### **Public Document Pack**



### **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Thursday, 11 April 2019 at 7.30 pm Conference Room, Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA Contact: Elaine Huckell

Scrutiny Officer

Direct: 020-8379-3530 Tel: 020-8379-1000

E-mail: elaine.huckell@enfield.gov.uk Council website: www.enfield.gov.uk

Councillors: Derek Levy (Chair), Huseyin Akpinar, Tolga Aramaz, Susan Erbil, Gina Needs (Vice-Chair), Lee David-Sanders and Edward Smith

Education Statutory Co-optees: 1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor Representative).

Enfield Youth Parliament Co-optees (2)
Support Officer – Susan O'Connell (Governance & Scrutiny Officer)
Elaine Huckell (Governance & Scrutiny Officer)

### 1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Council are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to the items on the agenda.

# 3. CALL IN: PROPOSED MARKETING AND LEASEHOLD DISPOSAL OF WHITEWEBBS PARK GOLF COURSE (Pages 1 - 20)

To receive and consider a report from the Director of Law and Governance outlining details of a call-in received on the Portfolio Decision taken on Proposed Marketing and Leasehold Disposal of Whitewebbs Park Golf Course (Report No. 210).

The decision that has been called in was a Portfolio Decision taken on 22 March 2019 and included on the Publication of Decision List No: 57/18-19 (List Ref:1/57/18-19) issued on 22 March 2019.

It is proposed that consideration of the call-in be structured as follows:

• Brief outline of the reasons for the call-in by representative (s) of the members who have called in the decision

- Response to the reasons provided for the Call-in by a Cabinet Member responsible for taking the decision
- Debate by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and agreement of action to be taken

Please also see the Part 2 agenda.

### 4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 MARCH 2019 (Pages 21 - 26)

To agree the minutes of the meeting held on the 19 March 2019.

### 5. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

To consider, if necessary, passing a resolution under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed in Part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that it will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006), as are listed on the agenda (Members are asked to refer to the Part 2 agenda).

### MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/2019 REPORT NO. 210

MEETING TITLE AND DATE: Overview & Scrutiny Committee, 11 April 2019

**REPORT OF:** 

Director of Law & Governance

Agenda – Part: 1 Item:

**Subject: Proposed Marketing and Leasehold Disposal of Whitewebbs Park** 

**Golf Course** 

Wards: Chase

**Key Decision No: KD 4849** 

Cabinet Member consulted: N/A

Contact officers and telephone

numbers:

Jeremy Chambers, Director Law and Governance

Tel: 020 8379 4799

Email: Jeremy.chambers@enfield.gov.uk

Claire Johnson, Head of Governance & Scrutiny

Tel: 020 8379 4239

E mail: claire.johnson@enfield.gov.uk

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report details a call-in submitted in relation to the following decision:

Portfolio Decision (taken on 22/03/19).

- 1.2 Details of this decision were included on Publication of Decision List No. 57/18-19 (Ref. 1/57/18-19 issued on 22 March 2019).
- 1.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the decision that has been called-in for review.
- 1.4 The members who have called-in this decision do not believe it falls outside of the Council's Policy Framework.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers the called-in decision and either:
  - (a) Refers the decision back to the decision-making person or body for reconsideration setting out in writing the nature of its concerns. The decision-making person or body then has 14 working days in which to reconsider the decision; or
  - (b) Refer the matter to full Council; or
  - (c) Confirm the original decision.

Once the Committee has considered the called-in decision and makes one of the recommendations listed at (a), (b) or (c) above, the call-in process is completed. A decision cannot be called in more than once.

If a decision is referred back to the decision-making person or body; the implementation of that decision shall be suspended until such time as the decision making person or body reconsiders and either amends or confirms the decision, but the outcome on the decision should be reached within 14 working days of the reference back. The Committee will subsequently be informed of the outcome of any such decision.

### 3. BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION

3.1 Please refer to Section 3 in the Decision Report.

### 4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

None – Under the terms of the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution, Overview & Scrutiny Committee is required to consider any eligible decision called-in for review. The alternative options available to Overview & Scrutiny Committee under the Council's Constitution, when considering any call-in, have been detailed in section 2 above.

### 5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To comply with the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution.

