



# Waterlow Park Trust

## Advisory Group meeting 7 Mar. 2017 3.30pm Lauderdale House

Present: Ben Cook (BC) [Lux], 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], Catharine Wells (CW) [Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum], Eileen Willmott (EW) [Dartmouth Park Conservation Area], Andrew Wright (AW) [Camden LA]

Item	Action
<b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b>	Approved - Proposed: PR, Seconded CR
<b>Signing of TAG Constitution and Partnership Agreement</b>  This item was deferred	  AW to progress
<b>Incident Reporting and Communications Protocol</b>  A draft document was considered. The meeting felt that the document labelling was misleading. AW stated that the document refers only to the Camden Council reporting protocol for 'serious incidents' as soon as possible after they have occurred. It does not refer to the procedures to be taken when actually dealing with a serious incident.  The main action to be taken for the latter would be to contact the relevant service (police, ambulance etc). However, Camden Council must be informed of the incident and of the action taken as soon as possible thereafter.	  AW to revise the document and make clear its role.
<b>Communication Pathways (including practical matters and branding)</b>  IH circulated a diagram. He made the point that Camden were hopeful that TAG might provide a single consolidated path for communications regarding the Park. This would avoid prevent email 'noise' and lack of clarity on the status of an issue and if a decision could be regarded as 'authoritative'	

from slowing down management process. IH continued that this was not appropriate when it comes to the implementation of practical matters both because TAG cannot afford to get bogged down in detail if it is to be effective in its strategic and advisory role, and because it would slow down communications that should in many instances be flowing directly between the Friends and Camden management. TAG should review existing Camden guidelines or get working parties to generate these in different areas (such as 'Trees and Views'). Once agreed implementation and minor variance should be a matter of direct communication between Camden as managers and whoever has a primary interest representing the Park stakeholders. It needs to be clear what such pathways are, and the primary contact liaising with Camden would need to be responsible for collating ideas, questions and recommendations and consolidating these for Camden so that management time is used as efficiently as possible.

It was noted that this issue had come to the fore due to the recent Camden Council action to put up safety notices around the Waterlow Park fountain. (The erection of the signs was stopped by the Friends as such signage had not been approved by the Park organisations.)

AW made the point that whilst Waterlow Park is 'different' it does have to abide by the safety procedures set by Camden. This point was noted but it was felt that any signage should take account of the particular situation - in the case of Waterlow Park most of the messages on the proposed 'signs' were not applicable. IH requested that any decision was deferred pending a report from the working party and further clarification.

Moreover, it was generally agreed that Waterlow Park signage should be standardised and what this standardisation should look like had not yet been considered.

The discussion raised the following issues:

- What are the legal signage requirements?
- What is the decision making process for approval?
- How does such signage relate to the current/future 'branding' of Waterlow Park?

It was agreed that PR would set up a short term working group involving all the key organisations directly responsible for the park and the activity within (Friends, Lauderdale House, Lux) to consider branding and signage. A representative from the Trees and Views Working Party could also be seconded to this group. A meeting would be convened within the next month. In the meantime installation of new signs would be deferred.

<p><b>Landscaping around Lauderdale House</b></p> <p>RS expressed concern about the wheelchair/buggy access path at the back of Lauderdale House. Firstly because it did not actually lead to step free access as the rear door has a 'step over lip' on the floor, and, secondly, because the path is not very attractive.</p> <p>KI explained that the builders had a reason for the way that it had been done.</p> <p>The overall question, however, was how could the appearance be improved?</p> <p>KI also stated that Lauderdale House wished to increase the size of the tarmac vehicle access space on the north side to enable delivery vans to turn within its confines rather than having to reverse out onto a busy Highgate Hill.</p> <p>IH said that the 'working breakfasts' previously suggested by KI should be started ASAP as this would be a good forum for this kind of discussion</p>	<p>It was agreed that such issues should first be discussed by the interested parties, in this case the Friends and Lauderdale House. When a strategy/actions were agreed upon these should then be presented to TAG. This example sets a modus operandi for TAG to fulfil its strategic role.</p> <p>KI to convene working breakfast with Lux / FoWP / Cafe / TCV(?)</p>
<p><b>Feedback from Strategy Workshop and Next Steps</b></p> <p>IH had circulated summary sheets prepared by AW listing the various ideas/points put forward at the workshop meeting. The questions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● what are the priorities?</li> <li>● how do we progress them?</li> <li>● can we afford them?</li> </ul> <p>PR suggested that our vision might be determined by considering the question "where do we want to be in 5 years time?"</p> <p>All agreed that Waterlow Park is a wonderful park and there is not a need for major change. We need to be strategic and identify and prioritise focus upon those areas where action is required. Any action plan needed to be based on clear criteria and affordability. Our Action Plan does not need to be a lengthy document e.g. 2 page Action Plan would suffice.</p>	<p>AW will present the financial data from Camden for funding the Park at the next TAG meeting.</p>

<p>It was suggested that the Friends (as their main remit is to be the voice of park users) should consult and input their ideas on developing this strategy, for consultation with other stakeholders and TAG.</p> <p>It was also suggested that we needed to bring together all issues relating to 'communications'. There were possibly some gaps in our list and also in relation to the links with Camden. What are the channels of communication? Who links to whom?</p> <p>It was suggested that this information, once clarified, should be put on public access sites giving transparency of process and decision making.</p> <p>It was agreed that there was no urgency regarding this as the role of TAG was still emerging.</p> <p>IH reminded the members that we needed to work within Camden Council timescales and that any agreed action plan needed to be signed off by the Trustee. AW advised that this would likely mean the plan needed to be agreed by TAG and moved through the various lines of communication by December 2017.</p>	<p>Friends of Waterlow Park to bring priority ideas for the next 5 years to the next meeting of TAG or as soon as feasible.</p> <p>AW to review the current diagrams and how they might incorporate the wider picture and other key players/participants - both from within the Council and also other relevant organisations</p>
<p><b>Trees and Views Working Party</b></p> <p>Any recommendations made by the working party would need to be approved by the Trustee. According to the terms of operation for TAG, the Trustee, Jessica Gibbons, would attend two meetings per year.</p> <p>The report from the Trees and Views Working Party would need to be discussed and approved at a TAG meeting prior to being presented to the Trustee for signing off.</p> <p>It was noted that, at present, TAG was meeting more frequently than originally proposed and its current role was not merely strategic. This current mode of working might need to continue until operational arrangements become clearer to all respective parties. Thereafter, TAG would normally meet four (4) times a year.</p>	<p>IH hopes to be in a position to present a report from the Trees and Views working party at the next TAG meeting</p>

**Any Other Business**

It was noted that OCS had not been successful in their bid to continue the Park Maintenance Service. Camden had awarded the contract to IdVerde. It was understood that the current gardening staff would be TUPE-d across.

IH asked if anyone from Camden was attending the New Model for Parks event? AW was aware of this event and thought so.

Code of Conduct Document: It was agreed to look at the document produced by the Cemeteries as a template.

AW to liaise with IH.

CR agreed to obtain a copy which would be circulated to TAG members to inform our development of such a document.