

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 29
JANUARY 2014**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Chaudhury Anwar MBE (Mayor), Ingrid Cranfield (Deputy Mayor), Kate Anolue, Alan Barker, Caitriona Bearryman, Chris Bond, Yasemin Brett, Jayne Buckland, Alev Cazimoglu, Lee Chamberlain, Bambos Charalambous, Yusuf Cicek, Christopher Cole, Andreas Constantinides, Christopher Deacon, Dogan Delman, Christiana During, Marcus East, Patricia Ekechi, Achilleas Georgiou, Del Goddard, Ahmet Hasan, Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward, Denise Headley, Ertan Hurer, Tahsin Ibrahim, Chris Joannides, Eric Jukes, Jon Kaye, Nneka Keazor, Joanne Laban, Henry Lamprecht, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Derek Levy, Donald McGowan, Chris Murphy, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott, Geoffrey Robinson, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Rohini Simbodyal, Toby Simon, Alan Sitkin, Edward Smith, Andrew Stafford, Doug Taylor, Glynis Vince, Ozzie Uzoanya, Tom Waterhouse, Lionel Zetter and Ann Zinkin

ABSENT Ali Bakir, Jonas Hall, Christine Hamilton, Simon Maynard, Paul McCannah, Ahmet Oykenner and Daniel Pearce

95

**ELECTION (IF REQUIRED) OF THE CHAIRMAN/DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF
THE MEETING**

The election of a Chair/Deputy Chair of the meeting was not required.

96

MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING

The Mayor advised that Guruji Vijas Sharma from Dharma Mandir, Hertford Road had unfortunately been delayed in attending the meeting so it would not be possible to offer a blessing on this occasion.

97

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) IN CONNECTION WITH THE
ORDINARY COUNCIL BUSINESS**

The Mayor made the following announcements:

(a) New Years' Day Parade

The Mayor thanked Art Start, on behalf of the Council, for representing Enfield at the New Years Day Parade on 1st January. The Swinging 60's had been the theme and Enfield's float had been based on a giant 60's style record player surrounded by performers who entertained the crowds.

Since the Borough had joined the New Year Parade, its Floats had been successful in winning money of varying amounts for the Mayor's Charity.

He also pointed out that Enfield now had its own street parade (taking place on 30th November) of which Art Start were a major stakeholder and which again would be raising money for The Mayors Charity Fund plus Nightingale Cancer Support Centre and BEVAD.

The Mayor hoped that the Council would continue to support what he felt was a valuable form of advertising for the Borough at both the New Years Day and its own street parade.

The Mayor ended by thanking Art Start for their support and participation in the New Years Day Parade, especially given the poor weather, and reported that as a result of their efforts the Borough Float had achieved 5th place overall resulting in a £2000 donation to the Mayor's Charity appeal.

The Mayor invited Kathy Worrall of Art Start to come forward in order to receive the award, and she was congratulated by members.

(b) Mayor's Spring Charity Ball

The Mayor took the opportunity to remind members that his Spring Charity Ball would be held on Saturday 29th March at Forty Hall.

98

MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on Wednesday 27 November 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Min.76: Opposition Business – Enfield: The Environment in which we all Live – reference on Page 5 of the agenda within bullet point 4 under (a) to read "Conservation" rather than "Conservative" Area.

99

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali Bakir, Jonas Hall, Christine Hamilton, Paul McCannah, Simon Maynard, Ahmet Oykenner and Daniel Pearce.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Kate Anolue, Christopher Cole, Pat Ekechi, Achilleas Georgiou, Denise Headley Henry Lamprecht and Ann Zinkin.

100

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The Mayor invited John Austin (Assistant Director Corporate Governance) to make a short statement relating to the potential declaration of interests in respect of two items on the agenda:

Agenda Item 9: Council Tax Support Scheme 2014/15 – Members were reminded that the Councillor Conduct Committee (14 February 13) had granted a dispensation in relation to disclosable pecuniary interests and the Council Tax setting process. The dispensation would apply until May 2014, so no members would be required to declare interests in relation to this item at the meeting.