# 6. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

### 6.1 Financial Implications

The financial implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in Section 6.1 of the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 6.2 Legal Implications

S 21, S 21A-21C Local Government Act 2000, s.19 Police and Justice Act 2006 and regulations made under s.21E Local Government Act 2000 define the functions of the Overview and Scrutiny committee. The functions of the committee include the ability to consider, under the call-in process, decisions of Cabinet, Cabinet Sub-Committees, individual Cabinet Members or of officers under delegated authority.

Part 4, Section 18 of the Council's Constitution sets out the procedure for call-in. Overview and Scrutiny Committee, having considered the decision may: refer it back to the decision-making person or body for reconsideration; refer to full Council or confirm the original decision.

The Constitution also sets out at section 18.2, decisions that are exceptions to the call-in process.

### 6.3 Property Implications

The property implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in Section 6.3 of the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 7. KEY RISKS

The key risks identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

# 8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES - CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD

The way in which the called-in decision impacts on the Council priorities relating to good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods, sustain strong and healthy communities and build our local economy to create a thriving place have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

The equalities impact implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The performance management implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

The health and safety implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

### 12. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

The public health implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Portfolio Decision Report.

### **Background Papers**

None

# **APPENDIX 1**

Call-In: Portfolio Decision: Proposed Marketing and Leasehold Disposal of Whitewebbs Park Golf Course



### **MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/2019 REPORT NO.**

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY** 

KD Num: 4849 Agenda – Part: 1

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:

**Subject: Proposed marketing and** leasehold disposal of Whitewebbs Park

Golf Course.

Wards: Chase

Cllr Ahmet Oykener - Cabinet Member for Property and Assets

**REPORT OF:** 

**Executive Director of Place** 

Contact officers:

Wesley Pemberton 0208 379 4637 Commercial Development Manager Wesley.Pemberton@enfield.gov.uk

Jessie Lea 0208 379 4004 Head of Strategic Property Services Jessie.Lea@enfield.gov.uk

#### 1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report requests that the Council takes a more flexible approach to marketing and agreeing the property transaction of Whitewebbs Golf Course, with the intention to re-purpose this challenging property and optimise delivery of the Council's Corporate Objectives.
- 1.2 The Council operates Whitewebbs Park Golf Course, which does not currently recover operating costs. The property has significant challenges, including, but not limited to, Green Belt planning designation and licensing restrictions.
- 1.3 A marketing process was previously undertaken in 2017 to award a lease for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course. Following a review, the award of the lease was halted in 2018, as although the transaction was undertaken within the Council's Property Procedure Rules, it did not optimise the delivery of the Council's wider corporate objectives.
- 1.4 See Part 2 report.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Property & Assets:

- 2.1 Agrees to the proposed marketing and disposal process described within this report, for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course.
- 2.2 Delegates the authority to the Director of Property & Economy to instruct the Director of Law and Governance to draw up legal agreements for a suitable property transaction for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course.
- 2.3-2.4See Part 2 report

### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Whitewebbs Park Golf Course, is located at the northern border of Enfield and is a 103 acres, 18 hole golf course with club house and pro shop. The golf course, which does not recover its operating costs, is laid out over undulating parkland, but requires significant investment to bring it back to modern standards. The course has two basic club houses, one of which is dilapidated, a pro shop and a mobile catering concession, which is contracted until March 2020. There is significant competition, with 19 golf courses within a 20 minutes' drive from Whitewebbs Park.
- 3.2 In 2017, Property Services undertook a marketing exercise to award a lease for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course. It was stipulated within the marketing offer, that a part golfing use of the site was to be retained.
- 3.3 Following a review of the terms of the proposed lease for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course in November 2018, the award of the lease was halted due to identification of several key issues. The key issues which were considered to be not being in the Councils best interests were:
  - The length of the proposed lease
  - The type of use proposed in terms of long-term viability
  - Likelihood of planning consent being granted
- 3.4 It is proposed that a new marketing exercise is undertaken to award a lease for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course. To maximise the level of commercial interest in the Whitewebbs, the Council will not restrict bidders to golfing use only of the site but will encourage a creative response to the opportunity, which will provide both a positive financial outcome for the Council and be beneficial for the local community.
- 3.5 Commercial Services will work alongside SPS, to manage the project. A cross Council project team has been formed to efficiently deliver the best holistic solution for the disposal of the asset. The team comprises of officers from:
  - Strategic Property Services (SPS)
  - Commercial Services
  - Operational Services
  - Legal Services
  - Finance
  - Development Control
- 3.6 Heads of terms and leases will be drafted and included in the marketing pack to expediate the completion of the lease. Planning statements will be prepared by LBE's Planning Service, advising bidders of all planning restrictions. Full due diligence will be undertaken for all of the assets and bidders advised on all other known site issues.

