

**UNRESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

*Denotes attendance

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

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

Observer: David Liebeck*

Also present:

Mr A. Gill – Interim General Manager – Alexandra Palace
 Mr I. Harris – Trust Solicitor
 Ms R. Kane – Managing Director – Alexandra Palace Trading Limited Ms H. Downie – Head of Finance – Alexandra Palace
 Mr M. Evison – Park Manager – Alexandra Palace
 Ms J. Parker – Director of Corporate Resources – LB Haringey
 Mr C. Hart – Committee Manager (Clerk to the Board) LB Haringey

**MINUTE
NO.**

SUBJECT/DECISION

<p>APBO56.</p>	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Val Paley, and for lateness from Councillor Stewart.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
<p>APBO57.</p>	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>The Chair clarified that there were no items of urgent business.</p> <p>The Committee Manager – Mr Hart advised that whilst there were no urgent items for consideration, there were two items which had been marked 'TO FOLLOW' agenda item 7 – Governance Review, and agenda item 8 – Regeneration Working Group Update – for which reasons for lateness would be given by the Interim General Manager.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
<p>APBO58.</p>	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS</p> <p>There were no declarations of interests.</p> <p>NOTED</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

**APBO59. QUESTIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS : TO CONSIDER ANY
QUESTIONS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS RECEIVED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH PART 4, SECTION B29 OF THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**

The Clerk to the Board – Mr Hart advised the meeting that 2 questions had been submitted by Mr Jacob O'Callaghan for response. The Clerk asked that Mr O'Callaghan come forward and sit at the meeting table in order to put his questions.

The Chair advised Mr O'Callaghan that whilst his questions had been submitted after the stated deadline of 10.00hrs – Monday 7 February 2011 – the rules being as detailed in the Council's Constitution, on this occasion the questions would be allowed to be put, but the Chair emphasised that this would not be setting a precedence and it was a 'one off'.

The Chair asked Mr O'Callaghan to put his questions. The Chair also advised that he would be responding to the questions on behalf of the Board.

Mr O'Callaghan asked his 1st question to all trustees, and Julie Parker:

"Would the trustees accept that the charity's main past financial, legal and PR disasters of the past thirty years of the charity (the overspend after the 1980 fire, the High Court decision, and the allowing of Firoka to take over the Palace and use charity and council resources without payment) were caused, according to both the official reports (the PFI report, and the Walklate reports respectively), because decisions were allowed to be made, and public money spent, without scrutiny, debate or indeed authority."

The Chair responded that mistakes had been made in the past, but lessons have been learned and the Board is keen to ensure that it continues to accept its trustee responsibilities for making decisions on the strategic direction of the Charity in accordance with best practice in the charity sector and the Council's rules. That was why the Board overhauled its governance arrangements and adopted the NCVO Code of Good Governance and why the Board was careful to take appropriate professional advice on every decision it had taken. The Board was accountable for these decisions; not the officers, not the Council, not the public at large and not the users of the Palace.

The Chair asked, for the purpose of elucidation if Mr O'Callaghan had a further point.

Mr O'Callaghan responded in the guise of a statement to the Board and the Chair reminded him that he would only allow a point of elucidation – therefore if there was not a point in this respect then to move on to the 2nd question.

The Chair then asked Mr O'Callaghan to state his second question.

Mr O'Callaghan asked his 2nd question to all trustees, and Julie Parker:

"Would the trustees, and Ms Parker, accept that several of the items they have taken in recent months, and are asked to consider tonight, including the decision they took in December about merging of the trading company and the charity's

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

identity, decisions of the regeneration working group, and Ms Parker's report on executive restructuring tonight, should have first been the subject of wider explanation, debate and consultation with interested parties and "stakeholders". Will they now kindly agree to postpone them until that explanation, debate and consultation has been arranged?"

