

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 2019**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT	Kate Anolue (Mayor), Sabri Ozaydin (Deputy Mayor), Huseyin Akpinar, Mahmut Aksanoglu, Maria Alexandrou, Daniel Anderson, Guner Aydin, Dinah Barry, Ian Barnes, Mahym Bedekova, Chris Bond, Yasemin Brett, Anne Brown, Alev Cazimoglu, Nesil Caliskan, Mustafa Cetinkaya, Katherine Chibah, Will Coleshill, Birsen Demirel, Clare De Silva, Chris Dey, Guney Dogan, Elif Erbil, Ergin Erbil, Susan Erbil, Achilleas Georgiou, Alessandro Georgiou, Margaret Greer, Charith Gunawardena, Christine Hamilton, Elaine Hayward, Stephanos Ioannou, Rick Jewell, Saray Karakus, Nneka Keazor, Joanne Laban, Bernadette Lappage, Dino Lemonides, Tim Leaver, Derek Levy, Mary Maguire, Andy Milne, Gina Needs, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Ahmet Oykener, Vicki Pite, Lindsay Rawlings, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Edward Smith, Jim Steven, Claire Stewart, Doug Taylor, Mahtab Uddin, Glynis Vince and Hass Yusuf
ABSENT	Tolga Aramaz, Sinan Boztas, Lee David-Sanders, Ergun Eren, Ahmet Hasan and James Hockney

1

THE MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING

Father Emmanuel Ogunnaike from St Edmund's Church, Edmonton gave the blessing.

2

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ORDINARY BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor began by wishing everyone good evening and welcoming them to Council meeting.

1. Statement from the Leader of the Council

The Leader made a statement to comply with one of the sanctions recommended by the Councillor Conduct Committee on 4th September 2019.

2. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor began by stating that it was a pleasure to be at the meeting after the long holiday period and that she hoped everyone had had a good break.

She had been very lucky to have been able to go to Nigeria to the New Yam Festival, a celebration of food and harvest and the installation of the traditional prime minister who remains until death.

She had been busy and had continued to enjoy her role, especially presiding at the Citizenship Ceremonies.

In September she had visited one of Enfield's twin towns, Gladbeck in Germany, to celebrate 100 years of the town's existence. She was planning to invite them back to Enfield in May next year to celebrate the 50 years of town twinning between the two places.

October was looking to be a busy with lots of activities for Black History Month.

The Mayor thanked Bill Cornish and Paresh Thakore, her attendants, for all their help and support and Koulla Panaretou in the Mayor's Office.

She praised the collaboration with the young mayors saying how much she had enjoyed the apple festival in Gladbeck with the 22 year old Apple Queen. She felt that it was important that young people were involved in their communities.

On 6 October 2019 she was looking forward to the African market at Edmonton Green, where many types of food and artefacts would be on sale.

On the Sunday following the meeting, she invited her fellow members to join her at the 3pm Church Service which was to be officiated by the Bishop of Edmonton.

On the 22 October 2019 at the Selby Hall in Tottenham she was planning a gala dinner in aid of her charities.

3. Deputy Young Mayor's Speech

The Deputy Young Mayor, Miss Christevie Ngoma, apologised for the absence of Okan Gurhan and updated members on their plans for the year. They had already set up a young cabinet, made plans to visit as many secondary schools as possible, were hosting a youth conference, were working to spread awareness of their work and to get young people involved in decision making and were also supporting two charities.

4. Response of Councillor Brett

Councillor Brett responded to the Leader's statement.

3

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 JULY 2019

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 8 May 2019 were received and agreed as a correct record.

4

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Aramaz, Boztas, Chibbah, David Sanders, Eren and Hockney and for lateness from Councillor Achilleas Georgiou and Doug Taylor.

Councillor Will Coleshill made a statement apologising for events of a year ago. He was aware, as he hadn't been at the time, of the breach of courtesy which he had committed.

5

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Taylor declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 (Energetik, Tranche 2 Investment) as he was a director of the company.

