

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 2 APRIL
2014**

COUNCILLORS

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

ABSENT Alan Barker, Christopher Deacon, Marcus East, Jonas Hall, Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward, Henry Lamprecht, Simon Maynard, Paul McCannah and Rohini Simbodyal

133

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

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

134

MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING

Father Jeffrey from Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St George Enfield gave the blessing.

135

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

The Mayor thanked Father Jeffrey for offering the blessing at the start of the meeting.

As this was his final ordinary Council meeting, he then provided a review of his year in office, highlighting the following for particular attention:

- He had enjoyed every minute of his duties as Mayor. Whilst the schedule was sometime punishing it had also been rewarding.

COUNCIL - 2.4.2014

- A real memory would be meeting so many people in the borough, particularly those working in the voluntary sector who provided so many services to the Council. Without them he felt the borough would not be an exciting place to live and work.
- During his office as Mayor he had visited many schools and met many children and teachers. The Mayors debating competition for children at both primary and secondary level had been extremely enjoyable and had demonstrated some exceptionally brilliant debating skills.
- He had also met all five branches of scouts and cadets in the borough, with the young people benefiting immensely from their training. These talented young people had taught him to fly, albeit on a computer, and had also benefited from experience gained in other training including camping, swimming and sports, which combined well with their academic achievements in aviation science.
- He had visited a large number of elderly people's organisations, with the elderly, he felt, contributing a great deal to the wellbeing of society. A lot of the elderly were really appreciative of his visits to their homes and rapport established with them.
- During his mayorship two significant events had taken place. The signing of the Armed Forces Covenant and on her Majesty's advice, flying the Commonwealth Flag outside the Civic Centre.
- He had attended about 400 engagements during the year, although he felt it was not the number of appointments that mattered but the quality of people met that was important.
- As a Council, the Mayor advised he would like to see further development of the contribution from voluntary & community groups and individuals who had done so much good work for the people of Enfield.
- He also extended his thanks and gratitude to his fellow councillors and the Labour Group for nominating him as Mayor. It had been a real privilege to serve as the first citizen of the borough. As an ambassador of the borough, he had also tried his best to promote its profile locally, nationally and internationally. During his time as a Mayor, particularly while presiding over council meetings, he had tried to be as fair and impartial as possible but recognised he may, at times, have incurred the displeasure of some councillors and for this he apologised. Particular reference was made to the previous meeting with specific apologies offered to Councillors Oykenner and Neville. The Mayor believed that honesty blossomed in magnanimity and as a result hoped that his fellow councillors had not been offended during his chairmanship of council meetings.
- He offered particular thanks to officers in the Mayoral team with specific reference to Rhoda, Melanie, Norman and Andy. Advice from John

Austin and Asmat Hussain had also been immensely helpful. In terms of the religious blessings at council he pointed out that he had also provided opportunities for all religious groups in the borough to participate, which he hoped had impacted on the behaviour of all councillors.

- The Mayor advised that he had decided to leave politics altogether, at the end of his term of office, to concentrate on community development in the borough particularly in relation to Black and Minority Ethnic groups.
- Before concluding his review the Mayor announced he had decided to introduce a good conduct award for council meetings. Whilst appreciating that all councillors had contributed and behaved well during his time in office, he felt that some stood out in terms of their excellent conduct in the chamber. He therefore named the following councillors as recipients of his good conduct award for Council meetings during 2013/14:

Labour Group

Bambos Charalambous
Doug Taylor
Christine Hamilton
Toby Simon
Del Goddard

Conservative Group

Mike Rye
Edward Smith
John Kaye
Joanne Laban
Denise Headley

The Mayor then made the following announcements:

- (a) Death of a former councillor

The Mayor announced, with sadness, the death of a past councillor Sir Colin William Carstairs-Turner, CBE, DFC who had served in the 1950s. He asked members to join him in extending the Council's sympathies to his family.

- (b) Council photo

All members were requested to remain in the chamber after the meeting for a group photograph to commemorate the Council during 2010 to 2014.

Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council, took the opportunity to respond by congratulating and placing on record his thanks to Councillor Anwar for the work undertaken as Mayor, and way he had conducted himself in the role and in chairing the Council over the year. A particular focus had been the work he had undertaken with the local voluntary and community sector, and he wished him well for the further work he planned to undertake in this area once his term of office had come to an end.