The Chair responded that the premise upon which this question was based, namely that the Board had agreed to merge the identity of the charity and the trading company, is not correct. The work of the Regeneration Working Group and the Executive Restructure were both rooted in the Governance and Future Vision review, upon which the Board had consulted widely with a large number of stakeholders. There had been no requests to the Board to consult again on whether it should find the money to regenerate the Palace or to address the obvious need for an effective management structure. There had been no suggested viable alternative to what the Board was doing. The Board stood by its decisions in these areas. It was painfully aware of the urgent need to arrest the dilapidation of the building and to find viable uses for the space that accord with our Vision for Alexandra Palace. The Board would like the support of all its stakeholders in this process but it was not prepared to delay further the key decisions it must take to allow officers to get on with the job of saving Ally Pally from a fate like the Crystal Palace.

The Chair asked, for the purpose of elucidation if Mr O'Callaghan had a further point.

Mr O'Callaghan commented that he had not understood the detail of the answer and that it had not addressed a number of issues in relation to the lack of consultation, and questioned whether officers had understood what consultation meant.

In response the Chair commented that he had raised the issue of consultation at the Consultative Committee on 8 February 2011 and the Chair reiterated the point made at that meeting that there seemed to be a misconception on behalf of people of what was meant by consultation and negotiation, and that there should not be any misconception.

The Chair then thanked Mr O'Callaghan for his questions on behalf of the Board.

NOTED

APBO60. EXECUTIVE RESTRUCTURING

The Chair asked for an introduction of the report.

The Director of Corporate Resources – LB Haringey – Ms Parker advised that there were two reports on the agenda in respect of the Executive Restructure of Alexandra Palace, being this and the other in the exempt part of the proceedings. The purpose of the report was to seek the Board's approval to the process for

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

and appointment of a new Chief Executive for the Trust as part of a staged restructuring of the Trust and its operations. and also, to consider interim arrangements as detailed in the exempt report before the Board later in the agenda.

Ms Parker referred the Board to its decision of 2 March 2010 to agree that proposals be drawn up for consideration of a permanent staffing arrangement. Ms Parker advised that the current staffing structure of Alexandra Palace and Park Charitable Trust (APPCT) was established in May 2007 and had been designed to meet the managerial and operational needs when it was planned to grant a lease to Firoka. However the current staffing structure was not appropriate in the light of the fact that the proposed lease to Firoka was not to be granted and does not recognise the current consideration of the future strategic direction of the Palace. It also had some inbuilt inefficiencies, lacked cohesion at strategic and delivery levels, as well as creating some unnecessary elements of competition, duplication of work and effort, leading to slow decision making. It therefore did not fit for the current needs of both the Trust and Alexandra Palace Trading Limited.

Ms Parker outlined the strategic work of the Trust in the coming months which included the completion of the new governance structure and standards, maintaining the momentum of the master planning process for the site, and managing any capital allocation for dilapidations while continuing to address compliance matters for the site. She also referred to the potential strategic work of APTL over the next year – namely building and consolidating its business position, embedding a number of new staff appointments into the senior management team, and continuing to build upon its profile to maximise commercial returns.

Ms Parker advised that in the past ten months considerable consideration had been given to what was the most appropriate management and staffing structure would be in a way that supported the long term future of the Trust//APTL and the recently approved new vision. Ms Parker commented that many of the weaknesses and inefficiencies of the current management arrangements would be addressed if there was one staffing structure covering both trust and company with one lead manager. The structure would be set up with a team of senior staff able to cover the many challenges of the building and park, be commercially driven to exploit the asset for revenue generation and also work on the execution of a master plan.

Ms Parker also advised that the management of the Palace would continue with its overriding requirement to act in accordance with charity law and discharge the charitable objectives of the Trust. A possible single staffing structure had been assessed, which had been examined and discussed with the Board, and the Directors of APTL , together with the Interim General Manager and Managing Director APTL. It was felt appropriate that a phased approach be taken to any reorganisation with an appointment of a new Chief Executive in lieu of the General Manager post in the first instance. In recognising that the Palace needed to move on after the period of uncertainty and align all its developing strategies and restructure it was felt appropriate that the new Chief Executive (to be appointed in June 2011), once appointed, would need to examine the resource requirements in the Autumn of 2011 with a view to developing a plan to

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

migrate to a single staffing structure to operate within the new governance structure and to meet the future strategic direction of the Trust.

