



Waterlow Park Trust

Trust Advisory Group meeting 24/1/17 2pm Lauderdale House

Present:

Ian Henghes (IH) [Chair], Katherine Ives (KI) [Lauderdale House], Ceridwen Roberts (CR) [Friends of Waterlow Park], Pippa Rothenberg (PR) [Highgate Society], Richard Shipman (RS) [Friends of Waterlow Park], Sue Tatum (ST) [Acting Minuting Secretary], Catherine Wells (CW) [Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum], Eileenea Willmott (EW) [Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Committee], Andrew Wright (AW) [Camden LA]

Item	Action
Minutes of previous meeting Matters Arising: Friends to speak to Peter Corcoran from the Morton Partnership regarding the mound project	IH to put previous minutes on TAG website
Signing of constitution and partnership agreement	AW to progress
Report on meeting with Jessica Gibbons - Trustee IH and AW reported that JG was very supportive of the brief for TAG as the 'think tank' for the Trust and keen to encourage strategic thinking about the coming years	
Report on public meeting held in early December in Lauderdale House The event was felt to be successful and a useful springboard for further ideas such as local signage. It was noted that wording should be changed to make it clear that initial lodges income is to pay off debt.	RS to review and amend on Google Drive. IH will then publish on TAG website. IH will try to do a short form version. 1 page max for circulation / noticeboards etc.
Interim report from Trees and Views working party IH reported on the first meeting (notes circulated). Tree labelling: The Friends have a small amount of money for this. Labels could tie in with online map. KI said this could be useful for schools. CW said there should be ongoing monitoring of tree health / maintenance & stopping self-sets from getting established. IH replied that the working party was to provide a report based on the brief from the last TAG meeting. If longer term work was required this would need to be identified and might be passed to the Friends or others. EW said tags on trees can be removed if placed within easy reach so need to be suitably positioned.	IH to email Al Smith to say this has been re-discussed by TAG and re two approaches for policy variation and to check timescales.

<p>IH said that Waterlow Park might need its own tree policy to deal with crowning which is not currently permitted by the Camden borough wide policy. AW said a new tree policy to be prepared this year by Camden might just carry a variation for Waterlow Park. IH said establishing how Camden dealt with variation was the important thing, and making it clear for Camden as managers. The precise process is not too important, but if a policy was needed TAG could draft this to give to Camden (subject to feasibility of the policy itself!)</p>	
<p>Next working parties / issues for TAG to address</p> <p>Fundraising a key issue and will follow from information on current and anticipated funding and setting a strategic direction. CR asked what timetable might be for funding reduction. KI said some idea about what is going to be required is important esp. re core costs. AW made it clear that income relating to the park comes first to the Council then to a cost centre for Waterlow Park. From here money from lodge rental will be paid back to Camden central funds to repay the refurbishment loan. PR said financial information must be in place to be able to have a persuasive argument for fundraising. There was some debate about what percentage of events and filming income comes to the park or how is this handled. AW pointed out that the events team had to fund itself from organising events and were Waterlow park to set high event pricing it could become unattractive. There is also a public benefit remit being fulfilled even where little or no income flows to the park which makes activities worthwhile. KI mentioned that park might be able to manage it's own events in future via Lauderdale House.</p> <p>Incident reporting protocol was agreed to be something to be reviewed and brought to TAG to ensure that proper communication channels are in place to deal with incidents in the park. This is particularly important as there are a number of groups in the park who all need timely information as well as to know what action to take should the need arise.</p> <p>Memorials was also mentioned as a topic for a future working party.</p>	<p>AW to gather Camden financial breakdowns and projections so TAG can consider the next few years.</p> <p>IH to provide AW with previous notes. AW to progress and bring back to TAG</p>
<p>Strategic direction</p>	

<p>IH said that TAG needs to have a session dedicated to ideas about setting a strategic direction for the future of the park. Asking what position we would hope the Park might be in a few years from now, if there are particular ideas to develop and thinking about how to get there. AW said that we are now at an important milestone in the history of the Park with TAG operational and Lauderdale re-opened / LUX in the Park Centre etc.</p> <p>Signage IH had prepared some notes which were circulated to Friends and some attendees at a recent meeting about signage in the Highgate area. KI reported on the recent meeting at Highgate Cemetery. Richard Webber from the Highgate Society has done a lot of work on this. The conversation at the meeting was about the look of signage; that it should be discreet. It needs to be affordable and in suitable locations. Using existing standards is sensible if people will recognise signs more easily. (London Transport signs etc). Actions from the meeting were for people to go away and look at costs. Some Community Infrastructure Levy money might be used. IH mentioned the potential issue with two boroughs wanting funds to be spent in their own areas only despite the scheme involving the N6 area (both Camden and Haringey). Highgate Cemetery hopes to put in 50% of the cost of signs which include them (subject to Trustee approval). Some people have been delegated to talk to councillors. FoWP question if there is a need to have any signage in the park. Signs in park pointing to things outside is probably to be avoided. Also a question about if style of any additional signs can be different if in the park. EW said that at the bottom of Swains Lane there is nothing to indicate Highgate Cemetery. Victoria from Camden has been asked to survey all the current signs in the park and would appreciate photos.</p>	<p>Action AW to come up with background financial information in the next couple of weeks for circulation ahead of a TAG brainstorm session in Feb.</p> <p>FoWP to get some public feedback on the issue of signs, discuss and provide a recommendation to TAG</p> <p>IH to take photos of current signs around the park and send to Victoria.</p>
<p>TAG membership / officers IH said that as Interim Chair he was available in the UK until the end of March. Would then be out of the country for some months, though likely back briefly in June. Sue Tatum has expressed an interest in the role of Chair and attended the public meeting. AW also has had one expression of interest in Secretary role some time back.</p>	<p>AW to circulate CV's. ALL to feedback and subject to agreement invite attendance at next TAG meeting so there is a process of familiarisation.</p>
<p>Draft report from 2015 / 16 for Charity Commission including draft financial statement</p>	<p>ALL to feedback to AW by the end of Wed 25th as</p>

Papers had been circulated and were briefly commented on.	reports must go for signing at the end of the week.
AOB Park will remain locked overnight when new maintenance contract starts. Date of next TAG meeting to be 21/2, 1pm at Lauderdale House 18/2 Highgate heritage day is to be held in Lauderdale House. Tables representing local interested groups invited. (HLSI? FoWP? Highgate School Museum?)	