6

PETITION - STOP THE BIN COLLECTION CHANGES

The Lead Petitioner Seraphim Leonides spoke for 5 minutes in support of the petition, Stop the Bin Collection Changes. He raised the following points:

- He thanked the members for the opportunity to address the chamber.
- He asked for the changes to be reversed or at least modified.
- The petition had followed on from the consultation which had taken place last year on the changes to the current arrangements for domestic recycling and garden waste.
- The options put forward were unacceptable to the majority of those who had responded to the consultation. In particular, the reduction from weekly to bi-weekly collections of general waste, retaining the smaller black bins and the imposition of the charge for collecting garden waste which residents regarded as a stealth tax.
- Many residents had welcomed the introduction of wheelie bins a few years ago, but most families in the opinion of the petitioners filled up the smaller black general waste bins every week. Making these collections bi-weekly would in the petitioners' view, increase rubbish on the street encouraging foxes, rats and other wildlife.
- Charging for the green waste bins would also encourage people to burn rubbish or drive to Barrowell Green which would have a negative impact on the environment.
- There was recognition that the Council had to make savings, but also a feeling that there should be room for compromise.

- These proposals would they felt, bring down standards of cleanliness across the green and leafy borough.
- There was uncertainty around any benefits in improving the clean, healthy and hygienic environment the changes may bring about.
- The request that the Council review the proposed changes, open a genuine dialogue with residents and look again at increasing the size of the black bin or at retaining the weekly general black bin waste collections and reducing or removing the new green waste charge.
- In conclusion he appreciated the opportunity to address the chamber and hoped that the members would consider his suggestions and negotiate an acceptable conclusion for the community.

In response, Councillor Dogan, Cabinet member for Environment and Sustainability made the following points:

- He thanked the residents for coming along to the meeting and understood that changes could be unsettling.
- The decision to make the changes had not been taken lightly, but the Council had to make savings. Government had decreased Enfield's grant by £178m since 2010.
- The cost of waste disposal was increasing and these changes would save approximately £2m per year.
- The changes would also enable an extra £500,000 to be put into street cleansing and to improve recycling rates, which would be good for the environment. Increasing recycling would create extra space in the black bins.
- Across the country 78% of councils have already moved to fortnightly collections, 4% to 3-4 weekly collections and 56% of councils charge for garden waste.
- Food waste would be collected weekly from November 2019.
- Four new permanent members of staff would be appointed. Leaflets were being circulated to inform people what they can and can't put in each bin.
- Already 5,500 people have signed up to the garden waste scheme.

Councillor Laban, Leader of the Opposition, said that:

- She supported the petitioners and that local residents in surveys always prioritised the street scene and waste services, but their views were ignored.
- Three out of the eight options in the original consultation were never going to be implemented and should not have been offered.
- The majority of the respondents had wanted no change. The option that was being bought in was the least supported.
- The Council had known that the financial support from the Government was ending and should have planned accordingly. In the Opposition shadow budget they had been able to find the funds for this service.
- The administration should admit that they had got it wrong and keep the weekly collections.

Councillor Caliskan, Leader of the Council, praised the Mayor, Councillor Kate Anouye's, who had recently been designated as one of the BBC's Greater Londoners, after her 40 years of service to the NHS and her support for young black people.

Other points highlighted during the debate by the majority group:

- The Government had recently withdrawn a grant of £2.5m which had supported the weekly collections. The Council had also had to find an additional £1.5m. To make this up, the Council would have to take it from other services such as adult social care, streetlighting, special educational needs.
- Acknowledgement that it was important to keep the streets clean, but disagreement that these proposals would increase the amount of rubbish on the street.
- Fly-tipping was an issue despite current weekly collections which would be addressed.
- It was essential to protect the services for the most vulnerable.
- Similar changes had been made a few years ago in Haringey. Since then recycling had gone up and the streets had not been overrun with litter.
- The Opposition were the party of austerity and deprivation. They should support the Labour party in petitioning the government for more money for public services.
- Over half the borough did not have gardens and have suffered from the huge government cuts to services that they depended on. It was fair that those people who had gardens should make a contribution to have their waste collected when funding was tight.
- Labour would always prioritise the needs of the vulnerable.