In terms of the way forward, Ms Parker commented that the Charity Commission would be advised of any proposals by the Trust when they were informed of any changes to the governance arrangements. In terms of the recruitment process it was recognised that this role will not be easy to fill and to progress the selection and interview process it would be appropriate to select support from an Executive Recruitment Consultant to assist in the search and selection of prospective candidates and to establish an Appointment Panel to act on behalf of the Board. Ms Parker advised that she was recommending the utilising of the Council's Framework for Executive Recruitment Consultants and that delegation be provided to the Director of Corporate Resources, acting on behalf of the Council's Chief Executive in his "charity capacity" to appoint a Consultant after a mini competition, in consultation with the Chair of the Board, at a cost circa £33,000.

Ms Parker referred to the Panel Membership of the Chief Executive's Appointment Panel, recommended as any five Members of the Board and a political composition of three majority party Members to two minority party Members, together with invited non-voting observers, the two Non-Executive Directors of APTL and the Director of Corporate Resources, as the representative of the Council's Chief Executive. Ms Parker concluded that there would be a number of processes and procedures that would be adopted over the next few months to guide the Panel to its decision and recommendation on a suitable candidate and whilst the Executive Recruitment Consultant appointed would assist it was considered pertinent for the final decisions on these arrangements to be delegated to the Director of Corporate Resources, acting on behalf of the Council's Chief Executive in his "charity capacity", and in consultation with the Chair of the Board. This would also include the final remuneration package to be offered.

The Chair thanked Ms Parker for her detailed introduction and asked that the Board focus on the first recommendation as detailed in terms of consideration of the appointment of a Chief Executive to replace the position of General Manager, as if this were not to be agreed then the remainder of the recommendations would not be considered. The Chair asked if there were any points of clarification from Members.

Councillor Williams queried the engaging of external consultants for the purpose of recruitment and the associated cost of this, and also whether there was a likely conflict in terms of the functions of Alexandra Palace and Park Board, and Alexandra Palace Trading Limited. Councillor Scott also sought clarification as to whether there were any other possible arrangements looked at as regards the proposed new structure.

In response Ms Parker advised that in terms of the engaging of consultants, it was felt necessary given the type of work required to carry out the recruitment process at this level, and that an external consultant would be able to assess the market to source and attract the required calibre of candidates. In terms of the proposed structure it had taken approximately a year to give thought to the outlined structure and though at times there may be a conflict as Chief Executive managing both the Charitable Trust and APTL but where there were such

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

conflicts there would be assistance from the LB Haringey's Chief Executive as Head of Paid Service. Ms Parker also stressed that the areas of conflict were not considerable and would not cause difficulties in terms of the overall management of the service areas.

In response to points of clarification from Mr Tarpey in respect of the LB Haringey's Chief Executive delegation as referred to in para 13.2 of the report the LB Haringey's Principal Lawyer – Mr Mitchison advised the Board that there was an overlap of regulations in terms of the Charity and the Council given that Council regulations required appointments taken by a Member level body with a Member of the Council's Cabinet sitting on that panel. In that respect such an arrangement would not be acceptable to the Charity Commission and therefore the alternative was to delegate the final decision to an officer – the Chief Executive of LB Haringey as Head of Paid Service to have the final say, and the Chief Executive would then delegate this to the Director of Corporate Resources who would sit on the Panel on their behalf.

(Mr Willmott arrived at 19.58hrs)

In response to further points of clarification, Mr Mitchison advised that the Interview panel would be sitting as Charity Trustees and acting solely in the interest of the Charity when making their decision.

The Trust Solicitor – Mr Harris, in concurring with the views expressed by Mr Mitchison, advised that in effect the Chief Executive of LB Haringey was the line manager of the current General Manager and would continue to line manage the newly appointed Chief Executive.

