

## DRAFT

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

6 SEPTEMBER 2005

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 E. Tulloch	:	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 W. Hoban	:	Alexandra Ward
*Councillor B. Millar	:	Bounds Green Ward
Councillor S. Gilbert	:	Fortis Green Ward
Councillor Q. Prescott	:	Hornsey Ward
Councillor J. Bloch	:	Muswell Hill Ward
Vacancy	:	Noel Park Ward
Vacancy	:	
*Councillor E. Prescott	:	

\*Members present.

Also in attendance

Councillor R Hare

Mr K. Holder - General Manager - Alexandra Palace

#### **028 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)**

The Chair asked if there had been any apologies given.

The Clerk advised that apologies for absence had been received on behalf of Cllrs Q Prescott and J Bloch.

**029 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**030 URGENT BUSINESS (Agenda Item 3)**

There were no items of Urgent Business.

**031 FUTURE USE OF THE ASSET – UPDATE (Oral report of the General Manager Alexandra Palace) (Agenda Item 4)**

The General Manager advised, in an update, on the current position of :

**i) Television Studios**

An Industry meeting of pan media professionals was to have been held on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005, but as this coincided with the date of the London atrocities, this was postponed until 5<sup>th</sup> September 2005. It was reported that there were mixed feelings on the potential for retaining as a museum or heritage based unit. It was thought that there was a potential to deliver 'something', which was, as yet, undefined. It was thought that this would not work as a stand-alone facility, particularly with the difficulties of transport access and other existing facilities in London. The fact that this was the birthplace of Television was not a driver for economic sense.

A mild interest had been shown by those present, (BBC, ITV, Ch 4, BSkyB, Royal Association of Engineers, Media people) who agreed to think around the concepts. It was thought that if one should show an interest, then others might join in. The idea of a 'home' for media archives did not receive any support, as everything was now moving towards digital archiving and it was not known if the original material would be stored. Following the 1½ hour meeting, no 'great' ideas were generated. One view of the meeting was that this might be of interest to the electronics industry to fund an electronics museum. It was also mentioned that the British Academy for the Advancement of Science had no permanent home for their exhibitions. It was agreed that networking of external contacts should take place over the next month and the position then reviewed.

**ii) Future Use Of The Asset as a Whole**

Parts of the Report were commercially confidential and could not be discussed publicly.

The General Manager reported that over the last 6 months a survey had been undertaken of the complete building. This had last been carried out following the rebuild after the fire. The General Manager had estimated from his information that repairs to the building would cost approximately £30m. The survey following the review had now put this figure at £38m for footprint repairs, without conversion.

With the proposed changes to alternative use, financial models had been used to establish overall viability. The modelling had shown that costs for conversion to alternative use were high.

The project had looked at alternative uses and interest in the building. They had looked at companies in similar business events, such as exhibitions / events /

banquets etc: where no planning change would be required. It was hoped to bring an extra dimension to the derelict parts.

The Board had considered options with a priority of reducing the burden on the council tax payer. An advert seeking expressions of interest was to be placed on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2005, with a press conference on the same day. Responses to the advertisement were to be received by noon on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2005. These would be evaluated and shortlisted companies would receive invitations to make further details of the proposed schemes to be submitted by the end of the year. The programme beyond this date would be driven by the levels of interest and responses shown. If interest was shown in the TV dimension, this could continue in parallel and the two exercises be then married together.

The advert would be placed in the property press in UK. It was mentioned that with the Olympics now coming to London, the New River sports Centre was to be a designated athletics track, thus bringing interest to North London, albeit that the major events were to be held in East London.

Recommendations would be made to the Board on the shortlist of applicants, who would then make the final decisions. Consideration would include the effects on the local community and public consultation would take place. It was appreciated that there were limited uses for a building of this size. It was recognised that this was a regional asset which should be shared London wide. A further report would be made to this Committee again at the end of 2005.

**RESOLVED:**

That the oral report of The General Manager be noted and the terms of the future of the asset be recognised. The Committee was to be kept informed on progress.

The meeting concluded at 21.30hr.

**D. LIEBECK  
CHAIR**