felt that it would be appropriate for the Committee to address these issues later in the proceedings. In terms of the notes of the inquorate meeting held on 15 November 2005 the Chair felt that these should be formally endorsed and it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That the notes of the inquorate meeting of the Advisory Committee held on 15 November 2005 be noted and endorsed as an accurate record of those proceedings.
- ii. That the minutes of the meetings of the Advisory Committee held on 14 June, and 6 September 2005 be submitted to the next meeting of the Advisory Committee on 28 March 2006.

(ii) Board Meeting – 29 November 2005

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Board meetings held on 29 November 2005 and 10 January 2006 be noted.

Matters Arising

Mr Aspden referred to Minute APP017 – and sought clarification as to the information relating to the criteria for evaluation and asked for some clarification and guidance on this issue. Mr Aspden felt that it was difficult to have an understanding of the process unless the evaluation criteria were known to the Advisory Committee.

The General Manager -Mr Holder responded that whilst such a request could be put to the Board he advised that cautiously such criteria contained crucial commercial information not for the public domain, and that all parties had signed confidentiality clauses to not disclose

information therefore the need to ensure that this was maintained. The disclosure was therefore unlikely.

In response to further questions Mr Holder advised that para 4 of the development brief set out the criteria for the bidders to address and was as such not confidential to the bidders. However any disclosure of responses to other parties could result in the Board being challenged on the process it had agreed and embarked upon. Therefore a request for the information could be considered by the board whilst the responses could not be made public.

036 **Future use of the Asset – Update (Verbal report of the General Manager Alexandra Palace) (Agenda Item 5)**

The Chair asked the General Manager – Mr Holder to give a brief introduction and background.

Mr Holder advised that following the meeting of the Board of 29 November 2005 the 3 preferred bidders - The Business Design Centre Group Ltd, Earls and Olympia Group Ltd, and Firoka (Heythrop Park) Ltd. had been required to submit their detailed proposals (“Proposals”) by 6th January 2006, and the Bidders had been asked to provide significant amounts of information in their Proposals, as detailed in section 4 of the development brief. He advised that as Members of the Committee were aware The Business Design Centre Group Ltd had withdrawn from the process on 21st December 2005.

At the Board meeting on 29 November 2005 it had been agreed that each of the bidders had been asked to make a presentation of their proposals to the Board. Of the two remaining bidders Earls and Olympia Group Ltd. [ECO] had declined to give a presentation to the Board whereas Firoka (Heythrop Park) Ltd,[Firoka] had complied with the development brief and given a presentation to the Board on 10 January 2006. Further ECO did not submit presentation boards for public display.

Mr Holder then gave a succinct outline of the Firoka bid which covered:

- to introduce additional uses to supplement the existing activities within the Palace, in a manner that reflected the original vision of the Palace, as a place of public entertainment on a grand scale.
- three distinct areas of use and related phases (as illustrated by an axonometric). Phase 1 (central areas) related to Exhibition use, Phase 2 (west end) to Hospitality and Phase 3 (east end) Community uses. The phases could be sequential or concurrent depending on the level and complexity of the existing business use at any one time. The existing Exhibition Halls would be refurbished and additional means of escape provided to increase both the capacity and flexibility of the Halls.
- Firoka’s intention to work with Mr Smith & the Alexandra Palace Organ Society to ensure The Willis Organ could be retained with the goal being, an increase in the range of concerts and attractions at the Palace.