Councillor Hare referred to the composition of the Interview panel and asked whether there should some merit to having an independent person sitting on the panel in a non voting capacity. In response, Ms Parker expressed her caution at the suggestion as currently the Panel was totalling seven in total, which in itself would be a daunting task for any interviewee. In her view, the role of the external recruitment consultants would fulfil this role adequately.

Councillor Strickland commented that the composition of the Panel involving non voting representatives was welcomed and that the advice of the external consultants in the process would offer a degree of external independence in terms of giving a view.

There being no further comments the Chair summarised and it was:-

RESOLVED

- i. that approval be given to the appointment of a Chief Executive to replace the position of General Manager within the Trust as part of a future plan to bring in one staffing structure for the Trust and APTL;
- ii. that the Full Council of LB Haringey be requested to amend the Council's Constitution so that the Trust may appoint its new Chief Executive in full accordance of The Local Authorities

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>Standing Orders Regulations (S.I. 2001/3384) entailing a delegation by the Alexandra Palace and Park Board to the Council's Chief Executive, in his "charity capacity", of powers to appoint, dismiss and discipline the Alexandra Palace & Park Chief Executive, and that such powers will be exercised in consultation with the Alexandra Palace and Park Board or its appointed Panel/Sub-Committee.</p> <p>iii. that the Council's framework to appoint Executive Recruitment Consultants be utilised to assist and support in the search and selection of suitable candidates with the contractual relationship to be with the Trust;</p> <p>iv. that authority be delegated to the Director of Corporate Resources, LB Haringey, acting on behalf of the Council's Chief Executive in his "charity capacity", and in consultation with the Chair of the Board, to the appointment of the Executive Recruitment Consultant and the finalisation of the interview process and the documentation required to commence and finalise the search and recruitment; and</p> <p>v. that an Appointment Panel for the recruitment of the Chief Executive be appointed as detailed in 11.6 of the report consisting of any 5 Members of the Board with the Panel having a political composition of 3 majority party Members to 2 minority party Members with invited non-voting observers consisting of one Advisory/Statutory Advisory Board Trustee; the two Non-Executive Directors of APTL and the Director of Corporate Resources, LB Haringey as the representative of the Council's Chief Executive.</p>
<p>APBO61.</p>	<p>FINANCE UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.</p> <p>The Head of Finance Alexandra Palace – Ms Downie advised the meeting of the results for the nine month period ended 31st December 2010 which were tabulated against budget at Appendix 1 of the report.</p> <p>Ms Downie went on to advise that unrestricted income was £12k below budget and unrestricted expenditure was £226k below budget, giving a net positive variance against budget of £214k. The reforecast for the year was detailed at Appendix 2 of the report and Ms Downie commented that the Trust's unrestricted deficit for the year was currently projected to be £100k lower than budget, before the reforecast position of APTL had been taken into account. This reflected the £40k forecast underspend presented to the Board in November together with further savings on security, repairs and maintenance (£42k), parks (£10k) and Trust staffing costs.</p> <p>Ms Downie went on to advise the Board of a potential pension liability in respect of one individual transferred to the new IFM contractor under TUPE. The potential liability was un-quantified, subject to change over time and would only crystallise</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>if the individual concerned leaves the organisation due to redundancy or retirement.</p> <p>There being no points of clarification the Chair summarised and it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. That the results for the nine month period to 31st December 2010 and the forecast outturn for the 2010/11 financial year be noted;ii. that the savings being implemented by the Trust to reduce the call on the Council's corporate resources in 2010/11 be noted; andiii. that the potential pension liability in respect of one individual transferred under TUPE to the new IFM contract provider.
<p>APBO62.</p>	<p>GOVERNANCE UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.</p> <p>The Interim General Manager – Mr Gill advised that the reasons for lateness of the report was as a result of consideration by the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee meeting after the agenda publication, and the need to report the outcome of that discussion to the Board.</p> <p>Mr Gill informed the meeting that the report gave an update on progress towards a combined and more effective stakeholder forum following the work done by both the Consultative Committee and the Statutory Advisory Committee in reviewing their relative effectiveness. As the Board were aware both Committees had established working groups which had met on several occasions and held a joint meeting on 14 January 2011. As a result, a report approved by the Chairs of both Working Groups was considered by the Statutory Advisory Committee on 25 January 2011 and by the Consultative Committee on 8 February 2011. The joint report recommended a two-stage process to move to a single 'reconstituted' Statutory Advisory Committee, which would effectively incorporate the Consultative Committee.</p> <p>Mr Gill went on to comment that the report before the Board detailed the process of the Review and informed the Board that both Committees were in accord with the proposed next steps, the first of which was to hold two joint meetings of both Committees, followed by a review after each meeting. The first such joint meeting was proposed for 5 April 2011.</p> <p>(Councillor Stewart arrived at 20.14hrs)</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Gill for his succinct introduction and asked if Mr Liebeck or Mr Willmott would wish to give their views.</p> <p>Mr Liebeck commented on the positiveness of the working groups and their due consideration of issues which had resulted in the formation of the two models. The second of the two models had been viewed as the most effective model to try and it did in effect avoid a considerable amount of duplication.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

