

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2021**

**COUNCILLORS**

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

**ABSENT** Yasemin Brett, Will Coleshill, Lee David-Sanders, Saray Karakus and Derek Levy

**1**

**THE MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING**

The Mayor's Chaplain, Kazim Yildirim from the Alevi Centre in Wood Green 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 the first Council meeting of the year. He trusted everyone had had a good Christmas.

He acknowledged that the pandemic was still affecting so many of our lives and advised that we must take as many precautions as possible to safeguard ourselves, our families and loved ones, whilst protecting our NHS.

He sent his best wishes to all the residents and staff and thanked again all those who were working so tirelessly to help defeat the virus.

This year Enfield Council had hosted and broadcasted a special online event to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day – an International Day of Remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust and other genocides. This

## **COUNCIL - 28.1.2021**

event had enabled those taking part to reflect on and remember the millions of people killed under Nazi persecution as well as the many other genocides that had occurred since the end of the second world war.

The Mayor said that the light at the Civic Centre would always burn brightly in remembrance of those lost. It is the "Light in The Darkness", lest we forget.

The Mayor then asked members to observe a minute's silence in memory of two former councillors who had recently passed away: Andrew Stafford and Jayne Buckland. Condolences were offered to their families at this sad time

Councillors Nesil Caliskan, Joanne Laban, Daniel Anderson, Doug Taylor, Alessandro Georgiou, Gina Needs, Kate Anolue, Ergin Erbil and Terry Neville, spoke in tribute to Andrew Stafford.

Councillor Mike Rye spoke in tribute to Jayne Buckland. Councillor Lappage said that tributes from the Labour group would be given at the next meeting.

A minute silence was held in memory of them both.

The Young Mayor, Kayhan Ali, gave a brief update on his activities since the last Council meeting. He thanked everyone who had helped him during the past year and said that he had been blessed to have had such an amazing opportunity. He was currently working with the Metropolitan Police on a booklet which he hoped would improve understanding between the police and young people and on a mental health project to support young people.

### **3**

#### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 NOVEMBER 2020**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 November 2020 were received and agreed as a correct record.

### **4**

#### **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brett, David-Sanders, Karakus, Levy and for lateness from Councillor Akpinar.

### **5**

#### **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

NOTED the statement from Jeremy Chambers, Monitoring Officer and Director of Law and Governance as follows:

"In accordance with guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government, there is no requirement for members to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to items 9 and 10.

The exception to this being any councillor who is two or more months in arrears on their Council Tax, in which case they will need to declare this and not take part in the vote.”

Jeremy Chambers confirmed that there were no councillors who were more than two or more months in arrears.

There were no declarations of interest.

## **6 OPPOSITION BUSINESS - LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOODS**

Councillor Maria Alexandrou introduced the issues paper prepared by the majority opposition group.

1. Issues highlighted by Councillor Alexandrou were as follows:
  - The view that low traffic neighbourhood schemes were unwanted by local residents and had been ineptly implemented.
  - That the consultation on the schemes had been flawed and people living within the areas affected had not had an adequate opportunity to comment on them.
  - Concern that no paper copies of the consultation had been provided, which she felt discriminated against the weakest and most vulnerable.
  - That the imposition of the scheme had resulted in congestion and gridlock in surrounding roads which had increased pollution and made the roads more difficult to cross for pedestrians. The congestion could delay the delivery of lifesaving medicines and treatments.
  - They had caused local businesses to lose trade and some people had found it harder to sell their properties.
  - Concern that the Council were making money out of the penalty fines which had been imposed due to the schemes.
  - That there was no evidence that the schemes reduced traffic, which she felt was just transferred to neighbouring streets.
  - Schemes in other boroughs had been found to be unlawful and had been removed.
  - The Council's own vehicles had been parked with engines running causing more pollution.
  - Enfield in comparison to Wandsworth has less than half the number of electric charging points.
  - Currently there were a lack of alternative travel options. A car was one of the safest options.
  - A recent high court judgement from Mrs Justice Elisabeth Lang had criticised road closures under similar schemes
2. Councillor Barnes responded on behalf of the majority party highlighting:

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

- That the current level of traffic on residential roads was unsustainable and destructive. The number of cars on the road had increased dramatically meaning in the last 12 years the number of miles driven on Enfield's roads every year has increased by over 300 million miles.
- There were now 140,000 vehicles registered in Enfield and this was predicted to continue to increase, while most of that extra traffic had been pushed onto residential 'C' and unclassified roads, sometimes at high speeds, by Sat-Navs.
- Low Traffic Neighbourhoods were part of Government policy to help fight climate change.
- They were beneficial to children and young people. They prevented rat-running. Cars in the Fox Lane estate have been measured up to 80mph which would kill a child on impact.
- Nearly a third of journeys were shorter than 15 minutes just over a mile which is a 15 minute walk for those who are able and the largest proportion of car journeys are for leisure.
- The Council had to meet the challenge to improve air quality and encourage more walking and cycling. This meant bringing about behavioural change.
- The schemes would lead to less congestion in future years for those who had to use a car such as those with disabilities.
- Low Traffic Neighbourhoods created safe corridors enabling children to travel to school safely inside the LTN and also the surrounding area. Many children are suffering from obesity. They need to walk and cycle more.
- The Fox Lane LTN scheme together with a school streets initiative have seen the number of children being driven to one school drop by 18%.
- Adapting to the new way of doing things was not easy and the necessary modal shift would take time. Tough decisions had to be made, but they should lead to a better future.
- There had been lots of misinformation spread about these schemes. Roads had not been completely closed and every house on streets within the schemes could still be reached by car.
- Engagement on the Fox Lane scheme had begun in November 2019 and took place over 6 weeks, over 1,500 responses had been received and changes to the design of the original scheme made in response. The Fox Lane scheme had been installed in October 2020 alongside a live consultation.
- The Opposition had had the opportunity to call in the decision to implement the Fox Lane scheme, when it was agreed but had not done so.
- The Bowes scheme had been introduced following years of traffic problems from the North Circular. It had been paid for by the government and introduced under its strict 8-week timescale. If the Council had not met this timescale the government would have reclaimed funds. The government has recently awarded the council a further £1.5 million.

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

- The emergency services had been and had had to be consulted on all schemes. The chief operating officer of the Ambulance Service was not aware of any LTNs that have led to any patient safety concerns or any significant delays.
  - Unhindered routes monitored by CCTV cameras were agreed with the Ambulance Service and all signage conformed to the regulations.
  - The schemes did not cause congestion, that was the result of the numbers of cars on the roads. The LTNs directed dangerous rat running traffic back on to the main roads which were better designed for high volumes.
  - There was concern about the 10% of people living on major routes and there was a need to campaign for more cycle lanes to push cars further from houses, more trees to act as pollution buffers, more pedestrian improvements and to improve traffic infrastructure, which was never designed for this amount of vehicles.
  - Electric vehicles could help reduce pollution but not congestion. The Council hoped to be able to introduce lamppost chargers soon.
  - Thirty nine percent of Enfield's emissions was from its roads and fighting climate change should not be political.
  - It was disappointing that these schemes should not be supported cross party, especially as the Council was enacting government policy.
3. Cllr Lemonides added the following on behalf of the minority Opposition group:
- Concern about the lack of consultation. Dialogue was essential. If a substantial number of people were against the proposals the plans should be changed. This had happened with previous plans and the number of complaints had then decreased dramatically.
  - Concern about the political judgement and approach by members of the Cabinet.
4. The comments from members of the majority administration:
- a. An attack on low traffic neighbourhood schemes was also attack on school street projects. Together these schemes were creating safer, less polluted streets for local children, improving air quality and making it easier for them to walk and cycle to school.
  - b. The schemes would reduce traffic over time, would improve the environment and would be extended to cover streets in other parts of the borough to reduce congestion further.
  - c. One school within the scheme had reported an 18% fall in the number of children being driven to school.
  - d. Attacking these schemes was seen to be putting politics above the wellbeing of children.
  - e. The views of hundreds of residents have been listened to.
  - f. Local people's anxieties had been whipped up by opposition parties with untruths and ridiculous arguments. Some of the

tactics used against the proposals had been appalling, reminiscent of Donald Trump.