Other points highlighted during the debate from the Opposition:

- Gratitude to the persistence of the petitioners.
- That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered the report and sent it back to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration.
- The consultation had received 5,602 responses of these 66% wanted to keep the current system.
- The view that an extra £500,000 would not make a significant difference to the street cleanliness.
- The Council should listen to the views of their residents.
- Council tax had increased and the garden waste fee was a stealth tax. The Council should stop wasting money.
- The view that the consultation was invalid as it had breached government consultations and that if it had been challenged, they would have lost the challenge.
- The issue of fly-tipping could be resolved if the Council removed the charges for collecting household items introduced by the Labour administration.

During the debate Councillor Ergin Erbil proposed a motion that the time allowed for debate be increased by 15 minutes. This was seconded by Councillor Glynis Vince and agreed without a vote.

Later in the debate, Councillor Ergin Erbil proposed and Councillor Glynis Vince seconded a motion that the time allowed for debate be increased by a further 10 minutes. This was agreed without a vote.

At the end of the debate Councillor Dogan stated that the Council would not take the action requested.

7

OPPOSITION BUSINESS - INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT

Councillor Smith introduced the issues paper, prepared by the Opposition Group.

1. Issues highlighted by Councillor Smith were as follows:

- The Opposition Group were alarmed at the proposals for high rise, high density developments on sites in Enfield including at Cineworld and at Cockfosters Tube Station which they felt were out of keeping and would strain the amenities of these areas.
- Clarification of planning guidance on housing densities following the publication of the Mayor of London's Local Plan is necessary to make clear to developers the Council's position.
- There is acknowledgement that there is a huge need for more affordable housing, but there is a debate about where this housing should be situated and whether it should be in tall buildings.
- It was felt to be inappropriate to build adjacent to the green belt or near the listed underground stations. There should be a presumption against tall building and changes to the skyline.
- Good quality building that fits in with the area should be encouraged.
- Area Action Plans could highlight areas which might be appropriate for high rise buildings but these should be limited.
- The Opposition were seeking reassurance that current guidance would not be jettisoned.

2. Councillor Caliskan, the Leader of the Council, responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

- That the National Planning Policy Framework established a need for all local authorities to update their Local Plans.
- When the Council's 2010 Core Strategy was developed, population growth and the housing crisis was not on the planning agenda to the extent that it is now.

- Previous Council housing targets were challenging, but moderate in comparison to today's housing challenges.
- Enfield's current target was 798 new homes every year, but under the new London Plan it is set to be 1,900. The government's assessment of need is higher at 3,500. Whatever the target, there is a need to increase the delivery of housing in the borough.
- The emerging Enfield Local Plan 2036 has put forward 7 options to meet the borough's growth. These will include looking at the role that existing industrial land and retail parks will have to play.
- Meeting a minimum target of 1,900 new homes a year, increasing industrial capacity and protecting and enhancing Enfield's character and green belt means being realistic.
- Intensification and co-locating residential development in industrial areas, as well as building on retail parks is important – and both these approaches are included in the Local Plan. The council is taking a brownfield, town centres first approach to accommodating growth. However, this will not be enough to meet the borough's housing needs.
- In that context the new Local Plan will provide updated policies regarding height and density to guide development in different places across Enfield. The approach to height will be dealt with on a case by case basis across the borough.
- There will be sites in Enfield, particularly where we have transport hubs, where development could increase density and include excellently designed taller buildings.
- The commitment to creating safe and strong communities by providing quality homes in well-designed places should always be a priority alongside ensuring that we are planning to accommodate the growth that is projected.
- The design of the 'place', the 'neighbourhood' matters. Therefore, whilst taller buildings will be part of the solution, the majority of sites across the borough will not necessarily be appropriate locations for tall buildings.
- Edmonton already has high rise and high density housing. There are thousands of families who live in cramped, substandard accommodation in parts of Edmonton – where in some wards 1 in 3 children are living in poverty, largely down to the soaring cost of housing because of the lack of supply.
- And those who are serious about tackling the housing crisis, should see development on the western side of the borough as well as the East.
- As regards the introduction of the permitted development rights referred to in the Opposition Paper this was a simplistic Government policy to encourage an increase in housing supply by removing the need to apply for planning permission to convert offices in to homes. This has had consequences in terms of potential impacts on jobs, quality of accommodation and the integrity and cohesion of neighbourhoods.