Mr Willmott, in sharing Mr Liebeck's view, commented that the joint meeting of the working group had been enthusiastic with a cross fertilisation of issues. There had been some useful and constructive comment and that there had been two main points that arose – namely that it had been felt that there had not always been due courtesy shown by the Board to the views of the Advisory Committee when referred to the Board, and the perception that the Board at times may see the Advisory Committee as more of a hindrance. The second point that had arisen was whether there may be an effective 'annual meeting' type event where all three bodies would meet to discuss issues likely to be forthcoming over the next year, and areas of commonality.

The Chair thanked Messrs Liebeck and Willmott for their contribution which was much appreciated and welcomed. The issue of overlapping between the two bodies would most certainly cease in terms of a joint meeting in the future and that any proposals for a joint body being informed would require certain agreement by the Charity Commission, and a change in existing primary legislation.

There being no further comments Mr Willmott placed on record his appreciation and thanks to those who had participated in the individual and joint working groups, particularly the effort of Colin Marr of the Consultative Committee. This view was shared by the Board as a whole.

The Chair then summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That the joint recommendations and comments of the two Working Groups and the resolutions of the Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory Committee from its 25 January 2011, and those of the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee of 8 February 2011 be noted;
- ii. That the approval be given to the proposal to hold two joint meetings of Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory Committee and the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee with the first such meeting on taking place on 5 April 2011, as proposed by the joint recommendation 1 of the two Working Groups;
- iii. That authority be delegated to the Chair of the Board with the assistance and advice of the Interim General Manager, to liaise with the Chair of the Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory Committee, in respect of an initial review of the joint meetings ;
- iv. that approval be given in principle to the adoption of a two-stage process with stage one the immediate implementation of a joint Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory Committee, and Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee (Model 1) and stage two a reconstituted Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory Committee (Model 2);
- v. That the Interim General Manager be instructed to investigate the practicalities of having a single Alexandra Park and Palace Statutory Advisory