Agenda Item 12.2: Motion in the name of Councillor Hamilton – Probation Service procurement process – Members were advised that if they owned shares, held employment, office, trade or other relationship for profit or gain in relation to G4S or any other company involved in the procurement process then they would need to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item and withdraw from the meeting. This would also apply if the same interest related to any family member or person with whom the member had a close association or personal relationship and the member was aware that they had such an interest.

Having noted the advice provided no declarations of interest were made by members at the meeting.

101

OPPOSITION BUSINESS - LONG TERM INITIATIVES FOR THE BOROUGH

Councillor Lavender introduced the issues paper, prepared by the Conservative Group. Issues highlighted were as follows:

1. Concerns were identified in relation to the following aspects of the Council's 2014/15 budget consultation process:
 - a. The lack of forward financial planning and focus beyond 2014/15, given the announcement in the Chancellors Autumn Statement relating to local government spending and the provision of longer term indicative statements. It was felt these provided a greater level of financial certainty than reflected in the budget consultation documents.
 - b. The failure to outline, in detail, clear plans to deliver a balanced budget and need to include within the budget setting report and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) sufficient details in relation to 2015/16 and beyond on:
 - the level of income, expenditure and future risks;

- the necessary reserves and provisions to enable the Council to be satisfied that the 2014/15 budget established a sustainable platform for the provision of services in future years.
- c. The need to ensure that sufficient provision was identified to fund all schemes within the Capital Programme, in order to:
- eliminate any double counting or funding gap in the programme;
 - avoid schemes being added (such as Palmers Green Library) towards the end of the current Administrations term of office without the necessary funding source having been confirmed, planned for and included within the MTFP; and
 - ensure delivery of the programme in a planned way without schemes being delayed or not progressed.
2. Whilst the negative impact of the Government's damping mechanism was recognised, it was felt that the increased level of Government funding being provided through specific funding streams and grants in relation, for example, to education and the New Homes Bonus also needed to be acknowledged.
3. The need to acknowledge and outline detailed plans to address the £66m gap identified as a result of the longer term indicative financial statements in relation to the planning and delivery of Enfield's MTFP over the next 4 years. A quick review of the consultation being undertaken in other boroughs had identified how this was being undertaken with proposals linked to a focus on service delivery and priorities.

As a result the Opposition Group were looking for more detail and transparency within the Council's budget consultation process and MTFP in relation to the plans for addressing the budget gap identified and prudent delivery of a balanced budget.

Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council, responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

1. The need to recognise the unprecedented level of cuts in local government funding implemented by the coalition Government, which the current Administration had been required to manage.
2. The view expressed within the Opposition Business paper that there was now more financial certainty within local government was challenged, with specific uncertainties highlighted in relation to:
 - the ongoing impact of the current economic downturn, particularly on the more vulnerable members of the local community and in the

removal of significant spending power within the local economy as well as on business rate yield and interest rate movements;

- the impact of changes in relation to delivery of Health Services and introduction of the Government's welfare reform programme;
 - the more limited flexibility created locally by the increased provision of ring fenced grants by the coalition Government as funding mechanisms;
 - the demographic changes in population.
3. The plans, taking account of the uncertainties identified, for the current Administration to take a robust, sensible and decisive approach towards the planning and delivery of its MTFP. At the same time the approach adopted would be sensitive to the needs of local residents and more vulnerable members of society.
 4. The limited long term proposals provided within the final MTFP produced by the last Conservative led Administration in 2010.
 5. The need to recognise the achievement of the current Administration in delivering its efficiency saving targets (totalling £96m) and maintaining a freeze in the level of Council Tax whilst also recording record levels of customer satisfaction, despite:
 - a. the impact of the damping mechanism on the funding formula grant allocation; and
 - b. the ideological views of the coalition Government in relation to local government and the magnitude of financial pressures and impact of funding reductions imposed.