- The Council applied to Government for an exemption to these changes to permitted development in 2013. This application was rejected by Government. Since then this policy had not been actively pursued, until early this year.
- The Leader did support the implementation of an Article A4 Directive in Enfield withdrawing these permitted development rights.
- In Enfield she felt that we must be holistic in planning, be firm and clear on vision practical in delivery.
- All of those things are necessary in order to create good growth for our borough, as opposed to sprawling growth, which would do nothing to reduce the inequalities our residents experience.
- In the hundredth year of council housing, the Council recently launched consultation on its draft Housing & Growth Strategy which set out how the Council will deliver more and better homes to address inequality, create a more balanced housing market and help local people access a good home.
- The Council is also committed to deliver a £41m housing investment programme, as part of a new Council housing asset management strategy, to make all our Council homes meet a standard fit for the 21st century.
- In regard to development in Southgate, only the Southgate Village scheme has been submitted for planning permission, but it is likely that the others will be submitted in the next few months. This report is about the precedent being set by the scale and location of these proposed developments and their impact on local communities.
- The Cockfosters and Arnos Grove Transport for London (TfL) scheme proposals are located at accessible transport hubs that are in principle appropriate for sustainable development for new homes. Much of the surface level car parking on the Cockfosters site is used by commuters from outside Enfield. But both of these proposals are at an early pre-application stage.
- The Southgate Office Village scheme is the subject of a live planning application which is still in the process of being assessed and has not yet been determined.
- As with all schemes, officers will consider local character and heritage as well as viability, the level of affordable housing proposed, the retention of jobs, local regeneration and quality of design.
- Proper engagement with residents from developers and the Council is crucial. A comprehensive engagement approach delivered through the recent consultation stage of the Local Plan will continue with the preparation of the next stages of the New Enfield Local Plan 2036.
- Regeneration and accelerating delivery of homes, and making sure they are of quality and affordable, is of equal importance. Homes should be of excellent design and take in account surrounding areas, not least heritage. The Leader believed that

this could be achieved with appropriately located taller building in the borough.

- The borough would evolve and change to accommodate significant growth.

3. Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

a. The need highlighted by the members of the Opposition Group:

- To acknowledge that it was essential that the right decisions were made. But the Opposition had grave concerns. They had been vocal in their opposition to the proposed 29 stories on the B&Q A10 site. If permitted this would be the tallest building in the borough and would be visible from all over, altering skylines.
- To recognise that it was important not to make the mistakes of the 1960's and to avoid future tragedies like the Grenfell Tower disaster.
- To acknowledge that the Mayor of London had said that decisions on high rise schemes were a local matter.
- Car parks were necessary to prevent people driving into Central London.
- Development needed to be balanced across the east and the west of the borough.
- The desire to work together with the administration on bringing forward plans which would improve the infrastructure in the borough such as Cross Rail 2.
- Too much development can change the character of an area.
- Large tower blocks can be isolating places to live, block sunlight and cause pressure on local health and education facilities.
- Concern about a lack of consultation with local residents.
- To acknowledge that the previous Conservative administration had carried out a lot of renovation work on the Edmonton tower blocks.
- New developments around tube stations were unlikely to serve existing local residents.

b. The need highlighted by members of the Majority Group:

- To understand that there was a need to provide housing close to transport hubs to encourage sustainable travel.
- Any new development should be tenure blind and include good design taking account of heritage assets and provide the required infrastructure.
- No new development should be higher than the surrounding properties.
- New developments should be shared around the borough and not placed in the most intensively developed areas which are often where the poorest people live.