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>Committee, and Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee and to seek legal and Charity Commission advice in order to advise further on this matter;</p> <p>vi. That further reports be submitted on this matter at future meetings and after the two trial meetings referred to (ii) to above had been held.</p>
APBO63.	<p>REGENERATION WORKING GROUP - UPDATE & FEEDBACK</p> <p>The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.</p> <p>The Interim General Manager – Mr Gill informed the meeting that the report gave an update on progress made by the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group (APPRWG) since the last report to the Board on this matter on 21 December 2010. The reasons for lateness of the report were due to the Interim General Manager wishing to present to the Board the most recent activity of the APPRWG, which had met on 2 February 2011.</p> <p>Mr Gill advised that the report provided the Board with more details of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study currently being undertaken by Locum (Colliers International) including the procurement and selection process that resulted in the appointment of Locum to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study. With regard the Communications Strategy for the Regeneration Project, this was now at an advanced draft stage and its primary aim was to undertake effective stakeholder engagement, through clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively, manifested in a two-way conversation with a range of stakeholders.</p> <p>Mr Gill advised that pending the consideration of the Communications Strategy for the Regeneration Project the report sought the Board's approval for the Chair/Vice Chair to act as spokespeople on behalf of the Board and for the handling of media enquiries. Mr Gill advised of the six key work stages involved in the study;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Stage 1 Inception and Review (complete)Stage 2 Site Analysis (complete)Stage 3 Consultation – Internal and ExternalStage 4 Analysis and ViabilityStage 5 Draft ReportStage 6 Final Report <p>Mr Gill also advised that Locum would not engage with any external stakeholders, potential operators or funders at this stage without the permission of the Working Group or the Board. The target date for Stage 5 was 1 April with a view to presenting the final report to the Board at its meeting on 28 April 2011. Mr Gill also stressed that key to all of the objectives was the imperative for clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively, manifested in a two-way conversation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Mr Gill further commented that further reports would be submitted to the Board on the Regeneration project at future meetings and at its meeting on 28 April 2011, there would be a report and a presentation on the findings of the Options Analysis</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

and Feasibility Study. Mr Gill also commented that the Working Group recognised that it would need to communicate to stakeholders and interested parties what it was doing and the Communications Strategy outlined in the report was designed to ensure that there was a two-way conversation with stakeholders underpinned by clear and accurate information about each stage of the Regeneration process to be disseminated effectively. Mr Gill concluded that Locum would commence engaging with selected stakeholders as part of the work on the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study, and letters would be sent within 48 hours of this evening's meeting to invite Trustees and Stakeholders to consultation workshops.

The Chair thanked Mr Gill for his introduction and asked if there were any points of clarification from Members.

Councillor Hare commented on some of the wording at para 6.14 of the report as regards to the consultation work of LOCUM and the possible perceptions externally that work was being carried directly by them without approval or knowledge of the Working Group and the reference to 'and/or the Board', and that perhaps to allay those possible perception the wording should be changed by deleting 'or'.

Mr Gill responded that the wording in the report could be amended to show that the Board would be giving authority, via the APPRWG. Mr Gill advised that the wording would be changed in the report and it be reflected and noted in the Minutes that the wording at paragraph 6.14 should read 'and the Board', and not 'and/or the Board', as stated.

Councillor Williams referred to recommendation 2.5 in terms of the Board agreeing that the Chair and/or Vice Chair are authorised to speak publicly on behalf of the Board concerning the Regeneration Project, and commented that he would also wish to give comment on the media on matters relating to the future regeneration of the Palace as a Member of the Board, and why this recommendation had been suggested.

Mr Gill responded that it was normal practice that any comments in terms of media or press and publicly should be channelled through the Chair or Vice-Chair and the recommendation was there to confirm that this process would continue.

Councillor Williams commented that he was unhappy with such a recommendation and that he would be unable to support it.

The Chair commented that in respect of the recommendation it was a fact that there had to be a collective voice reflecting a collective decision and that the Board should be acting independently of the Council and in the best interests of the Palace and park.

Councillor Hare commented that comment was issue dependent based and that comment did not change the actual decision of the Board.

The Managing Director Alexandra Palace Training Limited -Ms Kane commented that the reason for the recommendation being there was in order to have one voice in the consultation process and that it was easier for all media enquiries to

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

be handled by the Chair/Vice-Chair on behalf of the Board, speaking collectively and as one.

The Chair then summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That the recent and proposed work of the Alexandra Park & Palace Regeneration Working Group (APPRWG) as outlined in the report be noted;
- ii. That the procurement and selection process that resulted in the appointment of Locum to undertake the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study be noted;
- iii. That the APPRWG be requested to provide a synopsis of the Communications Strategy for circulation to Alexandra Palace and Park Board Members;
- iv. That the Chair and/or Vice Chair be authorised to speak publicly on behalf of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board concerning the Regeneration Project;
- v. That any media enquiries be referred to the Chair via the Alexandra Palace normal communications handling agency;
- vi. That the Chair of the APPRWG (or his nominated representative) be requested to present the findings of the Options Analysis and Feasibility Study to the Board's meeting on 28 April 2011; and
- vii. That the Interim General Manager be instructed to inform the Chair of the APPRWG of its resolutions on these matters.
- viii. That the wording in paragraph 6.14 be altered to read 'and the Board', and not 'and/or the Board'.

