



# Waterlow Park Trust

## Trust Advisory Group meeting 16th May 2017 2.0 pm Lauderdale House STRATEGY MEETING

**Present:** Pippa Rothenberg (PR) (Highgate Society) Meeting Chair, Ben Cook (BC) (Lux), Katherine Ives (KI) (Lauderdale House), Ceridwen Roberts (CR) (Friends of Waterlow Park),, Richard Shipman (RS)(Friends of Waterlow Park), Sue Tatum (ST) (Acting Minuting Secretary), Catharine Wells (CW)(Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum), Andrew Wright (AW) (Camden LA),

By FaceTime link: Ian Henghes (IH)

Apologies: Eileen Willmott (EW) (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area)

Item	Action
<p><b>1. Minutes of Last Meeting</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the attendees. As the purpose of this meeting was to focus upon Strategy, the minutes of the last TAG meeting were simply noted. Matters arising will be considered at the TAG meeting on June 14th.</p>	<p>Matters arising will be considered at the TAG meeting on June 14th.</p>
<p><b>2. Articulating the TAG Strategy</b></p> <p>The Chair outlined the purpose of this meeting: to identify a clear and achievable strategy for TAG. To support the discussion, TAG members had been asked to look at the Waterlow Park Income &amp; Expenditure 2016/17 statement prepared by AW and the Notes from the Waterlow Park Action Planning Workshop on 21/2/2017.</p> <p>The Agenda for the meeting had set out the following points:</p> <p>TAG needs to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What is its aim,</li><li>• What we need to do to get there, and</li><li>• How we do it.</li></ul> <p>Three key factors had been identified which inform and prescribe what can be achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The financial situation</li><li>• TAG Resources, and</li></ul>	

- Communications

### 3. The Park Financial Situation

Members were asked to look at the Financial Statement 2016-17 drawn up by AW as an indication of the financial situation. Camden does not have a separate, specific budget for all Waterlow Park expenditures. Therefore, this budget statement is *indicative only*.

The budget does **not** include the costs associated with the time given by Camden Council staff to the management of the Park & involvement with TAG.

It was also noted that only some of the rental income from the Lodges will contribute to Waterlow Park until the expenditure associated with their refurbishment had been repaid.

CW stated that the HLF agreement with Camden was that they were obliged to fund the Park for the next 10 years. AW raised the point that Council funding for the Park will gradually decrease each year for the next 10 years. Following the meeting AW checked the contract with the National Heritage Memorial Fund and it runs for 25 years from the 9 April 1988. It will cease on the 8 April 2023

Members questioned some specific elements of the funding:

- the charge of **£37,000 for repair maintenance, depots and toilets**. It was noted that currently all materials used by Camden are stored in the Park thus saving Camden storage costs.
- the charge of **£5000 for the TCV volunteering programme**. AW confirmed that, currently, the Waterlow Park Trust does not pay for this as the programme is currently funded by grants.
- **Events & Filming Income**. AW stated that any income from these are not held or recorded on a Park specific basis. The amounts cited on the Waterlow Park Statement were provided by the events service and the filming service.

**Question:** How could TAG work to increase income in these areas and how best could TAG ensure that any such income would be used to benefit Waterlow Park?

**Answer:** AW stated that money raised through the hiring of the park for 'events' **could not be ring fenced for the Park**