In addition, Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Cranfield, as Deputy Mayor, for the work and support she had provided to the Mayor during the year. This was an important role but one that could often be overlooked. As this was the final Council meeting of the current Administration he also placed on record his thanks to all of the previous Mayors and Deputy Mayors who had held office since 2010.

Councillor Lavender, Leader of the Opposition, endorsed the comments made and also congratulated and thanked the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the work they had undertaken during the year and for the way in which they had conducted Council meetings. He felt they had been a credit to the office and a great success in the role.

Before moving on, the Mayor reminded members that it had been the tradition in Enfield at the final Council meeting before a local election to offer those members not standing for re-election the opportunity to address the meeting. With the prior agreement of both Groups it had been agreed that each speech should be limited to a maximum of two minutes.

Before inviting members to speak, the Mayor expressed his thanks to those members not standing in the election for their services to the borough and wished them well for the future.

Councillors Constantindes, Anolue, Waterhouse, Ibrahim, Joannides, Goddard, Zetter & Berryman all spoke at the meeting outlining their personal experiences as councillors and thanking their fellow colleagues and officers for the support provided during the time they had served as members.

**136
MINUTES**

AGREED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on Wednesday 26 February 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**137
APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alan Barker, Chris Deacon, Marcus East, Robert Hayward, Elaine Hayward, Paul McCannah, & Rohini Simbodyal. An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Chris Murphy.

**138
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Toby Simon declared a non pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 7 (Opposition Business) as he lived in one of the roads which would be affected by the traffic proposals relating to the Mini Holland scheme.

John Austin (Assistant Director, Corporate Governance) confirmed the interest registered was of a non-pecuniary nature, so he would be able to remain in the meeting and participate in any discussion and vote on this item.

139

CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

At this stage in the meeting the Mayor advised that he had received notice of an emergency motion, which he had agreed to accept for consideration at the meeting, in accordance with the criteria detailed within the Council Procedure Rules.

The motion related to the efforts being made to seek the release of a student studying at Oasis Hadley Academy from the Yarls Wood detention Centre and to defer her scheduled deportation in order to enable her to remain with her family and complete her studies. As students from Oasis Hadley Academy had been invited to address Council on the matter the Mayor advised that the Opposition Group had, subject to a formal change in the order of business being approved, agreed to a request for this motion to be considered in advance of Opposition Priority Business.

Councillor Brett therefore moved and Councillor Waterhouse seconded a proposal to change the order of business on the agenda under paragraph 2.2 (page 4-5) of the Council's procedure rules to enable the meeting to consider the emergency motion as the next item of business.

The change in order of business was agreed without a vote.

140

EMERGENCY MOTION

Councillor Charalambous moved and Councillor Taylor seconded the following motion:

"Enfield Council notes and wholeheartedly supports the efforts of all the students and staff at Oasis Hadley Academy and politicians and supporters of the campaign seeking the immediate release of Yashika Bageerathi from Yarls Wood detention centre, and for her to be reunited with her family and be allowed to complete her education in Enfield at Oasis Hadley Academy.

Enfield Council requests the Leader of the Council to write and make urgent representations to the Government Ministers concerned regarding Yashika Bageerathi's situation and request that they defer any consideration of deportation until she finishes her studies."

In seconding the motion, Councillor Taylor provided Council with an update on the latest position regarding Yashika Bageerathi, which he advised had moved on significantly during the day. Members noted that despite written representations having being made to the Home Secretary and Air Mauritius that afternoon the decision had been made to proceed with her deportation,

which had been scheduled for 9pm that night. Members expressed regret and disappointment on a cross party basis at the decision to proceed with the deportation and also commended the highly effective campaign undertaken by Yashika's friends and fellow students at Oasis Hadley Academy in attempting to defer the deportation.

Councillor Charalambous then introduced students and a teacher from Oasis Hadley Academy, as representatives of the campaign group, and with the permission of the Mayor they were given the opportunity to address the meeting, highlighting:

- the background to the campaign;
- the exhaustive efforts made to seek the release of their friend and fellow student from her detention centre and to defer the deportation, which had unfortunately not been successful;

Following a short debate the motion was agreed unanimously, without a vote. Councillor Taylor advised that he would make available to members a copy of the written representations sent to the Home Office that afternoon.