Councillor Williams asked that his dissent be recorded against resolution 5.

APBO64. PARK UPDATE

The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.

The Park Manager – Mr Evison in a detailed introduction gave reference to the report circulated and in particular gave an update to the Board in respect of interim figures from the car park data collection exercise, together with issues relating to park tenants, including the issues regarding the Lease renewal for the old station building. Mr Evison also referred to suggestions from a local resident for a number of ideas to improve AP's sustainability, with a proposed response to the short-term suggestions shown at Appendix A, together with recommended actions.

In particular Mr Evison referred to the CUFOS issue and advised that since the report had been written CUFOS Trustees had met with the Interim General Manager and himself to discuss the key terms of the new lease. Mr Evison advised that the meeting had been a very positive one, and as a result there was

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>unlikely to be a difficulty with the level of rent. The CUFOS Trustees were considering two options regarding the term of the rent and a break clause in respect of regeneration of the park and palace.</p> <p>Cllr Hare sought and received clarification to a number of matters as detailed in the report.</p> <p>The Chair then summarised and it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. that the initial information from the car park data collection exercise be noted; ii. That the updates regarding park tenants be noted; iii. That authority be delegated to the Interim General Manager to agree renewal terms for the Lease to CUFOS before the deadline of 25 March 2011 and in default of agreement to instruct the Trust's solicitors to issue proceedings for interim rent; iv. That the London Borough of Haringey's Head of Legal Services be authorised to seal the finalised lease on behalf of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board; and iv. That the responses to the sustainability ideas suggested by a local resident be noted, and that those recommended items be included in the Trust's work programme for 2011-12.
<p>APBO65.</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the unrestricted minutes of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 30 November 2010, 21 December 2010, and 28 January 2011 (Special) be agreed, and signed by the Chair as an accurate record of the proceedings; ii. That the minutes of the Alexandra Palace and Park Consultative Committee held on 8 February 2011 be noted; and iii. That the minutes of the Alexandra Park and Palace Advisory Committee held on 25 January 2011 be received and noted.
<p>APBO66.</p>	<p>ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT</p> <p>There were no items of unrestricted urgent business.</p> <p>NOTED</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

<p>APBO67.</p>	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the press and public be excluded from the meeting in respect of Items 13-17 as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972; Paras 1, 2, 3, and 5 - namely information relating to an individual, and information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual, 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.</p> <p>At this point in the proceedings (20.50hrs) the Chair MOVED an adjournment of the proceedings for a period of 5 minutes, which was agreed nemine contradicente.</p> <p><u>SUMMARY OF EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDINGS</u></p>
<p>APBO68.</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>iv. AGREED the exempt minutes of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 30 November 2010, and 21 December 2010,;</p> <p>v. AGREED the exempt minutes of the Special Alexandra Palace and Park Board held on 28 January 2011, subject to minor amendment.</p>
<p>APBO69.</p>	<p>FINANCE UPDATE</p> <p>AGREED TO NOTE THE REPORT</p>
<p>APBO70.</p>	<p>EXECUTIVE RESTRUCTURING</p> <p>At this point in the proceedings all officers present, with the exception of the Director of Corporate Resources, LB Haringey - Ms Parker, the Trust Solicitor - Mr Harris, and the Committee Manager - Mr Hart, withdrew from the meeting.</p> <p>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</p>
<p>APBO71.</p>	<p>ANY OTHER EXEMPT BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT</p> <p>There were no items of exempt urgent business.</p> <p>NOTED</p>

**MINUTES OF THE ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK BOARD
TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

--	--

There being no further business to discuss the meeting ended at 21.36

COUNCILLOR PAT EGAN

Chair