### 3.7-3.8 See Part 2 report

3.9 Due to the specialised nature of the property, a commercial property agent will be appointed, to undertake the marketing of the assets. The agents will provide in-depth knowledge and expert advice for entering specific markets.

Evaluation of the bids received will be undertaken by the internal team comprising of officers from Commercial, Property and Planning, to optimise the delivery against wider Corporate Objectives and in compliance with s.123 of the Local Government Act 1972. The evaluation criteria will take into account financial returns as well as economic, social and environmental well-being criteria, to obtain the optimum result for the Council and the local community.

### 4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 The Council could do nothing and continue to operate Whitewebbs Park Golf. However, without significant inward investment, the site would continue to operate at a loss and continue to deteriorate.

### 5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1-5.2 See Part 2 report
- 5.3 It is expected that the new tenants will invest to re-purpose and modernise the asset and as a result improve facilities and accessibility for the local communities and increase footfall across the site.

### 6. COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS

- 6.1 Financial Implications
- 6.1.1 See Part 2 report.

### 6.2 Legal Implications

- 6.2.1 Pursuant to section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 when granting a lease a Local Authority needs to demonstrate that they have obtained the best consideration reasonably obtainable. The tendering exercise to be carried out by Property Services in respect of the proposed lease should demonstrate that this has been achieved.
- 6.2.2 The tendering process is scheduled for around May/June 2019 and should be in accordance with the Council's Property Procedure Rules.
- 6.2.3 The formal granting of the leases shall be in a form approved by the Council's Director of Law and Governance.
- 6.2.4 In accordance with the Council's Property Procedure Rules, given the cumulative value of the term of the lease, approval of the award of the Lease will be required from the Council's Director of Resources.
- 6.2.5 The recommendations contained within this report are within the Council's powers and duties.
- 6.2.6 The Council recognises that Transfer of Undertakings (TUPE) 2006 Regulations (TUPE) is likely to apply to the transaction and will constitute a 1st generation transfer as the transferring employees are direct employees of the Council (Regulation 3(1)(b)(i)). The Council must ensure that it adheres to TUPE and carries out all required obligations in relation to the transaction.

### 6.3 Property Implications

6.3.1 This report has been co-authored by the Commercial team and Strategic Property Services team. Property implications are therefore embedded within the body of this report.

### 6.4 Procurement Implications

6.4.1 As this is a property transaction it will be undertaken in accordance with the Councils Property Procedure Rules and suggested recommendations as contained in this report. Therefore there are no procurement implications.

### 6.5 HR Implications

- 6.5.1 The above proposal could constitute a service provision change under the TUPE regulations. Should this be a TUPE situation staff directly employed by the council and assigned to the provision of these services would be entitled to transfer to the successful applicant with their current terms and conditions intact. There are currently seven officers directly employed who are eligible to transfer.
- 6.5.2 The TUPE regulations require consultation to take place with the relevant trade unions and staff impacted by the transfer at the earliest opportunity.
- 6.5.3 Formal consultation will be led by the Council as the "transferors" in the transfer arrangements. The successful applicant will need to notify the Council of any intended "measures" they propose to take as a result of the transfer and will be expected where possible to support and engage in the consultation process with the staff and trade unions. Under TUPE regulations staff who transfer have their terms and conditions of employment protected and it should be noted that these can only be changed in very limited circumstances.
- 6.5.4 Should the successful bid not be related to golf course use nor feature a pro golf shop or similar retail venture, it is possible that the seven officers directly employed in provision of these services will be in a redundancy situation.
- 6.5.5 Staff directly affected should be made aware of this proposal and also receive regular updates from their service managers.

### 7. KEY RISKS

- 7.1 Planning constraints may result in some submissions being discounted due to proposed uses inability to comply with planning control. Planning statements will be prepared and included within the marketing process, to ensure bidders are fully aware of the restrictions on development.
- 7.2 Insufficient interest is received leading to a lack of bids for the asset. The project team will: undertake early market engagement to ensure all potential bidders are made aware of the opportunities; appoint specialist property marketing agents; and provide fluid terms, for up to 25 years, to attract long term investments and maximise the level of interest in the sites.
- 7.3 Concern around proposed changes, from existing users of the Golf Course, if the new tenant proposes alternative uses to the existing golf provision. Consultation will be undertaken with relevant community stakeholders. The

project team will work with corporate communications, to ensure that public relations for the project effective and transparent.