- In respect of Hospitality - this included the existing Palm Court from which the Hotel, Bar, Restaurant and relocated 1000 seat replacement Panorama Room were accessed. The 150 bedroom Alexandra Palace Hotel would be located in the restored south wing relating to the arcaded façade and the historical Glazed Corridor with lounges and suites located in the south west tower. Also, a casino and “Camden-style” market.
- the Community facilities, arranged around the three centrally stacked uses of Studio Cinemas, Bowling and a new 3rd floor Ice Rink. The historical Theatre would be incorporated within the Studio Cinemas to restore both its historical use as a Cinema whilst also providing a historical setting for theatre groups;
- other Community facilities including a Fitness Centre, Children’s Indoor Play and Crèche, Cafes, Bars, Retail and a rooftop Restaurant. A Museum celebrating the history of the Palace and its broadcasting history with the BBC would be created, including a reconstructed working Recording Studio that could be used by the BBC for training.
- Additional points: the height line would be raised by approximately 2 metres.
- proposals to create a multi-storey car park in the North Yard, re-open the staircase and create a terrace to give all-round access.

Mr Holder then gave a brief outline of the Earls Court and Olympia Group Limited ‘s bid and reiterated his earlier comments that Earls Court and Olympia Group Ltd (ECO). had declined to either give a presentation or submit presentation boards for public display. Mr Holder further advised that both remaining bidders had been given exactly the same notice for giving presentations.

Mr Holder then outlined the proposed submission and draft Heads of Terms submitted by Earls Court and Olympia Group Ltd by advising that it was proposed to carry out a comprehensive refurbishment and development of the whole of the Palace. In consultation with English Heritage and LB Haringey the aim was to provide a high quality mixed use exhibition, leisure, retail, office, housing and recreational development of the whole of the Development Footprint. To achieve this it would be a requirement that on completion of the purchase the primary activities of the Palace would cease to allow the building works to be carried out. The tenant would not be liable for taking on any staff or undelivered contracts.

Also, they wish to acquire the Paddock (and other?) car park and release 100 spaces to the Trust. This is outside the offered footprint.

Mr Holder outlined the main points of community interest within the bid as follows:

- In terms of the organ funding would be provided for its relocation to a more appropriate setting where it would be used on a more regular basis;
- A media / heritage / educational facility located at the studios. In the short term funding would be provided to

enhance the visitor experience of the 2 studios, and guided tours for the public would be provided on a weekly basis. Discussions were on going with interested parties for the long term use of the area;

- The theatre would be put into a safe shell condition and used for rehearsal space for local drama students and professional companies. Discussions were being held with local theatre groups;
- ice skating was a growing minority interest sport and funding would be provided for minor decorations and improvements and increased marketing of the facilities. In view of the condition of the equipment it was viewed unlikely that the ice rink would continue in use beyond 2009. At that stage the area would be integrated into the main exhibition/leisure use;
- All exhibition, event and Head Office staff are not required by the purchasers. The vendors to/ be responsible for all redundancies by completion;
- Exchange of contracts within 12 working weeks (period of exclusivity) followed by completion 12 months thereafter. Upon completion full vacant possession would be required with the exception of any ongoing commercial leases/licenses [but excluding the exhibition and events contracts]

Members of the Advisory Committee sought and received clarification as to both bids from Mr Holder.

The meeting then adjourned at 21:20HRS and reconvened at 21:30HRS.

The Chair then asked, and Members gave their views as to the development proposals – as summarised below in consensus form

N.B their comments represent similar views expressed on a range of issues for each bid:

- That in respect of the ECO bid - surprise, disappointment and concern that ECO had disregarded and/or failed to address or take into account in their vision of the future of the Asset and the importance of the continued availability of certain facilities for community use
- the bid appeared to display an over- emphasis on commercial development at the expense of community use by the eventual closure of the ice rink facility, and the removal of the historic Willis Organ to an outside location
- ECO appeared to have disregarded or failed to appreciate that they were required to restrict their proposals to the “footprint” of the Palace, viz. its proposals with regard to existing car park facilities outside the “footprint
- in the light of the fact that the ECO’s bid had failed to present its proposals in any detailed or meaningful fashion, including the lack of any public display board, whether ECO fully understood what was required in making its bid by the deadline of 6 January 2006