- House building had been neglected in the past and there was a desperate need for more housing in all parts of the borough.
4. At the end of the debate Councillor Smith summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group as follows:
- It was important to make sure that the correct decisions are made on applications for high rise developments. Their impact could change the character of the borough for decades. The administration should support the existing planning guidance and be clear and unequivocal in discouraging these types of development. Buildings should be of an appropriate scale. He hoped members would support the recommendations in the Opposition Business paper.
5. Councillor Caliskan then summed up on behalf of the majority group responding to the recommendations in the Opposition Priority Business Paper:
Councillors needed to be honest about the scale of challenge the borough faced to meet future housing need. Development was needed across the borough. She hoped that the opposition would join with her to oppose the cuts imposed by the Government and would with her to secure additional resources for the borough to help provide additional affordable homes. All planning decisions were to be taken by the Planning Committee on the advice of officers and a new Local Plan was in the process of being developed. She agreed with the Opposition comments on the need for improved infrastructure and felt that Cross Rail 2 could transform Enfield.

After the debate, the Leader's response to the Conservative Opposition Business paper, was not agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 37
Against: 15
Abstentions: 0

8

TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2018/19

Councillor Maguire moved and Councillor Caliskan seconded the report of the Executive Director Resources presenting the Council's Annual Treasury Management Report for 2018-19. (Report No: 41)

NOTED

1. The points raised by Councillor Maguire proposing the report:
 - a. That the Council was required to produce an annual report each year setting out the Council's debt, borrowing and interest payments.

- b. Outstanding debt to 31 March 2019 was £844.8m an increase of 148m since April 2018.
 - c. Borrowing this year has increased by £125.5m with interest payments of £19.6m. The Council had kept within its borrowing limits.
 - d. The Council borrowed money to fund the capital programme.
 - e. Tables in the report show the current borrowing, loans taken out, cost of borrowing and debt spread over 50 years.
 - f. Much of the borrowing is taken from the Public Works Loans Board.
 - g. No debt rescheduling was carried out last year.
 - h. The Council had provided assistance to schools whose accounts were overdrawn with a revolving credit facility.
 - i. When interest rates were low it was cheaper to borrow.
 - j. The current uncertainty arising from BREXIT was being monitored.
2. The following highlighted by the Opposition:
- a. Support for the actions with regard to the schools' debt.
 - b. Praise for the presentation of the report.
 - c. Concern about the levels of debt and the view that if the Council borrowed less then they would need less money to service the debt and that this was increasing pressure on the revenue budget and creating problems for the future.
 - d. As the Council sets its own borrowing limit it was not difficult to meet it.
 - e. Concern about the consequences of such high debt. Since 2010 Council debt has increased by £574m and the capital finance requirement gone up by £60m. Over the next 2 years it would reach £600m. This was felt to be unsustainable.
3. The following highlighted by the Majority Group:
- a. Thanks for officers and members for the report
 - b. Acknowledgement that this was a period with high levels of uncertainty, especially with the issue of BREXIT but that it was appropriate for the Council to strike a balance between borrowing when interest rates were low and achieving cost certainty over the period for which funds were required.
 - c. Making investments now was part of the strategy for the Council's capital programme and saves money in the future.
 - d. It was clear evidence that the Council's finances were sound and were being managed effectively and efficiently alongside measures for income generation.
4. The summing up from Councillor Maguire that the money borrowed was to enable the council to spend to invest, to build houses. In borrowing they had followed the advice of their external advisors and most of the money had been borrowed from the Public Works Loans Board. The aim of the Council was to make people's lives better.

Following the debate, the recommendations in the report were put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 36
Against: 14
Abstentions: 0

AGREED

1. To note the contents of the report.
2. To approve the revised Treasury Management Strategy noting the change to the minimum revenue provision with the addition of 4(c) set out in Appendix E to the strategy.