141

OPPOSITION BUSINESS - GLA & MAYORAL FUNDING: MINI HOLLAND PROPOSALS

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

1. The need to recognise and thank the Mayor of London for the level of investment provided for projects within the borough over the last four year period. This had included funds to refurbish the Hertford Road Business Centre and investment in the Council's market gardening initiative along with a range of other projects detailed within the Opposition Business Paper. Investment had also been pledged for the new Meridian Water Railway Station as well as third rail track.
2. In addition to the investment outlined in 1. Enfield had also been successful in bidding for funding as part of the Mayor of London's Mini Holland programme, with £30m allocated for investment in cycling and street scene improvements. The bid had been developed with cross party support and its success was regarded as an excellent achievement for the borough in times of austerity.
3. The Opposition Group recognised the benefits of the Mini Holland funding in terms of:
 - generating investment for Enfield's businesses;
 - acting as a catalyst to increase and provide safer ways of cycling; and

- improving infrastructure and street scene;

Concerns were, however, identified in relation to:

- a. The need to ensure that the opportunity represented by this funding was not wasted and that the scheme was designed to benefit, and had the full support of, the borough's residents and businesses.
- b. The Council's ability to deliver such a large scale regeneration scheme, given perceptions about its previous track record in consulting upon and delivering these type of large scale projects.
- c. The level of apprehension already being expressed by some local businesses, residents and other stakeholders about consultation on and development of the detailed proposals and how this would impact on them. The need to work and communicate with residents and local businesses was therefore seen as key in order to ensure that the project was a success.

As an outcome of the debate the Opposition were looking to recognise and thank the Mayor of London for the level of investment provided in Enfield and to ensure that the necessary consultation and governance arrangements were put in place (as promised within the bid submission). It was felt this was necessary in order to gain the support of residents and the local business community and to ensure that any issues raised were properly considered and, where necessary, acted upon.

Councillor Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration, responded on behalf of the Majority Group, highlighting:

1. The constructive nature of the issue raised under Opposition Business, but need to also recognise the amount of time and effort that had gone into developing the bid proposals which had been the main reason for its successful outcome.
2. Whilst appreciating the cross party support for the bid, it was felt that the Council could demonstrate a strong record of consultation, for example, on development of the South West Enfield Area Action Plan which had recently been approved following an extensive consultation process with local residents and businesses with virtually no amendment. He felt that a strong approach towards consultation was already embedded in the way that the Council approached regeneration schemes.
3. It was recognised that there had been some initial misunderstanding about what the proposals would involve, but he reiterated the commitment that the Council was proposing to work with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders, and would consider the issues raised in order to deliver a successful scheme.

4. The scheme was seen as a catalyst for regeneration and would link in with development of the Enfield Town Area Action Plan aimed at delivering a socially and economically vibrant town centre.

It was therefore felt that the scheme needed to be recognised as a real opportunity for the borough with an assurance provided that the detailed proposals would be developed in full consultation with local residents and businesses.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- (a) The need to recognise and welcome the opportunity provided as a result of the successful bid, for which there was support on a cross party basis.
- (b) The concerns raised by the Opposition Group in relation to:
 - the outcome of the initial consultation meeting with local businesses in Enfield Town and need to ensure that communication and consultation moving forward were genuine and designed to fully engage residents and local businesses;
 - the need for careful consideration to be given to the planning of cycle routes and hubs in order to recognise not only safety issues but also the likely purpose of journeys. Not all areas would be conducive to cycle routes, given the existing urban environment and space available, so it was felt thought needed to be given to where routes could best be sited with use made, wherever possible, of less busy secondary routes parks and other greenways as an example linked to the main hubs.
 - the fragile nature of the commercial vitality of town centres across the borough and need to ensure this was not damaged, particularly in Enfield Town, as part of the development of the Mini Holland proposals.
- (c) The need identified by members of the Majority Group:
 - to recognise that whilst welcomed, the investment provided by the Mayor of London was funded via the precept levied on local authorities and only represented a small proportion of his overall budget;
 - to recognise that the scheme was designed as a catalyst to encourage cycling along with the associated health benefits. This would involve the creation of schemes designed to segregate motorists and cyclists;
 - to acknowledge the success of the current Administration in developing and delivering large scale regeneration and other innovative projects such as Meridian Water. The need to ensure

that residents and local businesses were kept fully informed and engaged in development of the proposals had been recognised and would form a key part of the scheme moving forward;

- The need to protect and avoid damaging the commercial viability of town centres had been recognised. Whilst the scheme would involve the development of innovative solutions, given the need to manage existing pressures on infrastructure, the Council remained committed to working with local business over development of the detailed proposals.