As a result the Leader advised that the current Administration intended to set out in as much detail as possible, given the level of uncertainty identified, a robust and sensible approach towards delivery of its MTFP.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- (a) concerns were expressed by members of the Opposition Group in relation to:
 - the limited detail and options provided within the budget consultation document relating to plans within the MTFP to address the budget gap identified from 2015/16 onwards;
 - the need to ensure that clear and transparent plans were developed to address the budget gap identified and sufficient detail was provided on the available options and impact in terms of

service delivery, as part of the final budget setting and MTFP report, in order to ensure that the public were suitably informed;

- the blame being focussed on the current Government, given the financial legacy inherited from the previous Labour Government, current levels of funding being provided and what was felt to be the increased level of financial certainty as a result of the Chancellor's Autumn statement;
- (b) the need identified by the Opposition Group to recognise the healthy financial position which the Council's current Labour Administration had inherited as a result of the strong financial management of the previous Conservative Administration.
- (c) The need identified by members of the Majority Group:
- for the debate to focus on the issues identified within the Opposition Business Paper;
 - to recognise, in terms of the previous Administration's financial planning, that not all projects inherited within the MTFP had been funded e.g. Meridian Water Development and other Regeneration schemes which were now being followed through and delivered;
 - to develop and target delivery of the MTFP around a clear set of priorities and projections, which the consultation process had been designed to assist with, and avoid the approach of imposing blanket budget reductions across all services. This approach would need to take account of emerging issues such as the new growth deal and increasing level of financial devolution in relation to Government funding streams;
 - to recognise the real impact of the current level of budget reductions by Central Government and plan for the delivery of services on a sensible and responsible long term basis as demonstrated through the Council's approach towards its strategic economic planning involving – improvements to rail transport infrastructure; development of a decentralised energy network, delivery of improvements in business IT infrastructure and supply chain networks etc. It was felt this had demonstrated a real and long term commitment to local industries with the level of unemployment in Enfield falling more quickly than that nationally.

Councillor Lavender summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group by highlighting what he felt was a need to focus on the financial position faced by the Council and development of clear plans to address the budget gap identified within the MTFP. He felt there was a lack of clarity within the current budget consultation proposals with more detail needed in terms of the plans being developed and their impact on service delivery moving forward. In addition it was felt more recognition was needed about the level of funding

and support already being provided by central Government, particularly in relation to the economic development activities highlighted during the debate.

The Opposition Group were therefore requesting that clear details were provided within the budget setting report and MTFP on plans to deliver a balanced budget and ensure that the 2014/15 budget established a sustainable platform for the provision of services in future years.

In response Councillor Taylor highlighted what he felt were a number of inconsistencies within comments made by members of the Opposition Group during the debate, with specific reference to the level of Government funding and budget reductions faced by the Council. He confirmed that the final budget and MTFP would be forward looking and would provide a clear indication of the risks and pressures faced by the Council as a basis for ensuring that a balanced budget was delivered over the next four years which, whilst robust was also sensitive to the need of local residents.

The recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper were not, therefore, approved. No vote was requested by the Leader of the Opposition on the outcome of the debate.

102

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION: OPPOSITION BUSINESS, MEMBER & OFFICER PROTOCOL & MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCILLOR CONDUCT COMMITTEE

Councillor Simon moved and Councillor Brett seconded a report from the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services (No.176) seeking approval to a number of separate amendments to the Constitution.

NOTED that

1. The amendments had been recommended following a review of the Procedure Rules relating to Opposition Priority Business & Protocol for Member/Officer relations by the Members & Democratic Services Group (13 January 14) and membership requirements for the Councillor Conduct Committee.
2. The amendments to the Procedure Rules for Opposition Priority Business (OPB) had been designed to clarify the requirements in relation to the way that recommendations arising from OPB were presented and considered.
3. The amendments to the Protocol for Member/Officer relations had been designed to reflect recent legislative changes and to update the protocol so that it remained as effective and clear as possible. The protocol also included changes to the procedure for dealing with Super Part 2 reports at Cabinet and, where required, call-in meetings.

4. The changes being sought to membership of the Councillor Conduct Committee had followed a review of the procedure for handling complaints undertaken by the Committee (3 December 13). Given the non-political and balanced nature of the Committee members had recommended that the use of substitute members should be permitted in order to ensure that a political balance on the Committee could be maintained when members were unable to attend meetings. The options considered in terms of when the use of substitute members would be permitted had been set out in section 3.3.4 of the report.
5. Whilst the Opposition Group had expressed a preference for substitutes to only be permitted when members of the Committee were unable to participate in meetings or hearings as a result of a disclosable interest, they felt that the proposal within the report was acceptable as a way forward.
6. The need identified to ensure that all substitute members received training in advance of being able to participate in meetings of the Councillor Conduct Committee.