<p>and would go into the general Camden Park budget. However, he suggested that TAG could discuss with the events and filming services, that anybody hiring the park make a donation to the Trust.</p> <p>- <b>Predicted Deficit.</b> The predicted deficit of £104,800 for the end of this financial year was of considerable concern to members.</p>	
<p><b>4. Implications for TAG Fund Raising</b></p> <p>AW further clarified the current Camden budgetary process. Some income (i.e. tennis, lodge and park centre rental, memorial benches) is recorded against the Waterlow Park Cost Centre. Some income (i.e. events, filming) is not. Raising money to support general park maintenance activities/running costs would not be a good idea as such monies would be difficult to ring fence within the park cost centre. It would be better, therefore, to raise money for specific 'projects'.</p> <p>CR pointed out that most organisations they might approach for funding would need to be assured that the money was being used for the purpose for which it had been donated.</p> <p>The realisation of projects should, preferably, be at zero cost. Any costs (including those associated with the fund-raising) should be met by the money raised.</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> TAG to seek greater clarification from Camden regarding income generation and the establishing of specific Waterlow Park cost centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what types of TAG fund raising e.g. events, activities and projects would Camden consider such that the income generated would be ring-fenced to Waterlow Park and allocated a specific cost centre and what assurance would there be that such monies would be ring-fenced”?</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> AW &amp; RS to look at the Park contracts and financial management processes in relation to the ring-fencing of money raised.</p>
<p><b>5. Seeking Funding: Issues and Ideas</b></p> <p>A number of projects were proposed which built on work already in train. It was felt that where Working Groups were already established, these should be opened up to encourage</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> All Working Group Chairs</p>

wider local involvement, especially from experts. This would ensure a wider breadth of expertise and support fund raising.

**Funding Issues:**

**Issue 1:** What were the implications for TAG raising money for the Park as neither TAG nor Friends of Waterlow Park are a charity? Would funding need to come through the Waterlow Park Trust?

CR suggested the possibility of Endowment Funds could be considered but they had their problems.

RS suggested Corporate Sponsorship. It was noted that Camden Council currently do not support corporate sponsorship.

CR proposed seeking out 'Patrons of the Park' who would make a regular financial contribution to the Park. Such 'Patrons' could be 'recognised' by their names listed on signage.

**Issue 2:** From the financial process discussed in Section 3 it appears that the best way forward is to raise funds for specific projects rather than the general running of the Park.

At the present time, funding should be sought to fund identified projects. Such projects also include exploring how current Park running costs can be reduced.

**Agreed Project Ideas:**

All project leads should liaise with AW as appropriate to ensure that Camden is kept up to date.

**Project 1: Carbon Neutral project** (proposed by BC). This would mean that the park operated on a carbon neutral basis (including all maintenance vehicles).

This proposal had considerable support as it aligned with a number of agendas.

**Project 2: Enhancing Public Knowledge of the Park and their Experience of it: Digital Map**

**ACTION:** Possible sources for funding to be explored by FOWP in the light of the above.

**ACTION:** Agreed. Projects would be considered within this framework.

**Action:** BC to explore further and send a Summary (1 page max) to the Chair and Secretary by 9th June 2017 for consideration at the June 14th meeting.

**Action:** RS to discuss digital possibilities with IH. If the time scale

This incorporated a range of projects and working groups currently active e.g. tree labelling, setting out of nature trails, wildlife information. The aim is to enhance information about the park and its natural environment through a 'digital map'. This could be undertaken quite cheaply by building digital maps/Apps which provide information on the trees, wildlife, nature trails etc. If costs were associated then external funding sources should be sought.

**Project 3: Horticultural Management: Reducing Park Maintenance Demands &, therefore, costs:** CW stated that the park needs to become less demanding of maintenance so appropriate plants etc should be used. AW stated that as Camden Council was already following this approach, this would be very much in line with Council policy and actions.

**Project 4: Heritage Parks: Exploring Funding Potential**  
TAG needs to better informed regarding funding sources.

allows, a Summary (1 page max) to be sent to the Chair and Secretary by 9th June 2017 for consideration at the June 14th meeting.

**Action:** CR with the Friends to formalise a proposal in discussion with Camden. If the time scale allows, Summary (1 page max) to be sent to the Chair & Secretary by 9th June for consideration at the June 14th meeting.

**Action:** CW to explore what fund raising etc is possible for Heritage Parks. A Summary (1 page max) to be sent to the Chair and Secretary by 9th June 2017 for consideration at the June 14th meeting