Councillor Laban summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group by highlighting the recommendations set out in the Opposition Business paper which it was felt would ensure that residents and business faith in the project was maintained at the same time as delivering the best scheme possible.

In response Councillor Taylor felt there was a need to recognise the overall context within which the bid had been developed including the aim to tackle health, environmental and air quality issues across the borough. Whilst the clear objective of the programme was to encourage an increase in the level of cycling as a mode of transport it was recognised that the detailed design of proposals would also need to take account of the purpose of travel.

Concerns had already been expressed locally about proposals relating to Enfield Town. It was, however, important to note that an important element of the bid had involved Enfield Town which the Mayor was keen to see progressed. The development of these proposals would involve consideration of a range of options which would, as emphasised during the debate, be subject to an ongoing process of consultation with a range of key stakeholders including residents and local businesses.

In terms of the recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper, the Leader advised of the intention for Cabinet (under the new Administration) to consider proposals relating to the necessary governance structure and consultation arrangements on the scheme. The involvement of scrutiny in the process would be felt to be a matter for the relevant panel to consider as part of the process in setting their work programme. Whilst the scheme represented a great opportunity for the borough and the aim was to move forward with the support of all major stakeholders, it would not be possible to guarantee that every concern raised as the consultation and design process was progressed could be actioned. An assurance was provided that the Council would listen to views being expressed but the final decision would ultimately rest with the authority.

The recommendations in the Opposition Business Paper were not therefore approved, although it was noted that development of the Mini Holland proposals would be subject to further Cabinet consideration of the necessary governance structure and consultation arrangements. No vote was requested by the Leader of the Opposition on the outcome of the debate.

142

PROPOSED SUBMISSION NORTH EAST AREA ACTION PLAN

Councillor Goddard moved and Councillor Orhan seconded a report from the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.208A) seeking approval of the proposed submission North East Enfield Area Action Plan (NEEAAP) and supporting documents.

NOTED

1. The recommendations within the report had been considered and referred onto Council for approval by Cabinet on 12 March 2014.
2. The background to preparation of the NEEAAP, as detailed in section 3 of the report.
3. The key themes within the Action Plan (as detailed below), which had been designed with the aim of achieving sustainable growth and managing the delivery of key development potential for the area in a co-ordinated way:
 - regeneration of key local centres and improvements in connectivity to the areas surrounding them;
 - provision of a range of housing;
 - improvements to community facilities;
 - provision of improved public transport links;
 - addressing the internal connectivity within North East Enfield and to other areas;
 - making more use of the river and waterways; and
 - adopting a balanced approach towards business and employment;
4. The need identified, during the debate, to ensure that the NEEAP was used to support the parallel work being undertaken as part of the Northern Gateway Access Plan in relation to improving transport movement and connectivity, particularly in terms of the retention and improvement of crossing points as part of the West Anglia Mainline Extension Project (WAML). Members felt this was a key issue to be addressed in terms of local connectivity both within the area and in terms of wider east-west connections across the borough and sub region as a whole.
5. In response to 4. above, Councillor Goddard advised that this had already been recognised within the Northern Gateway Action Plan and that as a result an additional statement would also be added to the Movement chapter with the NEEAP relating to West Anglia Mainline Extension:
6. The thanks expressed to officers and other key stakeholders for their work in developing the Action Plan along with the cross party support expressed for the vision and themes within the Plan.

7. The concerns expressed by the Opposition Group in relation to the wide ranging nature of the operational delegation proposed within recommendation 2.2 of the report for the approval of any subsequent changes to the submission version of the Plan. It was felt this delegation should be at Portfolio rather than operational level, which the Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration advised members he would be willing to amend.
8. The next steps in the development of the Plan and submission process, as detailed in section 4 of the report, which would include a further period of public consultation on the proposed Submission Area Action Plan.

The recommendations in the report were then approved without a vote.

AGREED

- (1) To approve the Proposed Submission Draft North East Enfield Area Action Plan and supporting documents for a statutory 6 week period of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State for public examination, subject to the inclusion of the following statement in section 4.3.3 of the Movement Chapter relation to the West Anglia Mainline Extension project:

“As plans to develop future transport infrastructure are prepared the Council will do all that it can to secure east west connections so as to prevent fragmentation of communities and avoid areas of isolation.”