AGREED

- (1) The amendments to the procedure for dealing with Opposition Priority Business, as detailed within the section 3.1 and Appendix 1 of the report.
- (2) The updated version of the Protocol for Members/Officer relations as detailed within section 3.2 and Appendix 2 of the report.
- (3) The provision for substitute members (2 to be nominated by each Group) on the Councillor Conduct Committee (as detailed in section 3.3 of the report), with the use of substitutes permitted when an ordinary member of the Committee is unable attend a meeting due (a) to other commitments; or (b) as they have a disclosable interest.

103

COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2014/15

Councillor Stafford moved and Councillor Taylor seconded the report of the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services (No.142A) presenting the local Council Tax Support Scheme, Council Tax and Business Rate bases and Council Tax technical change for 2014/15.

NOTED

1. As part of the Government's welfare reform programme, the Council had adopted (in January 2013) a local Council Tax Support Scheme and was now required, on an annual basis, to consider whether it wished to revise or replace its scheme.

2. Having reviewed operation of the scheme and undertaken a programme of consultation (as detailed in sections 4 and 5 and Appendix C of the report) along with an Equalities Impact Assessment (as detailed in Appendix B of the report) a revised scheme for 2014/15 had been developed, considered and recommended by Cabinet (11 December 2013) to Council for adoption.
3. The full Council Tax Support Scheme had been detailed in Appendix A to the report, with the main revisions relating to exemptions being applied:
 - a. for working age recipients of Council Tax Support who also receive Carers Allowance, the support component of Employment Support Allowance or higher rate Disability Living Allowance (or Personal Independence Payments);
 - b. for working age foster carers recruited, trained and supported by Enfield Council in receipt of Council Tax Support;
4. The changes to the report detailed on the amendment sheet tabled at the meeting.
5. The following concerns identified by the Opposition Group in respect of the support being made available for local businesses relating to business rates, in terms of:
 - a. the limited focus of the Business Rate Hardship Relief Scheme pilot in Edmonton Green ward as opposed to other extended areas of the borough;
 - b. the need for a review of the criteria applied to the Hardship Relief Scheme and use of other relief options available to support small businesses, given their importance to the local economy;

In view of the concerns highlighted, Councillor Rye moved and Councillor Prescott seconded that an additional recommendation be considered as part of the Business Rate Base setting process requesting that Cabinet bring a further report to either full Council or Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the wider development of initiatives relating to local business rates. In moving the additional recommendation it was noted that the deadline for approval and submission of the NNDR Business Rate (Form 1) return was 31 January 14. Councillor Stafford advised that he would be willing to support the proposal but felt it was important to note that whilst utilising Government subsidies there was also a need to recognise the constraints on the Council as a result of the limited funding available. The inclusion of the additional recommendation was therefore agreed without a vote.

Following a period of further debate the recommendations in the report (as amended) were agreed, without a vote.

AGREED

- (1) The Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2014/15 with the following amendments:
 - (a) That working age recipients of Council Tax Support who also received Carers Allowance, the support component of Employment Support Allowance or higher rate Disability Living Allowance (or Personal Independence Payments) are exempted from the 19.5% reduction applied to all other working age claimants;
 - (b) That working age foster carers recruited, trained and supported by Enfield Council in receipt of Council Tax Support are also exempted from the 19.5% reduction applied to all other working age claimants.
- (2) 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 2014/15 shall be 88,868 Band D equivalents (as detailed in Appendix D of the report).
- (3) The Department for Communities and Local Government NNDR1 business rate base return for 2014/15 (as detailed in Appendix E of the report).
- (4) In accordance with the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, the Council Tax technical change, as set out below and detailed in Appendix F of the report:
 - (a) reduce the Council Tax discount for vacant dwellings undergoing major repair from 100% for up to one month to nil with effect from 1st April 2014; and
 - (b) reduce the Council Tax discount for empty and unfurnished dwellings from 100% for up to one month to nil with effect from 1st April 2014.
- (5) As an additional recommendation moved at the meeting, that Cabinet bring a report to either full Council or Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the wider development of the initiatives relating to local business rates.