9

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITOR FIRST QUARTER (JUNE) 2019

Councillor Maguire proposed and Councillor Caliskan seconded the report of the Executive Director Resources on the Capital Programme First Quarter to June 2019. (Report No: 72A)

NOTED

1. Cabinet agreed at their meeting on 11 September 2019 to recommend the report to Council.
2. Councillor Maguire in introducing the report highlighted the following:
 - To acknowledge the good news that the Council had won £156m from the Housing Infrastructure Fund. The represented a substantial investment in Enfield and would support the Council's work to build houses in Meridian Water. Thanks to Peter George (Programme Director Meridian Water) and his officers and to all the councillors who had lobbied and supported the bid.
 - The report sets out the Council's current position on capital schemes, the estimated capital spending and required financing.
 - The Council were planning to spend £144m. £32.4m financed from external grants. Forecasts are contained in tables 1-5 in the report.
 - Table 7 shows financing for the Housing Revenue Account. Loans would only drawn down when required.
 - There are two additions to the capital programme. Reardon Court and the Capital Condition Programme.
3. Concern from the Opposition Group:
 - That reprofiling of £63m has been required since the Capital Programme was agreed in March earlier this year, suggesting that previous forecasts had been unreliable.
 - About the lack of building work at Meridian Water and the extra £34m required for decontamination works.
 - That extra items could be charged to the capital fund.

- About the money being spent on the Council companies including Housing Gateway. The view that this money could have been better spent on a specialist housing provider.
 - Queries about the additional monies required for environment schemes including the changes to the waste collection scheme.
 - The lack of details in the report.
4. Comments from the majority group:
- This report shows the overall expenditure for the approved capital programme and the increased funding from the GLA for Reardon Court. The Council is investing in major and minor works to improve the lives of Enfield Council tenants and address fire safety concerns.
 - That the success of the bid for Meridian Water infrastructure shows a confidence in the scheme and in Enfield which will help unlock the huge potential of the project.
5. The summing up from Councillor Maguire that the capital programme was for investing in services and should be supported by the Opposition Group. She suggested that Councillor Rawlings put her queries in writing and these would be addressed.

Following the debate the recommendations in the report were put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 36

Against: 14

Abstentions: 0

AGREED:

1. To note the additions for the Capital Programme as set out in Table 3 in paragraph 4.9 and approves the addition of the following to the approved capital programme:
 - i) Reardon Court
 - ii) Corporate Capital Condition Programme (CCCP)
2. To note the proposed reductions set out in Table 4 in paragraph 4.11 of the report.
3. To note the £156m Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) award
4. To agree the revised four year approved programme totalling £562m as set out in Appendix A of the report.

10

ENERGETIK - TRANCHE 2 INVESTMENT DECISION

Councillor Maguire moved and Councillor Caliskan seconded the report of the Director of Commercial seeking a second tranche of funding to deliver the remainder of the Energetik Business Plan. (Report Nos: 74 and 78).

Councillor Ergin Erbil moved and Councillor Laban seconded a resolution to exclude the press and public so that the part 1 and part 2 reports could be discussed at the same time.

RESOLVED, in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed on part two of the agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

All press and public left the meeting at this point.

NOTED

1. Cabinet had considered this report at their meeting on 17 July 2019 and agreed to recommend that Council approve the additional funding.
2. Councillor Maguire introduced the report highlighting:
 - Energetik had been set up to provide a cheaper reliable form of renewable energy for new developments. An initial sum of £15 had been invested. So far four networks have been created.
 - It helps the Council tackle the climate change emergency reducing the borough's carbon footprint, provides improvements to air quality and health and helps alleviate fuel poverty.
 - A supply agreement with the North London Waste Authority was due to be signed by the end of the month.
3. The concerns of the Opposition Group with regards to:
 - The effectiveness of district heating systems in helping the environment.
 - The administration costs and customer resistance.
 - The difficulties in delivering the second part of the project.
 - The amount of money involved. Although provided by grants and loans, if the company were wound up, the Council would have to pay these back.
 - Risks that the system would break down or that the Meridian Water and other developers may not sign up to the scheme.
 - That the project was too ambitious and too much of a financial risk.
 - That the scheme could cause poor air quality.
 - That agreements were not fully signed up.
4. The comments of the Majority Group:
 - The report had been agreed by Cabinet the preceding week for the second tranche of funding to deliver the remainder of its business plan including the hearing infrastructure required to serve Meridian Water.
 - In October 2018 Cabinet had asked Energetik to review the alternative funding sources and to develop a more customer focussed approach and to focus on alleviating fuel poverty and helping the Council tackle the climate change emergency.