- to ask the Board to seek professional advice and/or to satisfy itself that all the rules applying to the bidding process were made clear to ECO, and whether the Board ought to have given ECO an extension of time to allow any further more detailed submission by ECO;
- the Firoka's vision of 3 phases and/ or "zones" namely for hotel and hospitality, exhibition and community/leisure usages in principle, provided a good balance in terms of the continued mixed use of the Asset for community and commercial purposes, with the proposal to retain and upgrade the existing ice rink facility, and restore and maintain the Willis Organ for future use in the Palace
- concern at the possible encroachment of the Firoka proposals into the Park area and whether there would be health and safety problems arising from the required density of use to make these proposals commercially viable
- concerns at the lack of drawings or plans to illustrate the Firoka vision of the intended development and appearance of the north side of the building and some uncertainty and concerns as to the proposed use of this area
- that CUFOS continue to occupy its premises without interruption under its existing lease and be allowed to continue operating beyond its expiry date of March 2011;
- severe criticism of the lack of a proper public consultation process in respect of the proposal(s) and bid(s) , namely a lack of a reasonable period of time, insofar as the period of consultation from the date on which the "bids" were made public lasted barely 6 days, that there was merely a single display board of the Firoka bid on display, without any provision for a more meaningful exposition of their proposals being provided by Firoka or the Board in the form of a video presentation, e.g. on an hourly basis during the day for a (reasonable) consultation period
- that the Board should be asked to reconsider the issue of consultation, and whether there were any legal constraint to the period of consultation for both bids being extended by one further month;
- That the Board should determine whether it was obliged to make a decision on either of the bids on 30th January, 2006 in the light of the criticisms expressed above concerning the lack of consultation, and the state/ lack of detail of the ECO bid;
- That the Board should determine, as a delegated body of the Council in respect of any further consultation with the public and the Advisory Committee relating to proposals concerning the future use of the Asset;
- That the Board should ensure with any future consultation that it meets the eight " Principles of consultation" and 'good consultation practices' adopted by Haringey Council in 2003;
- That, the successful bidder provide to the Advisory Committee, as soon as practically possible, a full and detailed presentation of its bid, and to hear the views of the Advisory Committee in respect of its proposals concerning the future use of the Asset;
- That the Board be asked to disclose to the Advisory Committee in time for its next meeting the criteria it set for the bidding process;
- That the Board be advised that the Advisory Committee, on the information currently available and presented to it by the General

Manager, did not in any way blame the Board itself for the lack of information supplied by ECO

Concern was further expressed at the likelihood of considerable additional traffic being generated in the area if the proposals were implemented. A comprehensive traffic assessment should therefore be carried out before either proposal be finally accepted.

Following the expression of views of the Committee the Chair then summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

That the Alexandra Palace and Park Board be requested to consider and take account of the following views of the Advisory Committee in respect of the future use of the Asset at the special meeting of the Board on 30 January 2006 prior to making its decision:

1. that in respect of the “bid” by Earls Court and Olympia Group Ltd (ECO) the Advisory Committee expresses its surprise, disappointment and concern that:-
 - i. ECO have disregarded and/or failed to address or take into account in their vision of the future of the Asset the importance of the continued availability of certain facilities for community use ; their bid appears to display an over- emphasis on commercial development at the expense of community use – viz. the plan for the eventual closure of the ice rink facility, and the removal of the historic Willis Organ to an outside location;
 - ii. ECO appear to have disregarded or failed to appreciate that they were required to restrict their proposals to the “footprint” of the Palace, viz. its proposals with regard to existing car park facilities outside the “footprint”;
 - iii. in the light of the fact that the ECO’s bid has singularly failed to present its proposals in any detailed or meaningful fashion , including the lack of any public display board, the Advisory Committee questions whether ECO fully understood what was required in making its bid by the deadline of 6 January 2006; and,
 - iv. in view of the Advisory Committee’s comments in (c) above, it asks the Board to seek professional advice and/or to satisfy itself that all the rules applying to the bidding process were made clear to ECO, and whether the Board ought to have given ECO an extension of time to allow any further more detailed submission by ECO;
- 2, that in respect of the Firoka bid the Board the general consensus of the Advisory Committee was that :