104

REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY POLLING DISTRICTS & POLLING PLACES

Councillor Stafford moved and Councillor Brett seconded the report from the Chief Executive & Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services (No.177) detailing the outcome of a review undertaken by the Electoral Review Panel of all polling districts and polling places, under the requirements of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (as amended by the Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013).

NOTED

1. The Electoral Review Panel had commenced its review on 1st October 2013 and following consideration of all representations received agreed the final outcome for recommendation on to Council at its meeting on 20th November 2013.
2. Members thanks to John Austin & Peter Stanyon (Head of Electoral, Registration and Governance Services) for their extensive effort and work undertaken on the review, which had involved an extensive range of consultees (as detailed in section 3.3 of the report).

AGREED to adopt the recommendations of the Electoral Review Panel as set out in paragraph 3.4 and sub-paragraphs 3.4.1 to 3.4.20 within the report, for implementation with effect from 17 February 2014.

The above recommendation was agreed unanimously, without a vote.

105

COUNCILLORS' QUESTION TIME (TIME ALLOWED - 30 MINUTES)

1.1 Urgent Questions

None received.

1.2 Questions by Councillors

NOTED

1. The forty three questions on the Council's agenda which had received a written reply from the relevant Cabinet Member.
2. The following supplementary questions and responses received for the questions indicated below:

Question 1 (Protection of Public Health Budgets) from Councillor Ann Marie Pearce to Councillor Hamilton, Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing and Public Health:

"Can confirmation be provided as to how funding provided for Public Health purposes has been channelled into new Public Health projects?"

As Councillor Hamilton had submitted her apologies for the meeting, members were advised that a written response would be provided.

Question 2 (Council Tax Collection and Arrears) from Councillor Savva to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“In view of the response provided, does Councillor Stafford feel previous concerns raised by the Opposition Group in relation to the level of Council Tax collection and arrears are not justified or accurate?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“My response sets out the Council’s performance in relation to its Council Tax collection rate. The current Administration inherited approx. £3.3m worth of uncollected taxes from the previous Conservative led Administration and this level has reduced overall since we have been in power. I’m therefore not sure why these concerns have been raised.”

Question 3: (Public Health budget) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“It would appear that the definition of activities which can be funded through the public health budget is not as wide as Councillor Stafford would like it to be. Can he therefore justify the engagement of a corporate policy research officer (scale PO1) which appears to be funded through the public health budget?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“Given the budget deficit identified, the Council is looking at a range of alternative options to address the position. This will include consideration of the legitimate use of public health funding, although the position will be kept under review.”

Question 5: (budget consultation process) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“Would Councillor Stafford accept that the main focus of the budget consultation process is resident based and, if so, that it is important as part of any meaningful consultation for details to be included on any proposed reduction in services and their likely impact?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“Unfortunately, given the uncertain financial position faced by local government given the funding reductions imposed by central Government, the proposals and options included within the consultation document have been more limited. The main focus of the consultation process this year has therefore been on how the limited funding available should be prioritised rather than on where reductions should be made.”

Question 7: (Tourism and Town Twinning Working Party) from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council:

“Can the Leader of the Council confirm when the decision was made to treat the Tourism & Town Twinning Working Party as a private rather than public meeting and on what statutory basis this decision was based?”

Reply from Councillor Taylor:

“As I am not able to confirm specific details at the meeting and will therefore arrange for a written reply to be provided.”

Question 8: (bad weather provision) from Councillor Levy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“I would like to commend the work of officers in developing Enfield’s Winter Maintenance Plan in order to ensure that key roads throughout the borough are kept open during bad weather. Can I ask Councillor Bond whether any contingency is in place, should the need arise due to prolonged bad weather, for the % of roads gritted to be increased?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“Currently 47% of Enfield’s road network is covered under the Plan which comprises of all major routes, bus routes and other hazardous locations (Priority 1 Network). Given the coverage within the existing Plan, consideration would only be given to extending the initial network if there was a prolonged spell of bad weather with large stocks of salt available to ensure the borough was well covered should the need arise.”

Question 10: (climate change): from Councillor Brett to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Would Councillor Bond support me, given the recent bad weather, in calling for the Government not to make any further reductions in the flood risk management budget?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“Yes, I would fully support this.”