5. Councillor Maguire summed up by saying that due diligence had been carried out, the project would be investing in fuel poverty, and needs this next tranche of money to move forward. The Council had been very cautious in their approach to the project.

Following the debate, the recommendations in the report were put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 30
Against: 13
Abstention: 0

Councillor Neville voted against the recommendations.

AGREED:

1. To approve a further investment of £30m to fund phase 2a of Energetik business plan up to 2024 which is contingent on the Council securing HNIP and MEEF funding as set out in table in 3.50. For the avoidance of doubt, the execution of the Heat Supply Agreement with the NLWA is a condition precedent on the Council releasing the approved funding being sought – see 3.4.4.
2. To note that Cabinet is due to agree on the 11 September 2019 that should the Council not be able to demonstrate the need for HNIP gap funding by January 2020 as set out in the table at 3.50, the decision on an updated investment strategy will be brought back to Cabinet.
3. To approve the forecast £7.25m allocation to be added to the Council's 'Projects in the pipeline'. Addition to the approved programme will require relevant Council and Cabinet approval. Tranche 2b is the remaining investment required to deliver the full Energetik business case on the current assumptions and timelines.
4. To note that Cabinet is due to approve on 11 September 2019 the revisions to the company's 40-year Business Plan as outlined within the company's Business Plan Addendum and the revised financial projections as identified within paragraphs 3.47 to 3.49 of this report.
5. To note that Cabinet is due to approve on 11 September 2019 the delegation to the Executive Director, Resources (in consultation with the Director of Commercial) to agree and approve any items arising out of the due diligence exercise being conducted by KPMG, and from the legal and financial state aid advice.
6. To note that Cabinet is due to approve on 11 September 2019 that the Executive Director, Resources (in consultation with the Director of Commercial) is to work with the company to agree and execute an on-lending agreement to cover Tranche 2 expenditure and to implement any arrangement involving equity by the Council. As per paragraph 3.33, this is 3% or 2.13% above the blended rate, whichever is higher.
7. To note that Cabinet is due to approve in principle on 11 September 2019, subject to investment being secured from HNIP, the ring-fencing of an amount of the received interest payments from Energetik, to be used on Enfield fuel poverty projects, to be reviewed annually, noting

that a further paper will be required in due course detailing the intervention options available.

The press and public returned to the meeting.

**11
CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Ergin Erbil moved and Councillor Nesil Caliskan seconded a proposal under paragraph 2.2(B) of the Council procedure rules to change the order of items on the agenda.

It was proposed that motions should be taken as the next item of business.

This was agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 30
Against: 13
Abstentions: 0

The minutes reflect the order of the meeting.

**12
URGENT MOTION**

Councillor Caliskan moved and Councillor Yusuf seconded the following motion:

"This Council believes that Boris Johnson's decision to prorogue parliament during a critical period approaching the 31st October deadline is a cynical affront to the principle of parliamentary democracy. This view has been reinforced by Scotland's highest civil court who ruled on the 11th September that the Prime Minister's shutdown of parliament was unlawful. On the 6th September the English high court judges decided that suspending Parliament was a 'purely political' move by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister's refusal to allow our representatives in the House of Commons to debate and scrutinise his government, is the disposal of democratic legislative scrutiny altogether.

As Johnson hurtles towards a no-deal exit, residents across Enfield are worried. The Governor of the Bank of England has warned of an instant shock to the economy in the event of a no-deal, and that medicine and food would become more expensive if the UK leaves the EU without an agreement.

EU nationals and their families living in Enfield and across the country face huge instability about their 'settled status' and the threatened prospect of the end of freedom of movement on the 31st October 2019.

This council opposes the Prime Minister's decision to prorogue parliament and believes he should respect the court ruling that his actions are unlawful."