- (1) The Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration, in consultation with the Director of Regeneration & Environment or any other authorised Director, be authorised to approve as a Portfolio (rather than operational) decision under the Council’s Scheme of Delegation appropriate changes to the Submission version of the North east Enfield Area Action Plan and undertake any further consultation required, in the run up to and during the public examination process into the document, in response to representations received, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice. This process will also be subject to changes of a substantive nature being considered by the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee.

143

SMALL HOUSING SITES - FUNDING REQUIREMENT

Councillor Oykenor moved and Councillor Stafford seconded a joint report from the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care & Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.206A) seeking approval to the funding requirements for the Small Housing Sites project.

NOTED

COUNCIL - 2.4.2014

1. The Small Housing Sites project had been approved by Cabinet on 12 March 2014, with Council only being asked to approve an update to the Capital Programme relating to the allocation of funding from the Investment in Private Rented Sector Homes to the Small Housing Sites project.
2. The background to development of the Small Housing Sites project, as detailed within section 3 of the report.
3. The development of funding options to support the scheme, as detailed within section 4 of the report. The preferred option identified would involve funding the construction costs through council borrowing via the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) and European Investment Bank (EIB) rather than a private finance company, on the basis set out within Option 2 in the report.
4. Whilst recognising the innovative nature of the scheme, concerns were identified by the Opposition Group in relation to:
 - a. The ongoing impact of borrowing identified in relation to management of the overall capital programme and Government cap on the HRA capital programme;
 - b. The complex nature of the ownership structure for properties generated as part of the scheme, on the basis that it would require the creation of a further Special Purchase Vehicle (SPV) by the Council;
5. In response to the concerns outlined in 4. above the Cabinet Member for Finance & Property clarified that the funding required for the scheme would involve the reallocation of resources already approved under the Investment in Private Rented Sector scheme and had already been factored into the Council borrowing requirement.

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

For: 30
Against: 0
Abstentions: 17

AGREED

- (1) To approve an update to the General Fund Capital Programme for 2014-16 and allocate £17.3m from the Investment in Private Rented Sector Homes to the Small Housing Sites project.
- (2) To note there are would be no additional costs to the Council from the recommendation to reallocate £17.3m from the Investment in Private Rented Sector Homes to the Small Housing Sites project. This

borrowing had already been factored into the Council borrowing requirement.

144

ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE

Councillor Stafford moved and Councillor Georgiou seconded a report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.207A) detailing the process developed to deal with Assets of Community Value as a requirement of the Localism Act 2011.

NOTED the procedure for dealing with Assets of Community Value had been approved by Cabinet on 12 March 2014. In approving the process, Cabinet had requested that the report be referred on to Council for information and noting. The report was subsequently noted, without debate.

AGREED to note the duty under the Localism Act 2011 to implement the Community Right to Bid and process agreed by Cabinet (12 March 14) to comply with the relevant requirements.

145

COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME (TIME ALLOWED 30 MINUTES)

1.1 Urgent Question

The Mayor advised that in accordance with the criteria set out in the Constitution, he had accepted the following as an urgent question:

From Councillor Keazor to Councillor Oykenner, Cabinet Member for Housing

“Given the changes that have been made to ECO funding by the Government, will the Cabinet member for Housing provide the Council with an update on recent developments of ECO funding to Enfield.”

Councillor Oykenner provided the following verbal response at the meeting:

“I can confirm that ECO works to properties within the borough are being undertaken on a two phase basis. The first phase involves works (on a pilot basis with British Gas) to properties at Scott House which are due to be completed by June 14. The second phase involves works to other medium rise housing blocks scheduled for 2015.

Recent Government announcement regarding significant reductions in carbon credits has led to energy providers walking away from similar ECO deals with other local authorities, which in turn will impact on higher energy bills. In Enfield, however, negotiations have continued with British Gas and as a result it has been possible to reach agreement to secure significant continued investment with a contract due to be signed shortly. I would like to

congratulate officers on this achievement which will have a significant impact in terms of energy efficiency, fuel bills and employment within the borough.

The deal with British Gas will contribute towards the decent homes programme of works and involve 6 small blocks across the Exeter Road and Kettering Estates. Securing this investment is a significant achievement for Enfield when compared to other councils and in terms of tackling fuel poverty.”