Question 12: (Outcomes from Deaf Area Forum) from Councillor Simon to Councillor Georgiou, Deputy Leader of the Council:

“Would Councillor Georgiou welcome the recent initiative to hold this Area Forum and consider extending coverage for other groups with specific needs and disabilities within the local community. Would he also welcome, as one of the outcomes achieved from the Deaf Area Forum, the initiative with the local Fire & Rescue Service to provide and fit smoke alarms for people with profound deafness?”

Reply from Councillor Georgiou:

“The recent Deaf Area Forum was very successful and plans are being developed to hold a second meeting in the future. As an Administration we are keen to extend the initiative, where possible, to engage with different groups across the Borough. I was very pleased with the outcome of this meeting and hope that as many people as possible come forward to take advantage of the alarm fitting service being offered as a direct result of the Forum.”

Question 15: (Free School - Ashmole Academy site): from Councillor Kaye to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

“Whilst recognising that the Authority does not have any direct role in approving any expansion plans for a Free Primary School on the Academy site, can Councillor Orhan confirm whether she welcomes the proposals given the growing demand for school places in the area?”

Reply from Councillor Orhan:

“It is difficult for me to respond to this question as the Council does not have any control over applications for Free Schools or the running of the Academy, which is not located within the Borough. My focus is on how we address the shortfall of school places identified within this borough.”

Question 16: (Mini Holland bid) from Councillor Sitkin to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Councillor Laban has, in the past, criticised this Administration for being too friendly to cyclists. Having supported the Mini Holland bid, however, does Councillor Bond know what her views on cycling actually are?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“I am grateful to Councillor Laban for her support on the Mini Holland bid but am not aware and therefore cannot comment about her personal views on cycling.”

Question 17: (Care Leavers Pledge) from Councillor Vince to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

“I am pleased that Councillor Orhan has signed the pledge but can the Cabinet member explain why officers were not aware, at the Corporate Parenting Committee, that she had done so?”

Reply from Councillor Orhan:

“This is a great pledge that I was honoured to sign. I do not know why officers were not aware of my support at the meeting but will check.”

Question 18: (New Year Honours list): from Councillor Constantinides to Councillor Taylor, Lead of the Council:

“Would Councillor Taylor confirm if there are any plans to invite those Enfield residents included in the New Year Honours List to a civic reception in recognition of their achievements?”

Reply from Councillor Taylor:

“I can confirm that two residents have been awarded honours and I am in discussion with the Mayor over plans to invite them to a civic reception.”

Question 19: (monitoring of funding to voluntary organisations and community groups): from Councillor Prescott to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council

“Can the Leader of the Council provide a report outlining the performance, outcomes and value for money achieved as a result of each individual programme for which funding had been provided, prior to the end of this Administration?”

Reply from Councillor Taylor:

“I feel the written response to the original question on this matter is detailed enough and therefore stands as it is.”

Question 21: (Schools Lettings Service): from Councillor Vince to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People:

“Whilst thanking Councillor Orhan for her written response, is the Cabinet Member aware that schools are still not getting the service required and can she advise of the reasons for the delay in addressing this issue?”

Reply from Councillor Orhan:

“As Cabinet Member I also share the concerns being raised about the service and value for money being offered and thank Councillor Vince for her determination in pursuing the issue. The service has been subject to an audit review, considered by the Audit Committee, but is not what I regard as core. I am therefore keen to review the service in order to consider whether it is viable on an ongoing basis and will be undertaking a consultation with relevant parties, including schools. I am happy to keep Councillor Vince informed on progress, prior to any final decision being made as a result of the review.”

Question 22: (Ordnance Road Joint Service Centre) from Councillor Keazor to Councillor Charalambous, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure, Youth and Localism:

“How does the Cabinet Member feel the progress made on delivery of this project compares with the previous Conservative Administration’s plans to relocate Palmers Green Library?”

Reply from Councillor Charalambous:

“I can remember the previous Conservative Administration seeking to take out a 25 year lease for a property on Palmers Green High in order to relocate the library. This led to a public outcry, which resulted in those proposals not being progressed. Compare that with the current progress made on delivery of the Ordnance Road Joint Service Centre and this demonstrates how we as a Labour Administration can and have delivered major projects and developments.”