7.4 See Part 2 report.

## 8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES – CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD

### 8.1 Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods

8.1.1 The granting of a lease for Whitewebbs Park Golf Course will support regeneration within the borough, by allowing investment for the property to be developed and managed by an experienced tenant, who will provide wider leisure activities and opportunities to all within the diverse community of Enfield.

### 8.2 Sustain strong and healthy communities

8.2.1 The potential investment in Whitewebbs Park Golf Course, will result in modernised leisure facilities within the borough. It is anticipated that this will create a safe and enjoyable meeting point for adults and children, whilst providing all year-round leisure activities in the local neighbourhood and increase the footfall across the sites.

### 8.3 Build our local economy to create a thriving place

8.3.1 The income achieved from leasing Whitewebbs Park Golf Course will assist the sustainable economic growth for the Authority, as well as potentially creating a boost to the local economy and local employment.

### 9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Corporate advice has been sought in regard to equalities and an agreement has been reached that an equalities impact assessment is neither relevant nor proportionate for the approval of this report.

### 10. PERFORMANCE AND DATA IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The projects to take the assets to market will be managed by Commercial and Strategic Property Services. If leases are awarded they will be managed by Strategic Property Services.

### 11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Should the Council gain an income from Whitewebbs it will allow it to provide or support other services for Enfield residents. The exact implications for the health of the public though will depend on the final use of this land.

### **Background Papers**

None



# **APPENDIX 2**

Call-in request form submitted by 8 members of the Council



### **CALL-IN OF DECISION**

(please ensure you complete all sections fully)

Please return the completed original signed copy to: Claire Johnson, Democratic Services Team, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Civic Centre

WHITEMEBES PARK GNE CIVIC	OYKENER, CABINET MEMBER FOR
LIST NO: 57/18-19 (* N.B. Remember you must call–in a decision and notify Democratic Services Team within 5 working days of its publication).	
A decision can be called in if it is a corporate or portfolio decision made by either Cabinet or one of its sub-committees, or a key decision made by an officer with delegated authority from the Executive.	
(a) COUNCILLORS CALLING-IN (The Council's constitution requires seven signatures or more from Councillors to call a decision in).	
(1) Signature:	Print Name: Joanne Laban
(2) Signature: M. M.	Print Name: Mike Rye
(3) Signature: September 1	Print Name: STCP.HANDS TRANSON
(4) Signature Ourle	Print Name: TYINCC
(5) Signature:	Print Name: A MILNE
(6) Signature:	Print Name: MTRIAALCOMD RO
(7) Signature:	Print Name: STEVELD
(8) Signature: Plane Haxward	Print Name: DLANF HAYWARD
(b) SCRUTINY PANEL RESOLUTION (copy of minute detailing formal resolution to request call-in to be attached).	
NAME OF PANEL:	
DATE OF PANEL:	



# **APPENDIX 3**

Reasons for Call-in by Councillor calling in the decision

&

Briefing Note in response to called in decision

The response will be 'To Follow' and will be Part

2



# Call-in: Proposed marketing and leasehold disposal of Whitewebbs Park Golf Course

### Reason why the decision is being called in:

• The report fails to go into any detail as to why the current business model is failing.



### Public Doeument Pack

### **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 19.3.2019**

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE **HELD ON TUESDAY, 19 MARCH 2019**

**PRESENT** 

COUNCILLORS: Derek Levy (Chair), Huseyin Akpinar, Susan Erbil, Tolga Aramaz, James Hockney, Rick Jewell, Lee David-

Sanders.

**STATUTORY CO-OPTEES** 

1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent

Governor representative) – Italics Denotes absence

**OFFICERS:** 

Peter George (Director - Meridian Water), Bindi Nagra (Director of Adult Social Care), John Baker (Meridian Water Project Director), Iain Hart (Service Development Ehiagwina (Principal Regeneration Manager). Oba Officer), Susan O'Connell (Scrutiny Officer), Elaine Huckell

(Scrutiny Secretary).

Also Attending:

Councillor Nesil Caliskan (Leader of the Council), Councillor Edward Smith, Councillor Clare De Silva, Councillor Anne Brown and Simon Allin (member of the press).