1.2 Questions by Councillors

NOTED

1. The fifty three questions on the Council’s agenda which had received a written reply from the relevant Cabinet Member.
2. The request from Councillor Neville for confirmation to be provided on the circulation of written responses to supplementary questions asked at Council on 29 January 2014, which the Assistant Director Corporate Governance agreed to provide following the meeting.
3. The following supplementary questions and responses received for the questions indicated below:

Question 1 (Palmers Green Library development) from Councillor Ann Marie Pearce to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance & Property:

“Has a date been set for the start of the development work on the library?”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“The works are due to start any day now, with full details provided within the Cabinet report already referred to.”

Question 3 (Support to Friends of the Park Groups) from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment:

In my question I asked for details of the reasons for the reduction in parks officers supporting the Friend’s groups, to which no response has been provided. Could I ask why these officers have been reduced?”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

“The reduction was as a result of a departmental restructure.”

Question 12 (London Stansted Cambridge Corridor Consortium) from Councillor Savva to Councillor Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration:

“Could the Cabinet Member provide further details on the objectives of the Consortium?”

Reply from Councillor Goddard:

“The main purpose of the Consortium is to identify and help to provide social and economic development opportunities along the corridor as a whole, without regard for political boundaries. Its function is to bring all the key stakeholders together in order to identify and lobby for infrastructure improvements and other inward investment opportunities on a co-ordinated basis (recognising the way other regions function across the South East of England) based on a clear and well defined profile for the area. The approach also ensures joined up working between the relevant LEPs, Planning Authorities & County Councils covering the Corridor area.

The Government’s aim to achieve full employment will require the creation of approx. 40,000 jobs in Enfield, which it will only be possible to deliver on a joined up basis working with key partners and neighbouring authorities. The Consortium provides a robust mechanism for delivering this approach, which also has the benefit of being recognised by the Government.”

Question 13 (Community Help Point Scheme) from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Hamilton, Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing & Public Health

“Although not able to provide specific details, the response does confirm that the controller for each site has been trained and Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checked. In terms of the sites listed, however, would the Cabinet Member review the information provided as some of it appears out of date.”

Reply from Councillor Hamilton:

“Can I start by stating that this is a fantastic scheme. I do recognise that the list of help point sites needs to be updated, which will be done along with further promotion to ensure that as many people as possible are aware of this excellent scheme.”

Question 14 (New River algae treatment) from Councillor Anolue to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance & Property.

“Can the Cabinet Member please confirm that the product being used to treat the waterways in front of the Civic Centre is animal friendly.”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“I can confirm that the product being used has not been tested on animals and is BUVA approved. We encourage all sub-contractors to use these type of cleaning products. It is also worth noting that the product being used to treat the waterways has been developed by a resident based in North Enfield, and is now being marketed on a nationwide basis.”

Question 16 (outsourcing of Council posts) from Councillor Levy to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance & Property

“Given the detrimental impact that the relocation of Council staff out of borough would have on the local economy can the Cabinet Member explain why he feels the current Opposition have raised this as an idea for consideration.”

Reply from Councillor Stafford:

“I have no idea why anyone would raise the idea of relocating jobs out of the borough at the current time given the efforts being made to tackle unemployment and levels of deprivation across the borough. Whilst, as an example, Barnet Council may have outsourced its call centre to Belfast I see no benefit to the borough from this type of approach which would be a disaster for the local economy. I can confirm that this is not an approach that the current Administration supports.”

Question 18 (secondary school places) from Councillor Hasan to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People.

“Will the Cabinet Member join me in thanking the officers involved for their hard work and assistance in development and delivery of the secondary place strategy.”

Reply from Councillor Orhan:

“I will be more than happy to thank not only officers but also the schools, Headteachers and Governing Bodies for their ongoing support in delivery of the strategy, which has been made more difficult by the funding restrictions introduced by the Government.”

Question 22 (Brimmsdown School kitchen) from Councillor Simon to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People.

“Can the Cabinet Member confirm that she is aware of the current age of the facility being used as the kitchen at Brimmsdown School, which is well overdue for replacement.”

Reply from Councillor Orhan:

“I am aware that this facility is well overdue for replacement, with funding already identified for new facilities at the school.”

Question 29 (Palace Gardens Car Park) from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

“Could the Cabinet Member provide a more specific date for the final update on investigation of the parking problem identified.”