Question 23: (Internal Audit Plan - Enfield Homes) from Councillor Smith to Councillor Oyken, Cabinet Member for Housing:

“Can Councillor Oyken please explain the reasons for the delay in implementation of the 10 outstanding recommendations from the 2012/13 Enfield Homes Internal Audit Plan and provide a deadline for addressing these?”

As Councillor Oyken had submitted his apologies for the meeting, members were advised that a written response would be provided.

Question 24: (Enforcement of spitting ban in Enfield) from Councillor Taylor to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Can Councillor Bond advise if he has been approached by any Conservative led Councils or Opposition Groups for advice on introducing a by-law to ban spitting?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

I can confirm that I have been approached by various Opposition Groups and Councils including those with Conservative led Administrations.

Question 25: (Enfield Homes tenant satisfaction survey) from Councillor Smith to Councillor Oyken, Cabinet Member for Housing:

“Can Councillor Oyken please outline what specific actions are planned to address the disappointing level of customer satisfaction in relation to resident consultation and involvement by Enfield Homes and around the value for money of service charges?”

As Councillor Oyken had submitted his apologies for the meeting, members were advised that a written response would be provided.

Question 27: (Housing Benefit security checks) from Councillor Hurer to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“Whilst I am satisfied with the written response to points 1, 2 and 4 in my question, can I ask Councillor Stafford to confirm (in relation to the 7,300 visits

to benefit claimants reported within section 3 of his written response) how many of these actually resulted in face – to – face contact being made and also to any subsequent prosecutions?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“As I am not able to confirm the specific details at the meeting, I will arrange for a written reply to be provided.”

Question 28: (External Auditors Certification) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“Although not a member of Audit Committee, I assume that Councillor Stafford has read the Certification Report provided by the External Auditors and can I ask what action he plans to take to address the errors identified?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“The number of errors, quoted by Councillor Neville in his original question are substantially different to those identified within the report. Six, as opposed to forty, errors were identified as a result of the initial audit and I do take these seriously with robust checking procedures in place.”

Question 33: (Cost of sick pay) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“Can I thank Councillor Stafford for this response, which it has taken some time to obtain. Whilst having every sympathy with staff suffering from long term illness can I ask the Cabinet Member to provide me with details on the number of staff affected?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“As I am not able to provide the specific numbers at the meeting I will arrange for a written response to be provided. It is important to note, however, the significant work undertaken on a partnership basis with the Trade Unions to reduce sickness absence and encourage attendance across the Council with current levels reduced from an average of 10.3 to 7.9 days.”

Question 34: (Cost of Agency Workers) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“In view of the written response provided, can Councillor Stafford please provide details on the number of agency staff and interim management posts engaged under the current contract and the role of the central HR function in managing these staff?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“As I am not able to provide specific details at the meeting I will arrange for a written response to be provided. In providing any response it is important to note that the aim of the Administration is, wherever possible, to employ staff on a full time basis but where this is not possible agency staff are used.”

Question 35: (Redundancy Savings arising from Learner Programme) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:

“Can Councillor Stafford provide me with details of the savings achieved as a result of the 155 redundancies identified in his written response?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“As I am not able to provide specific details at the meeting I will arrange for a written response to be provided.”

Question 36: (NLWA cinema advertisement) Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Can Councillor Bond advise if he has seen the NLWA advertisement now showing at Cineworld Enfield?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“Yes.”

Question 37: (Access to Palace Gardens Car Park for Blue Badge holders) from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Can I ask Councillor Bond to provide an update on any plans being developed to deal with the problem identified?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“We are still reviewing the options available and I will provide further details once a solution has been identified and agreed.”

Question 41: (Damage to New River Loop pump) from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

“Will the Cabinet Member confirm that any future reports of vandalism to the pump will be reported to the police?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“Whilst it is not clear what caused the damage to the pump I am happy to look into this.”

Question 43: (Carbon emission reductions): from Councillor R. Hayward to Councillor Sitkin, Chairman of Sustainability and the Living Environment Scrutiny Panel:

“Can Councillor Sitkin outline what he feels will be the local impact of energy companies considering their funding commitment towards the Energy Companies Obligation as a result of plans recently announced by Ed Milliband in relation to the introduction of levers on them by a future Labour Government?”