- g. An acknowledgement that all new traffic schemes could be disruptive, but also there was an urgent need to reduce the number of short car journeys: 40% of greenhouse gasses were from road traffic vehicles. In order to tackle the climate emergency emissions from cars had to be reduced.
- h. Electric charging points were only one part of the solution. More electric cars would not solve traffic congestion.
- i. This administration was willing to take action on problems and was looking to the long term future of residents in the borough. These schemes were effective at taking traffic away from residential roads, reducing pollution and increasing walking and cycling.
- j. The abuse received by officers and members about these schemes was shameful and unacceptable.
- k. Other boroughs had benefitted from the reduction in traffic and the schemes in Enfield would be expanded to other areas, funding permitting. There was no evidence that they only benefited the wealthier areas. Less traffic makes life better for all.
- l. In the middle of a climate emergency it was essential to support efforts to reduce traffic, encourage walking and cycling and make Enfield a better place to live.
- m. It was misleading to state that there had been no consultation on the schemes. In Bowes a live consultation was currently being carried out and in Fox Lane where improvements to the scheme had been made.
- n. There were signs that pollution had also decreased. Although this was too early to be able to make a meaningful assessment by how much at this point.
- o. It was essential to reduce obesity, to improve public health and wellbeing, to encourage people to become more active: (61% of Enfield residents were overweight and 41% of 11 year-olds). Obesity increased risk of heart disease and cancer. Physical inactivity was responsible for 1 in 6 deaths.
- p. Low traffic neighbourhoods were one part of the strategy to address public health problems as well as air pollution and injuries.
- q. Future generations would thank us for addressing these problems now.

**5. Comments from the Majority Opposition members:**

- a. More than 34,000 fines had been issued and £1.2m raised from people not obeying the new rules. This was felt to be immoral.
- b. Gridlock had been created in surrounding roads.
- c. There were accounts of carers refusing to visit clients in the restricted roads because of traffic delays.

- d. Keys to access roads were said to be unavailable.
- e. The consultation had not been transparent. The schemes had serious flaws and the timing was unrealistic. They should be suspended.
- f. The Labour administration had chosen to bid for money to implement these schemes, designed them and chosen where they would be implemented not the Government.
- g. Moving traffic onto the already congested main roads traffic just increased pollution and congestion along those roads. People living along main roads were already more likely to suffer health problems. The schemes have benefitted the few at the expense of the many.
- h. These schemes punished the motorists and, although temporary at the moment, would soon be made permanent by the Mayor and Transport for London.
- i. Legitimate concerns had been dismissed. The Council should be serving the whole community.
- j. There was no real evidence that pollution had decreased. It was only being moved from one area to another.
- k. Emails leaked from the Ambulance Service showed that they did not support the scheme.
- l. The money from government should have been used around town centres for social distancing measures.
- m. There were a large number of residential properties along main roads.
- n. Councillors had received a large number of emails protesting against these schemes.
- o. Concern that there had been no equality impact statement. The elderly and the disabled were unable to walk and cycle and depended on their cars or taxis.

**6. Comments of the minority opposition group:**

- a. The traffic would not disappear as a result of low traffic neighbourhood schemes it would only be mainly displaced to other streets.
- b. Many residents have been annoyed by the patronising responses received to their complaints.
- c. The population in London has grown hugely which accounted for the rise in the number of cars. Areas needed servicing by vehicles.
- d. Traffic fines should not be used to raise money.
- e. The view that there was nothing in the 2018 Labour manifesto about low traffic neighbourhoods and that the schemes should be removed.
- f. A more effective solution would be to impose a 20mph limit across the whole borough.
- g. The money offered could have been used to encourage safe social distancing on footways.

**7. Summing up on behalf of the Opposition:**

Councillor Laban asked the Leader and the Deputy Leader to listen to the community and agree to the recommendations in the Opposition business paper. These schemes had created awful divisions, setting neighbour against neighbour and the pain they had caused needed to be recognised.

**8. Response on behalf of the administration:**

Councillor Barnes responded by saying that the majority opposition had refused to co-operate and had not come up with a viable alternative to these schemes. There had been large amounts of misinformation put forward, emotions had been manipulated and divisions encouraged. Enfield Conservatives were opposing not only the Council and the Mayor of London, but also their own government. Quieter Neighbourhoods had been included in the Labour Manifesto. In Bowes Fines would have been imposed if rules had not been breached. the government would have clawed back funds if strict implementation timescales had not been met.

It was necessary to contain pollution, to help address climate change and to put children first. Introducing 20 mph zones boroughwide would slow traffic down making the streets safer but would not solve the problem of congestion on the roads.