- ii. the Firoka's vision of 3 phases and/ or "zones" namely for hotel and hospitality, exhibition and community/leisure usages in principle, provided a good balance in terms of the continued mixed use of the Asset for community and commercial purposes, viz. the proposal to retain and upgrade the existing ice rink facility, and restore and maintain the Willis Organ for future use in the Palace;
 - iii. it was concerned at the possible encroachment of the Firoka proposals into the Park area and whether there would be health and safety problems arising from the required density of use to make these proposals commercially viable;
 - iv. it was concerned at the lack of drawings or plans to illustrate their vision of the intended development and appearance of the north side of the building and there was some uncertainty (and concerns expressed) as to the proposed use of this area;
 - v. the Board should ensure that CUFOS continue to occupy its premises without interruption under its existing lease and be allowed to continue operating beyond its expiry date of March 2011;
- 3.
- i. That The Advisory Committee was severely critical of the lack of a proper public consultation process in respect of the proposal(s) and bid(s) , namely a lack of a reasonable period of time, insofar as the period of consultation from the date on which the "bids" were made public lasted barely 6 days, that there was merely a single display board of the Firoka bid on display, without any provision for a more meaningful exposition of their proposals being provided by Firoka or the Board in the form of a video presentation, e.g. on an hourly basis during the day for a (reasonable) consultation period ;
 - ii. That, in the light of these points, the Board be asked to reconsider the issue of consultation, and whether there were any legal constraint to the period of consultation for both bids being extended by one further month;
 - iii. That the Board should determine whether it is obliged to make a decision on either of the bids on 30th January, 2006 in the light of the criticisms expressed above concerning the lack of consultation, and the state/ lack of detail of the ECO bid;
 - iv. that the Board determines, as a delegated body of the Council in respect of any further consultation with the public and the Advisory Committee relating to proposals concerning the future use of the Asset , that it will

ensure that it meets the eight “ Principles of consultation” and ‘good consultation practices’ adopted by Haringey Council in 2003 ;

4. That, the successful bidder, by its representatives, be required by the Board to meet and provide to the Advisory Committee, as soon as practically possible, a full and detailed presentation of its bid, and to hear the views of the Advisory Committee in respect of its proposals concerning the future use of the Asset ;
5. That the Board disclose to the Advisory Committee in time for its next meeting the criteria it set for the bidding process; and
6. That the Board be asked to note that the Advisory Committee, on the information currently available, and presented to it by the General Manager, do not in any way blame the Board itself for the lack of information supplied by ECO.

037 Panorama Room, Alexandra Palace – Planning Application and Listed Building Consent – Report of the Facilities Manager – Alexandra Palace (Agenda Item 6)

Following a brief introduction of the report by the Facilities Manager – Mr Loudfoot, the Chair summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

That the planning application and associated listed building consent for the Panorama Room at Alexandra Palace be endorsed and the Board be advised accordingly.

038 Theatre Stage, Alexandra Palace – Listed Building Consent – Report of the Facilities Manager – Alexandra Palace (Agenda Item 7)

Following a brief introduction of the report by the Facilities Manager – Mr Loudfoot, the Chair summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

That the listed building consent for the Theatre Stage at Alexandra Palace be endorsed and the Board be advised accordingly.

039 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (i) Ms Hutchinson sought clarification and Mr Holder responded in respect of the cost monitoring of the future development of the asset.

- (ii) In respect of the rules of procedures and governance arrangements for the Advisory Committee the Chair advised that it would be appropriate for the Committee to discuss the matter at the next meeting of Committee In March 2006.

Time meeting concluded: 22.45hrs

David Liebeck
Chair of the Advisory Committee