

Report Title: **Interim Chief Executive's report , APPCT**

Report of: Emma L Dagnes, Interim Chief Executive, Alexandra Park and Palace

**1. Purpose**

1.1 To inform the Advisory Committee and the Consultative Committee of plans to revisit the Vision and Values in light of the HLF grant

1.2 To update the SAC and CC on the Trusts lawyers recommendations regarding formal constitution

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 That the Committees note the contents of this report and advise the main Board where appropriate

Report Authorised by: **Emma L Dagnes, Interim Chief Executive Alexandra Palace and Park**



Contact Officer: **Emma L Dagnes, Alexandra Palace Way, Wood Green N22 7AY Tel No. 020 8365 4335**

**3. Executive Summary**

3.1 The Committees are asked to note:-

\* that approval will be sought from APPCT Board to revisit the Vision

\* that SAC and CC will be invited to take part in workshops as per previous years to review the Vision and Values of Alexandra Park and Palace

\* that the outcome of this work is to ensure the Strategic Vision of Alexandra Park and Palace achieves a bridge from the present to the future

\* that advice from the Trust lawyers was sought on the question raised at the 14<sup>th</sup> April SAC and CC regarding establishment of a formal constitution

**4. Reasons for any change in policy or for new policy development (if applicable)**

4.1 N/A

**5. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

5.1 N/A

## **6. Strategic Vision**

- 6.1 In 2013 a project was started to test the current vision with the long term aspirations of the Park and Palace. A number of workshops were held with stakeholders, partners, staff and consolidated into a report. The report offered an alternative vision which received the following feedback from those who took part in the review:-
- The alternative statement is an improvement on the original and accepted as in the right territory
  - There are areas to change and consider further
  - The vision should be a statement of what we will do/what we are, and not focus on the regeneration journey
  - Entertainment isn't broad enough – it must encompass learning and wider experiences
  - Need to omit asset – it is generally felt to imply something that can be sold on
  - Wide mix is preferred over diversity
  - Stating London is felt to be important to some
  - Mixed views on the inclusion of community in the statement
- 6.2 The decision was taken that though this had been a very useful exercise and had started the conversation about a revised vision it would be prudent to wait until the HLF decision had been made before revisiting the project.
- 6.3 We are therefore at the stage of pulling together a project plan for Board approval with a road map for revisiting the vision, drawing out our values, which will build a bridge from the present to the future, inspire and excite stakeholders, staff, partners, visitors and the community about the future aspiration of Alexandra Park and Palace.

## **7. Governance**

- 7.1 Following the 14<sup>th</sup> April SAC and CC joint committee meeting the following question was put to the Trust Lawyers. Is it possible for there to be a formal constitution for the Statutory Advisory Committee ('SAC') and the Consultative Committee ('CC')?
- 7.2 BWB response: It will not be legally permissible to constitute a joint formal committee for the SAC and CC as this would effectively result in the augmentation of the membership of the SAC. As previously advised, due to clauses one to three of Schedule 1 of the Alexandra Park and Palace Act 1985, it is doubtful that the number of members of the SAC can be amended without a change to primary legislation.
- 7.3 The Trust presented a further question on whether a Memorandum of Understanding between the SAC and CC could be established.
- 7.4 BWB response: In terms of a long term approach to this issue, it is worth noting that there is nothing to prohibit members of the CC acting as observers to the whole or part (depending on the decision making required) of a SAC meeting and the CC members are, I understand, currently acting as such.

As set out above, the members of the CC cannot act as voting members of the SAC but they can contribute to the discussion. For this purpose, it is possible to consider the idea of 'rules of engagement' for the two committees.

It would be possible to draft a Memorandum of Understanding ('MOU') which acknowledges the joint aims of the committees and the importance of issues being discussed by a wide range of stakeholders before they are subject to a vote of the SAC.

The MOU could also outline an agreed approach to the administration of informal joint committee meetings.

MOUs are not generally considered to be legally binding, unless expressed otherwise. An MOU between the SAC and CC would be an expression that the two committees intend to cooperate and to do so under certain agreed terms.

These terms would need to be considered and agreed between the two committees, the APPT Board and LBH. There would also be no legal recourse if the terms of the MOU were not honoured by one of the committees. Although the MOU can include notice provisions which stipulate the process by which either committee withdraws from the MOU, either committee would be at liberty to pull out of the MOU.

Notwithstanding that the joint committee is not a decision making body of APPCT, the MOU should provide a framework that will allow for efficient and effective joint working, with helpful clarity on the rules of procedure.

## **8. Legal Implications**

- 8.1 The Council's Assistant Director, Corporate Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no comment, save that he notes the advice on governance received from the Trust's Solicitors BWB and will seek to be involved in commenting on any progression of the issue.

## **9. Financial Implications**

- 9.1 The Council's Chief Financial Officer has been consulted on the contents of the Report and has no additional comments to make.

## **10. Use of Appendices**

- 10.1 There are none.