Reply from Councillor Sitkin:

“There is a need to stop joking about irrelevant things and focus on the serious damage that could be done to this borough's economic prospects if all the work we have done building up an energy efficiency supply chain were damaged by this Tory-led government's environmentally short-sighted policy of curtailing ECO funding. The Prime Minister needs to start standing up to those climate change denying Members dominating his back benches.”

**106
MOTIONS**

1.1 Councillor Charalambous moved and Councillor Anne-Marie Pearce seconded the following motion:

“This Council acknowledges with pride Chickenshed's contribution to arts, community and education in the London Borough of Enfield over the last 40 years and restates the Council's commitment to a continued partnership which has benefited so many of the borough's residents.”

Following a debate, during which the cross party nature of activity undertaken to establish and support the work of Chickenshed was acknowledged, the motion was agreed unanimously, without a vote.

1.2 Councillor Taylor moved and Councillor Bearryman seconded the following motion, originally submitted in the name of Councillor Hamilton:

“I call on Enfield Council to urge the Government, and in particular the Ministry of Justice, to think again about their proposals for the privatisation of the probation service where they are proposing G4S and the like running the probation service.

We oppose the government's plan to privatise the probation service to make cost savings from centrally managing more offenders in the community and closing prisons. This will increase risk to Enfield residents.”

During the debate on this item, concerns were raised by the Opposition Group in relation to the naming of a specific company within the motion whom it was reported had subsequently been withdrawn from the tendering process. As a result Councillor Taylor advised that he would be willing to move an

amendment to the motion in order to remove reference to the specific company.

Following a period of further debate, Councillor Taylor then moved and Councillor Brett seconded the following amendment:

To delete the following words at the end of the first paragraph “where they are proposing G4S and the like running the probation service.”

The amendment was put to the vote and agreed, with the following result:

For: 30

Against: 1

The substantive motion (as amended and detailed below) was then immediately put to the vote and agreed, with the following result:

“I call on Enfield Council to urge the Government, and in particular the Ministry of Justice, to think again about their proposals for the privatisation of the probation service.

We oppose the government’s plan to privatise the probation service to make cost savings from centrally managing more offenders in the community and closing prisons. This will increase risk to Enfield residents.”

For: 30

Against: 16

Abstentions: 2

107

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8 - DURATION OF THE 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 8 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.

108

MOTIONS

The following motions listed on the agenda lapsed due to lack of time:

1.1 In the name of Councillor Hamilton:

“This Council believes that the safety and security of Enfield residents is being put at risk by the Mayor of London and the Tory led Coalition Government as

a result of cuts to the key emergency services – the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Brigade, the London Ambulance Service and the Accident & Emergency Departments.

The Council believes that the cuts are too far and too fast and that the many millions of pounds being taken from the budgets of the NHS, the Metropolitan Police Service and the London Fire Brigade will inevitably endanger families and communities in Enfield.

The closures of Met police station front desks, fire stations and A & E departments alongside cuts to the London ambulance service means that the safety of Enfield residents is put at risk.

This Council calls on the Mayor of London and the Coalition Government to reconsider the changes which reduce the safety and security of our residents.”

1.2 In the name of Councillor Lavender:

“Enfield Council notes with sadness the death of Lord McAlpine and requests that Councillor Hamilton withdraws the remarks she made in a debate at Council that a senior Conservative was a paedophile at a time when unfounded allegations were being made against Lord McAlpine and which were subsequently withdrawn.”

109

MEMBERSHIPS

AGREED the following changes to committee memberships

AGREED to confirm the following changes to committee memberships:

1. **Older People & Vulnerable Adults Scrutiny Panel** – Councillor R.Hayward’s appointment be deleted in order to ensure the agreed political balance on the Panel was maintained.
2. **Councillor Conduct Committee** – Councillors Cranfield & Levy to be appointed as the Majority Group substitute members with names to be notified for the 2 Opposition Group substitute members.

110

NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

No changes were notified.

111

CALLED IN DECISIONS

None received.

112

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED

1. The next meeting of the Council would be held at 7.00pm on Wednesday 26 February 2014 at the Civic Centre.
2. The final Council meeting of the 2013/14 Municipal Year would be held at 7.00pm on Wednesday 2 April 2014 at the Civic Centre.