This administration would not be removing the trials at this time and would complete the consultations. When more funding became available, schemes would be introduced into the east of the borough. The administration would look to learn lessons and would continue to engage with residents. They would also work to join up the Bowes scheme with Haringey's LTN and would also look to find ways to reduce traffic and further protect residents on the main routes, aware of the 10% of residents who lived along them. Ultimately if the schemes were judged to be unsuccessful, they would try something else, because something needed to be done.

During the debate Councillor Vince moved and Councillor Laban seconded a procedural motion that discussion on the opposition business paper should be extended for a further 15 minutes. Councillor Stewart suggested that it should be extended for a further 30 minutes. This was unanimously agreed.

Later in the debate Councillor Vince moved and Councillor Laban seconded a further motion to extend the discussion for another 15 minutes. This was not agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 18  
Against: 38  
Abstentions: 0

At the end of the debate, the majority group response to the opposition's recommendations was put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 38  
Against: 18  
Abstentions: 0

**7  
EMPOWERING YOUNG ENFIELD - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S  
PLAN**

Councillor Jewell proposed and Councillor Vince seconded the report of the Executive Director People – Empowering Young Enfield – Children and Young People’s Plan.

**NOTED**

1. In proposing the report Councillor Jewell (Cabinet Member for Children’s Services) highlighted the following:
  - Thanks to officers for creating a strong robust plan and doing such a fantastic job.
  - The past year had been very difficult for many children; some had missed almost 12 months of schooling, and this would have a far-reaching impact on their futures.
  - Supporting young people, at this time, was more important than ever.
  - This plan replaced and carries on from the previous young people’s plan.
  - Young people and youth organisations had been involved in creating the plan. It was full of many direct quotes from young people.
  - The plan had identified 6 priorities; empowering young people, including them in decision making, providing good accessible housing, giving them the best possible health and wellbeing, keeping them safe and protected from harm and giving them an environmentally sustainable future.
  - It was an overarching document which aimed to put young people at the heart of everything the Council does.
2. Councillor Vince welcomed the report in seconding it. She had been involved in children’s services for more than 27 years and seen many changes. During this time, she had visited all the schools in the borough and had always listened to young people and made sure their views were represented. She was pleased to support the adoption of the new policy.
3. Councillor Anderson on behalf of the Community First group welcomed the new plan and endorsed the comments above.
4. The comments of the majority administration members:

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

- a. Strong support for the plan, especially from the younger councillors.
  - b. The new plan would bring in many positive changes including improving skills at the national and local level and creating safe, healthy and confident communities.
  - c. It would encourage stronger and more active youth participation and peer to peer co-operation.
  - d. The need for the Council to support young people and to make sure that they were engaged and listened to.
  - e. Concern about the financial difficulties many young people faced.
  - f. The Council wanted to work in partnership with young people and to enhance and improve the quality of their lives.
  - g. Over 900 people had been consulted.
  - h. To acknowledge that the Council was listening to young people, shared their vision and ambitions and what they could be empowered to achieve.
  - i. It was important to look after young people as they were the future. Housing, education and employment were key.
  - j. Praise for the excellent role model showed by the young mayor talking about his collaboration with the police at the start of the meeting.
5. The comments of the majority opposition members:
- a. Support for the plan.
  - b. Concern about the lack of information about the success of the previous plan and how the new plan related to what had been done before.
  - c. Concern about the lack of additional financial resources, despite these being much needed.
  - d. Thanks to all the staff who work in schools.
  - e. The need for high aspirations.
  - f. Concern about the lack of clarity on how the plan will be delivered.
6. The summing up by Councillor Jewell that this had been a disastrous year for everyone, especially young people. The last plan had been a success and he queried why the opposition had not made their concerns known earlier, during the extensive consultation on the plan.

Following the debate, the plan was approved unanimously without a vote.

**AGREED** to approve and adopt the new Children and Young People's Plan, Empowering Young Enfield 2021-25.

8

## ENFIELD COUNCIL CAMPAIGN FOR FAIRER FUNDING

Councillor Caliskan proposed and Councillor Maguire seconded a report of the Executive Director Resources on fairer funding for Enfield.