Following the debate, the motion was put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 32

Against: 12

Abstentions: 0

The Mayor had agreed to accept the above motion as an urgent motion for the following reason:

"The reason for submitting this motion as an emergency is because on the 11th September 2019 Scotland's highest civil court ruled that the Prime Minister's shutdown of parliament was unlawful. The 11th September is after the 12 calendar days required for notice of a motion to Council on 18 September 2019.

Also, the Supreme Court is currently dealing with the case against the Prime Minister. These are unprecedented times and warrant the permitting of the motion."

13

DURATION OF COUNCIL MEETING

The Mayor advised, at this stage of the meeting, that the time available to complete the agenda had now elapsed so Council Procedure Rule 9 would apply.

NOTED that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 (page 4-8 – Part 4), the remaining items of business on the Council agenda were considered without debate.

14

REARDON COURT EXTRA CARE HOUSING SCHEME

RECEIVED a report from the Executive Director People on the Reardon Court Extra Care Housing Scheme (Report No: 48)

NOTED

1. The Scheme was agreed and recommended to Council by Cabinet at their meeting on 17 July 2019.
2. The report was considered in conjunction with report no:51 on the part 2 agenda.

AGREED

1. To note that Cabinet agreed at their meeting on 17 July 2019:

- 1.1 To note the content of this report, including the Council's successful bid to the Greater London Authority (GLA) for £9,443,161 capital funding to develop Extra Care Housing at Reardon Court.
 - 1.2 To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement, the Director of Health & Adult Social Care and the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Health & Social Care:
 - 1.3 The award of construction work contracts for the demolition and redevelopment of the site.
 - 1.4 Project management and procurement arrangements including operational resourcing, appointments for all pre and post contract construction services and submission of a planning application
 - 1.5 To approve the application of funds (circa £2.5m – see section 3.5.7) from the Kingsdowne Society Trust to this project - subject to administrators releasing the funds and the Charity Commission approval - to reduce the Council's borrowing requirement for the scheme.
2. To approve the allocation of capital funding for this development from the Council's Capital Programme based on the improved business case. (See Part 2).

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Joanne Laban, advised that if there had been a vote her group would have voted against.

15

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORKPROGRAMME 2019/20

RECEIVED a report from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee setting out the scrutiny annual work programme and workstreams identified for 2019/20. (Report No: 69)

NOTED

1. The report was considered at Cabinet on 11 September 2019 and recommended to Council for approval.

AGREED to approve the scrutiny work programme and workstreams for 2019/20.

16

CHANGES TO HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD

RECEIVED the report of the Director of Housing and Regeneration on revised terms of reference for the Housing Advisory Board. (Report No: 61)

AGREED to approve the revised terms of reference for the Housing Advisory Board.

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Joanne Laban, advised that if there had been a vote her group would have voted against.

17

MEMBERS ALLOWANCES

AGREED that the current Members Allowances Scheme is re-approved as set out in Part 6 of the Constitution, and that the automatic increase in allowances by the average earnings as at March not be implemented for the 2019/20 financial year.

18

COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. Urgent Questions

There were no urgent questions.

2. Questions by Councillors

NOTED

1. The forty questions on the Council agenda and the written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Members.

19

MOTIONS

The following motions lapsed under the guillotine arrangements: 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5, 16.6, 16.7, 16.8, 16.9, 16.10, 16.11.

20

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

There were no changes.

21

NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

There were no changes.

22

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that the next ordinary Council meeting will take place on Wednesday 20 November 2019 at 7pm.

23

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED, in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed on part two of the agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

24

ENERGETIK TRANCHE 2 INVESTMENT DECISION

The minute for this report has been included in the part 1 agenda.

25

REARDON COURT EXTRA CARE HOUSING

RECEIVED the part 2 report of the Executive Director People on the Reardon Court Extra Care Housing Scheme. (Report No: 51)

NOTED

1. that Cabinet had considered this scheme on 17 July 2019 and recommended it to Council for approval.
2. That the report was considered in conjunction with the part 1 report no 48.

AGREED to approve the allocation of capital funding for this development from the Council's Capital Programme (as detailed in the part 2 report) based on the improved business case.