# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 21 MARCH 2022

## **COUNCILLORS**

PRESENT Susan Erbil, Birsen Demirel, James Hockney, Derek Levy and

Michael Rye OBE

ABSENT Margaret Greer, Lee David-Sanders, Mahmut Aksanoglu and

Elif Erbil

STATUTORY CO-OPTEES:

1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), vacancy (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes

absence

**OFFICERS:** Claire Johnson (Head of Scrutiny, Governance & Registration

Services), Mark Bradbury (Director of Property & Economy), Vincent Lacovara (Head of Planning), Shaun Rogan (Head of Communities, Partnerships and External Relations), Rebekah

Polding (Head of Cultural Services Development), Sue McDaid (Head of Regulatory Services), Dudu Sher-Arami (Director of Public Health), Melanie Dawson (Senior Solicitor) and Doug Wilkinson (Director of Environment & Operational Services), Clare Cade (Governance Manager), Megan

Roberts, (Cabinet Support Officer)

Also Attending: Councillor Alev Cazimoglu, Councillor Ian Barnes and

Councillor Rick Jewell.

## WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed officers and members to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Greer, Aksanoglu, E.Erbil, and David-Sanders whom Councillor Rye substituted for.

## 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

# 3 CALL-IN: DUGDALE CENTRE REFURBISHMENT (KD5433)

Cllr Ebril introduced this item and outlined the process to be followed. It was re-iterated that only comments and questions relating to the points included

within the Reasons for Call-in would be permitted. The Chair welcomed Councillor Vince as the Call-in lead.

Councillor Vince explained the reasons for the call in as set out in the agenda pack highlighting that the Dugdale is a much-loved asset in the community and the new proposals do not enhance the museum space, or guarantee disabled access toilets for the town centre. Councillor Vince raised concerns on the procurement process not providing value for money.

In response Councillor Barnes stated the proposals improved learning & wellbeing whilst creating space for residents of all ages to get together. Previously the Dugdale had become tired and cluttered making it not fit for purpose. These proposals will make it modern with the new museum set up in a prime location for visitors. Councillor Barnes confirmed that there would still be a disabled toilet in the facility.

Members of the Committee asked the below questions.

Q: Why refurbish the Dugdale now?

A: The site has been used a vaccination centre highlighting its need for a refresh. The first and second floor refurbishment of the Thomas Hardy site has already started providing a cost effective opportunity to use the same contractor. The new design will be a creative space and attract new customers.

Q: What is the current floor space of the museum compared to the future plans?

A: It was not a "museum" on the first floor of the Dugdale, it was corridors with display cabinets which weren't visited unless attending a meeting in that area. The new museum will be less square foot space but much more visible and accessible space. The designated space will be built on the success of the popular Culture Palace.

Q: Will there be a like for like replacement of the disabled toilets? A: Yes.

Q: The figures in the report are unclear.

A: The budget for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor renovations include a discrete budget for the ground floor of £76k to cover the cost of moving the museum.. The opportunity for a broader refurb has occurred. The income from the previous 1<sup>st</sup> floor was made up largely of internal recharges in the Council.

Q: How will the existing contract support the Council in relation to value and quality?

A: A national framework has been used for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor redevelopment which is assessed against quality and price. All sub-contracts have been individually tendered. The Culture Palace has been nominated for RIBA awards,, and increased footfall, this will remain in place until the Dugdale is re-opened.

Q: The report refers to a £6m spend. How will this been spent?

A: This does not relate to this call-in and is being used on the 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> floor refurbishments to create a Children's and Family Service's Hub.

Q: The two projects are happening at the same time with the same contract, could of the £6m be used for some of the works taking place on the ground floor?

A: £76 from the £6m budget for floors 1 and 2 has been allocated for the move of the museum. There may not be a need to spend all of the £1.5 on the ground floor scheme as the same contractor is being set up they will not need to set up the same preliminary requirements on a building site, such as a site office, as they already exist. However, the materials costs have increased which may affect this.

Q: What are the risks involved in not going ahead with the refurbishment?

A: The Dugdale was a rundown site. The refurbishment will guarantee its survival in the future. The site being used as vaccine centre has caused damage to the site. By completing the refurbishment there will be increased football at the Dugdale through the improved bar and café areas.

Q: Why has the main entrance of the Dugdale been moved?

A:. The entrance will not be behind the bus stop in the area but directly by the crossing and will have improved signage for the Dugdale. It is hoped that the café will be popular with those working in the Microsoft office. The museum will be a central feature when walking into the Dugdale whereas previously the displays available were not done justice. The new Dugdale will include a small flexible performing space for poetry readings, music, etc, which can be used when an auditorium is not necessary. Repeat bookers for events at the Dugdale were previously very low with 19% of transactions for one ticket.

Q: This will cost £1.5m of tax payers money, how is the cost justifiable?
A: The cost is inline with a refurbishment of a building that size and includes the costs of furnishings for the building.