NOTED

1. Councillor Caliskan in proposing the report highlighted:
  - That the Council was under unprecedented financial pressure on account of the Coronavirus.
  - At the start of the pandemic crisis, the Government had promised to cover any extra costs arising from the pandemic response.
  - Enfield in good faith had acted quickly to support local people. They had organised food parcels, arranged prescription deliveries, provided local care homes with PPE grants, waived rents, administered grant fund relief and business rate reductions and provided housing for rough sleepers. They had done this in the belief that any extra costs would be covered by the Government.
  - The Government were now however asking local taxpayers to cover the costs by asking councils to increase their Council Tax.
  - Councillor Caliskan had written to the Chancellor of the Exchequer asking him to make sure that Enfield had the funding it needed to cover the extra costs incurred. She had approached the Leader of the Opposition to co-sign the letter, but the Leader of the Opposition had declined to do so.
  - Many Enfield residents had lost their jobs and were suffering during the pandemic. The Leader felt that it was unacceptable for the Government to put the burden of the cost of the pandemic onto residents.
  - The Government had so far only provided funding to cover 62% of the extra costs of the pandemic.
  
2. The response of Councillor Hockney on behalf of the majority opposition highlighting:
  - The Conservative Group agreed that there was a need to address the issue of damping, which meant that Enfield received less funding than it was estimated that it needed, but in the letter to the Chancellor, the Leader had conflated several other issues, which meant that the opposition could not support it.
  - This was a time when people should come together to support the Government.
  - Enfield had received an increase in Government funding and the Government has stepped in to fund extra costs. Enfield

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

residents had also benefited from the Government's very generous furlough scheme and from business rate holidays.

- The ten percent increase in the Mayor of London's precept was part of the reason for the need to increase council tax.
- More Labour than Conservative authorities were increasing council taxes.

### 3. Councillor Anderson for Community First highlighted the following:

- Support for what had already been said. Enfield's unequal funding position had never been properly addressed and it was at a severe disadvantage in terms of low public health funding. The Council had also lost funding worth £193m, over the last decade.
- The large majority (82-84%) of Council funding came from Government. Only 10% from Council Tax. Council Tax could not make up the difference. The whole local government funding model needed reappraisal.

### 4. The comments of the majority group:

- a. The council was under huge pressure and had suffered from massive funding cuts. This had had a devastating impact on services.
- b. A council tax increase of 5% was an unfair burden to place on local residents, particularly when many were struggling financially.
- c. The Government should refund the Council fully for the extra costs of the pandemic.
- d. The Government needed to properly fund services for vulnerable people. Funding allocations were unfair. Westminster Council for example received 2.5 times more than Enfield for public health. The Council had suffered from 10 years of austerity under Conservative Governments. Enfield just wanted its fair share.
- e. The one-year funding deal currently offered created no certainty. The issue of social care needed to be addressed urgently. The sticking plaster approach could not continue. The Government should recognise the crucial role of local government.
- f. The Council had spent legitimate amounts of money on residents needs which the government should honour.

### 5. The comments of the majority opposition group:

- a. The opposition believed in fairer funding for Enfield including for public health and had in the past always supported this, but they could not support this paper because it was not just about the longstanding damping issue.
- b. The letter to the Chancellor went beyond this fairer funding.
- c. Councils had a finite budget and had to operate within it. There could not be a blank cheque. The Council could not be surprised

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

that the Government would not cover out of control costs or pre-existing debts.

- d. Quarter two financial reports showed that the Council had enough money and did not need further financial support. The Government had already been generous, but this had not been recognised by the administration.
6. The summing up by the Leader, that the Government had promised at the start of the pandemic that Councils should do whatever was needed and that any money spent would be refunded. This promise had been broken. She could not understand why the opposition would not join with the administration to ask the Government to provide the funding that they had initially promised. This point of view was supported by the Conservative led Local Government Association.

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

For: 41  
Against: 15  
Abstentions: 0

### **AGREED:**

1. To note the current financial context within which the budget for 2021/22 is being set.
2. To recognise and support the letter from the Leader of the Council to the Chancellor of the Exchequer issued on 18 January 2021 requesting the release of additional Government funding to help the local authority meet the costs incurred supporting residents and businesses during the Covid-19 pandemic.
3. To set up a fair funding webpage to enable residents to show their support for the Council, that the Council should continue to lobby government for the full costs incurred through the Covid-19 pandemic, should they wish to do so.

## **9**

### **COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME FOR 2021/22**

Councillor Maguire proposed and Councillor Yusuf seconded the report of the Executive Director Finance on the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2021/22

### **NOTED**

1. Councillor Maguire highlighted the following in proposing the report:
  - This scheme was reviewed annually. It enabled the Council to help people on low incomes who have difficulties paying their Council Tax.
  - The Council funds its own scheme.