### 1030 **WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

Councillor Levy welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

It was noted that Councillor Rick Jewell was substituting for Councillor Gina Needs and Councillor Hockney was substituting for Councillor Edward Smith for item 3 - 'Call in of Decision: Meridian Water Station Public Realm Place Making'.

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Alev Cazimoglu Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care and from Councillor Gina Needs.

Councillor Levy reminded everyone that discussion on the two call-ins to be looked at this evening, should be about the specific reasons for call-in given in the papers and responses to them. The reasons given should be evidence based and not opinions or statements. Discussion needs to specify what is being asked to go back to the decision taker for reconsideration.

### 1031 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### 1032

# CALL IN OF DECISION: MERIDIAN WATER STATION PUBLIC REALM PLACE MAKING

The Committee received a report from the Director of Law and Governance outlining details of a call-in received on the decision taken by the Leader of the Council on the Meridian Water Station, Public Realm Place Making.

NOTED that this report was considered in conjunction with the information in the part 2 agenda.

The Chair invited Councillor Smith to outline the reasons for call-in. It was noted that this discussion was held in public under the part 1 section of the meeting.

Councillor Smith outlined the reasons for calling in the decision:

- The report provided was not clear in some respects and although responses had been provided to the reasons for call-in – not all points had been covered. However, he said the level of reporting was improving.
- 2. Concern that the estimate for the cost of works had increased substantially and that the costs had not been properly reported at the call-in meeting in September 2018.
- 3. That the estimated cost of the project appeared to have risen by 62% in four months, which he now estimates to be £3.9million. A cost breakdown had been prepared by Councillor Smith which gave what he considered to be an estimate of total scheme costs. He had sought a detailed cost breakdown from officers, which had subsequently been provided by them and which had been included in the agenda papers.
- 4. The decision to award the design and works contract to a single contractor -Volker Fitzpatrick was taken after a failed procurement and a renegotiated contract, when the original Master Developer procurement was abandoned. Earlier concerns had been given that the lack of a competitive procurement process for the scheme might lead to significant increase in costs which, he felt, was now apparent.
- 5. Further clarity was needed regarding the cost estimate for the scheme what fees have been included and maintenance expenditure expected.

Councillor Levy, reminded everyone that calling- in a decision was not a mechanism to satisfy curiosity as this could be achieved by other means, for example by having discussions with officers and asking for further information.

He invited Councillor Caliskan to respond to the points raised by Councillor Smith.

The response of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caliskan. She highlighted the following:

- The decision to call-in this report was a waste of members and officers time. Four reports relating to Meridian Water have been called-in which could have been resolved by members discussing issues of concern with officers or with the Chief Executive or herself.
- As set out in the 'Response to reasons for call- in' the latest Delegated Authority Report (DAR) provides a full and complete break down of the costs which show that there has not been an increase in costs. The correct figure for the works is £3.5 million which is within the original estimates given at the previous Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September. This reflects the VolkerFitzpatrick contract works at £3m and £500k on other packages.
- The sequencing of the Meridian Water contract meant that it was crucial for VolkerFitzpatrick, the appointed contractor, under a Preconstruction Services Agreement (PCSA), to complete the public realm works within timescales. At the meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 September 2018 all political parties agreed to allow the original decision to approve the works to the public realm adjacent to the new railway station on Meridian Way to be confirmed. There have been no substantial changes since that time.

The following issues/ questions were raised:

- Peter George said he would be happy to spend time with Councillor Smith explaining any issues of concern he may have regarding the Meridian Water project. Partnership working with Network Rail and LB Enfield is ensuring delivery of the new station for Meridian Water on time and on budget. The Council is supported by Stace LLP (Construction & Property Consultancy) as Project Managers and Cost Consultants. They have confirmed that the total budget price of £3.5m represents value for money.
- Councillor Hockney referred to the Part 1 report which referred to an indicative cost for the delivery of the public realm work which was undertaken using external cost consultants, in Autumn 2016. At that time a figure of £750K was identified for design and £3.25m for construction work. He asked for clarification on this. An explanation was given that figures given at this time were for high level works and gave a worse- case scenario. The works have come in under budget. The original authorisation was necessary for a PCSA with VolkerFitzpatrick to enable the planning application submission. The logistics meant It was necessary to do this to ensure the work comes in on time, ready for the station opening, May 2019.
- It would not have been possible to undertake works needed through a
  traditional tender process within the timeframe. It could have led to
  delays and increased costs. Councillor Hockney referred to Stace LLP
  confirmation that the estimated price was value for money. It was
  stated that comparisons are undertaken with cost documents used and
  comparing rates. There is a rigorous process in place.