#### AGREED:

To refer the matter back to the decision maker, Councillor Ian Barnes, to consider the below:

- The vision to be better articulated.
- Breakdown of finances for each area of the Dugdale
- Income projections against spend and recharge losses.

#### 4

## MANAGING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: INTERIM SUMMARY REPORT

Thank The Chair thanked officers for a well written report and invited Councillor Cazimoglu to introduce the report.

Councillor Cazimoglu sent her condolences to those who had lost loved ones and thanked those who had worked hard during the pandemic. She highlighted that this report was interim as the pandemic is not yet over. Councillor Cazimoglu spoke of how Enfield responding quickly to the

pandemic helped it success from acquiring PPE to supporting the homeless, to Enfield Stands Together. Testing site were set up quickly in the borough and used to create Covid champions and marshals, care homes were protected by stopping those who tested positive entering, financial support was given to those in need and regularly comms were sent to residents in a range of languages. The borough still faces some on-going challenges such as inequality, vaccine hesitancy and the future impact Covid will have on residents in the borough.

Members of the Committee asked the following questions:

Q: What is in place to support care homes?

A: The Care Home Action Plan is still in place and care home have not been forgotten about. The pandemic provided a learning experience for infection control in homes. A lot was learnt from the 1<sup>st</sup> wave of Covid which has informed learning going forward on controlling outbreaks.

Q: National lockdowns damaged a lot of people's mental health and wellbeing such as increasing mental health issues, loss of mobility, etc.

A: This will most likely be picked up in a Central Government review. Enfield was led by the science available at each stage. Analysis of Covid deaths will take place when it can and the data is presented in a way which allows this. Work is starting on looking at the physical and mental impact of Covid. People being unable to access to GPs will have an ongoing effect on residents.

Q: Is there the capacity and will for an independent analysis relating to Enfield and Covid?

A: Early in the pandemic there was bespoke analysis done on death registrations for the borough. Independent analysis will be conducted, however any bespoke analysis will not enable comparison with other boroughs.

Q: What ongoing work is taking place around vaccine hesitancy in the borough?

A: The Council has tried everything possible and work is taking place around what can be done differently. Vaccine Champions will be trained through the voluntary sector and a door to door scheme is being trialled. A report on the vaccine roll out has recently gone to the Health & Wellbeing Board, and Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny, with the aim to understand the reasoning behind the vaccine hesitancy.

Q: Have policies been reviewed to reflect structural inequality?

A: This is something that will be acted on in the coming months and years. Community Hubs will help address inequality across the borough and there is a programme of work to access healthcare. Accessing health care has been an area of concern in the borough for a very long time as there are not enough face to face appointments available as there are not enough GPs in the system.

Q: What is in place to support health services as there is a mental health crisis?

A: A mental health services review is currently taking place which will be used to shape services in the coming years. School are promoting better mental wellbeing and work is being done to support the adult population. Enfield Council has recently introduced a trial for Mental Health Champions.

Members of the Committee made the following points:

- The report and its contents were welcomed.
- The report adequately highlights the Council's success in response to the pandemic and sets out the learning.
- Pleased it also acknowledges the work done by organisations outside of the Council.
- The work conducted by the Council during the pandemic showed the Council at its best.
- Officers were praised for their work during the pandemic. Many officers took on additional responsibilities to support the borough.
- There is a need to review the way Covid deaths were registered as Covid often was a secondary reason to deaths but still classified as a "Covid death".
- Services such as CAMHS could be included on future work programmes for scrutiny to review.

The Chair thanked officers and the Cabinet member for their contribution to the meeting.

# 5 GAMBLING ACT 2005 - CONTROL OF GAMBLING PREMISES INCLUDING IN TOWN CENTRES

Sue Mcdaid, introduced the report highlighting concerns about gambling premises in the borough and the effect they have on wellbeing of residents. There is a higher concentration of gambling premises in deprived areas of Enfield. The licensing of gambling premises was transferred to Enfield in 2007, however, by then a large number of facilities were already in the borough. Recently there has been a shift from applications for betting shops to bingo & adult gaming centres. The Gambling Act requires Councils to permit betting and gambling premises unless they do not meet the codes of practice and licensing objectives of the Act and the Council's gambling act policy. In 2023, the Council is expecting the results of a recent Government consultation on the Gambling Act which is hoped will work in favour of the Council. The Gambling Commission have listened to concerns and also have a concern around online gambling.

The Committee made the following comments:

- Officers were thanked for their report, and the work conducted on this.
- It would be useful to see the Planning and Gambling Act regimes better aligned.
- The requirements of DMD33 should be explained in plain English to residents of the borough.

• Efforts could be focused on planning permissions to reject gambling premises and seek any good practice from other councils.

## 6 2021/22 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The concluded work programme was noted.

# 7 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next provisional date for the Committee was noted as 27 April 2022 which would be used if a call in was received.