## COUNCIL - 28.1.2021

- The proposal was to retain the same scheme as last year as set out in appendix A to the report.
- Transitional arrangements would remain covering 122 residents.
- The scheme had provided vital support to low income households during the pandemic. During 20/21 the working age council tax support caseload had increased by 1,400. The highest number of claimants ever.
- The government had provided additional hardship funding of £6.2m to enable payments of £250 to be given to eligible council tax payers.
- Unemployment was predicted to rise at the end of the furlough scheme and it was important that the Council could continue to provide discretionary support for those who needed it most, to help people avoid falling into debt and support health and wellbeing.

2. In seconding the report Councillor Yusuf highlighted the following:

- He commended the report and said that the council was doing its best to support everyone despite the reductions in funding.
- The Council were willing to support everyone who had a reasonable claim. Even those currently on furlough did not have as much money as they would have had without the pandemic.
- It was wrong to increase the Council tax at this time.
- The Council Tax Support Scheme provided essential support to low income families including those effected by Covid and the introduction of universal credit.

At this point in the debate the time available for the discussion of reports came to an end under the guillotine arrangements.

The recommendations in the report were agreed without a vote. If there had been a vote the minority opposition group indicated that they would have voted against.

### **AGREED**

1. To approve the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2021/22 as summarised in Appendix A to provide financial support for households on low incomes in paying their Council Tax. The 2021/22 scheme is based on the 2020/21 scheme, updated for legislative amendments, income uprating and administrative changes.
2. To delegate responsibility to make any minor and consequential changes, including the correction of accidental errors, necessary to the detailed council tax support provision as a result of any changes in the regulations upon which the scheme is based to the Executive Director of Resources following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement.

3. For the 2021/22 scheme:
- That the minimum contribution for working age households, not in a protected group, to be maintained at 24.5%
  - That the maximum earned income for Universal Credit claimants to receive council tax support to be £1,100 net per month
  - That the administrative changes set out in paragraph 15 and 16 of the report be incorporated into the scheme to improve service delivery.

## **10 CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Claire Stewart moved and Councillor Vince seconded a proposal under paragraph 4.2 of the Council procedure rules to change the order of items on the agenda so that Motion 2 under Item 13 Motions should be taken as the next item of business.

This was agreed unanimously.

## **11 MOTIONS**

**Councillor Laban moved and Councillor Dey seconded the following motion:**

“In the week of Holocaust Memorial Day, this council reaffirms its adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's definition of antisemitism:

“Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

Enfield Council pledges to continue to work towards combating antisemitism.”

Cllr Caliskan reaffirmed that previously Full Council has agreed to endorse the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism.

Following the debate on this motion, it was approved unanimously.

Motions 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13 and 14 lapsed under the guillotine arrangements.

## **12 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 8 (page 4-8 – Part 4), the remaining items of business on the Council agenda were considered without debate.

**13**

**COUNCIL TAX AND BUSINESS RATE COLLECTION FUND 2021/22**

RECEIVED the report of the Executive Director – Resources, on the Council Tax and Business Rate Collection Fund 2021/22.

**AGREED**

1. To increase the empty homes premium, for council tax for dwellings empty for more than 10 years, from 200% to 300% effective from 1 April 2021.
2. That pursuant to this report and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of the Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the London Borough of Enfield as its Council Tax Base for 2021/22 shall be 92,965 Band D equivalents.
3. To approve the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government NNDR1 Business Rate base return for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix B to the report.

The majority opposition group indicated that they would have voted against this report if there had been a vote.

**14**

**DESIGNATION OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER (S151) ROLE**

RECEIVED the report of the Director of Law and Governance on the designation of the new Chief Finance Officer (s151) role.

**AGREED**

1. To note the contents of the report and to designate Fay Hammond, Executive Director Resources as the Council's Chief Finance Officer. (Section 151 Officer).

If there had been a vote on this report, the minority opposition group indicated that they would have abstained.

**15**

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME**

**1. Urgent Questions**

There were no urgent questions.

**2. Questions by Councillors**

NOTED

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

**16**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

There were no changes to membership of Committees,

**17**

**NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

There were no changes to the nominations to Outside Bodies.

**18**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED that the next ordinary Council meeting will take place on Tuesday 2 March 2021 at 7pm. Not Wednesday 24 February 2021 as previously scheduled.