 Councillor Caliskan said members have a choice whether they want to refer the report back. This could however result in delays to the project and public realm works not being ready in time for the station opening. It could also lead to higher costs.

Councillor Smith summed up by saying that he was entitled to question decisions where it is apparent that there appears to be unjustified cost increases. Since the last call-in on this subject in September 2018 the figures given seem to show a 65% increase. He understood that under the original plans for the project the main contractor was going to pay for the new station but that this was no longer the case.

The Chair stated that Councillor Smith had made assertions and answers had been given and costings provided. The Chair reminded Councillor Smith that he can seek clarification from officers, or the Leader and request items come to Scrutiny.

Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the reasons provided for the callin and responses provided and having considered the information provided the Committee agreed to confirm the original Portfolio decision:

- 1. Authorises the expenditure to complete public realm related works identified in the Part 2 report
- 2. Authorises the delegation to the Meridian Water Programme Director to place smaller packages of work to those packages as set-out in the Part 2 report
- 3. Authorises VolkerFitzspatrick to deliver the works by variation of existing agreements as set out in the Part 2 report

Councillors Levy, Akpinar, Aramaz, Susan Erbil and Jewell voted in favour of the above decision. Councillors David-Sanders and Hockney abstained.

Following this item Councillor Lee David-Sanders left the meeting and Councillor Smith took has place on OSC.

### 1033

CALL IN OF DECISION: ENFIELD COUNCIL AND ENFIELD CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (CCG) JOINT COMMISSIONING FOR COMMUNITY REHABILITATION SUPPORT SERVICES

The Committee received a report from the Director of Law and Governance outlining details of a call-in received on the Portfolio decision taken on Enfield Council and Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) joint commissioning for Community Rehabilitation Support Services (Report no:203).

NOTED that this report was considered in conjunction with the information in the part 2 agenda.

### Page 25

### **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 19.3.2019**

All the discussion on this item took part in the part 2 section of the meeting.

# 1034 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 19TH FEBRUARY 2019

AGREED the minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2019.

# 1035 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted the dates of future meetings as follows:

Provisional Call-Ins: Tuesday 26 March, 2019 Thursday 11 April, 2019

The business meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee: Wednesday 3 April, 2019

# 1036 EXCLUSION OF PRESS & PUBLIC

Resolved in accordance with the principles of Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of the Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

# 1037 MERIDIAN WATER STATION - PUBLIC REALM PLACE MAKING

NOTED the information provided under the part 2 agenda.

All discussions took place under part 1 of the agenda

### 1038

ENFIELD COUNCIL AND ENFIELD CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (CCG) JOINT COMMISSIONING FOR COMMUNITY REHABILITATION SUPPORT SERVICES

The Committee received the information provided on the Enfield Council and Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) joint commissioning for Community Rehabilitation Support Service which had been included in the part 2 section of the agenda.

### NOTED

The information was considered in conjunction with the report on the part 1 agenda.

The Chair invited Councillor Clare De Silva to outline the reasons for call-in

Councillor De Silva referred to the Delegated Authority Report which set out details of the current support provision for Enfield residents with high mental health needs that require more intensive support within the community. The part 2 of the report proposes the remodelled service.

Councillor De Silva's concerns relate to the financial modelling/ costings used, she was not challenging the process of going out to tender.

The responses given were as follows:

 Bind Nagra (Director of Adult Social Care) explained the modelling process used for obtaining and assessing tenders from providers for this service.

Other points discussed included

- Briefings could be provided to Councillor De Silva regarding the proposals as they developed.
- Iain Hart (Service Development Manager), said it was hoped that the new contract would commence from the beginning of January 2020.
- Section117 contributions were explained.

Following the discussion and noting the comments made the Committee agreed to confirm the decision.

'To agree the proposal to remodel and retender the pathway for service users with high/complex mental health needs, currently in secure units or locked rehab, requiring a well-supported transition back into the community.'

Councillors Levy, Akpinar, Aramaz, Susan Erbil and Jewell voted in favour of the above decision. Councillors Smith and Hockney abstained.

Councillor Levy thanked everyone for attending the meeting.