Reply from Councillor Bond:

"I expect to have a definitive position sometime in April."

Question 30 (Market Garden initiative) from Councillor Brett to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council

"Does the Leader of the Council feel the market garden plans are supported by the Conservative Opposition in Enfield?"

Reply from Councillor Taylor:

"The Conservative Opposition will need to answer this question themselves, although it does appear that they are somewhat cynical judging by previous comments made. The important thing to note, however, is that the proposals are supported and have been partially funded by the Conservative Mayor for London. He has recognised the potential of the initiative to provide employment and training opportunities as well as the environmental and income generation benefits for the borough."

Question 32 (flood risk management) from Councillor Levy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

"Would the Cabinet Member agree that the quality of flood risk management work undertaken is of such high calibre that it also opens up the potential to explore income generation opportunities?"

Reply from Councillor Bond:

"I would definitely agree and feel that we should be proud of the service and expertise provided. The potential to develop income generation opportunities as a result is something that can be looked at as part of the new Administration."

Question 39 (Council Tax Bill) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council

"Does the Leader accept the benefits, given the public are so ill informed about local government finance of including a breakdown of Government Grants and support funding along with locally raised taxes as part of the future explanatory leaflet accompanying Council Tax Bills. Is there not a case to be made, within a democratic society, for this information being provided and not hidden from the public?"

Reply from Councillor Taylor:

"We will, having won the next election, be producing a Council Tax leaflet which takes on board the concerns raised by Councillor Neville. In order to provide a fully informed position this will also, however, need to include a list

of the funding reductions imposed by Central Government along with other movements in Government support (in real terms).

I also note the claims in leaflets being distributed by Conservative candidates in the forthcoming local election regarding our plans for Council Tax, which are pure figments of their imagination.”

Question 45 (landlord registration scheme) from Councillor Hurer to Councillor Oyken, Cabinet Member for Housing

“Given the vague nature of the written response provided does this mean that the Council will not be charging itself the fee for each property it owns under the proposed landlord registration scheme and if so will this not provide an unfair commercial advantage. Can the Cabinet Member also advise, should the scheme be agreed, whether this will lead to the Council taking legal action against itself for any anti-social behaviour caused by their own tenants?”

Reply from Councillor Oyken:

“Whilst the Council has undertaken a consultation process, no final decision has yet been made on adoption of the licensing scheme. If it is decided to implement a scheme the full details of how it will apply will be made explicit.”

Question 53 (voting patterns at Planning Committee) from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Constantinides, Chair of Planning Committee.

“Could the Chair also provide a breakdown of the occasions when he has voted or abstained on decisions at Planning Committee.”

Reply by Councillor Constantinides:

“These details will be available, as a matter of public record, in the minutes from each meeting.”

146

MOTIONS

Councillor Sitkin moved and Councillor Charalambous seconded the following motion:

“This Council notes how reduced central government funding of Enfield, including the 7% grant damping, has diminished the resources available to local residents. It asserts that there are alternative sources that central government could mobilise, specifically a Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) on the speculative activities that have accelerated the enrichment of the few to the detriment of the many. It therefore calls upon the government to levy the FTT and use the proceeds to increase central grants to local authorities like Enfield.”

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

For: 32
Against: 17
Abstentions: 0

147
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 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.

148
MOTIONS

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

1.1 In the name of Councillor Waterhouse:

"Enfield Council welcomes the cross-party campaign on blacklisting organised by Stephen McPartland MP and Kelvin Hopkins MP, supported by the GMB union.

This Council deplores the illegal practice of 'blacklisting' within the construction industry and will ensure that any company known to have been involved in blacklisting practices and not to have indemnified their victims will not be invited to tender contracts by Enfield Council.

This Council encourages Enfield residents who may have been affected to visit www.stoptheblacklisting.com".

1.2 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 threatened by longer response times.

This Council calls on the Mayor of London and the Coalition Government to reconsider and abandon the draconian cuts to the emergency services on which we rely to keep Enfield residents and Londoners safe.”

1.3 In the name of Councillor Orhan

“Increasingly this Council is having to support families whose immigration status has not been resolved by Government. Currently, the Council is supporting 105 families, an increase on last year.

Undoubtedly this is a difficult position for these families as they are in a state of limbo. Some have been in this position for almost 5 years. As their immigration status remains unresolved, this Council is obliged under legislation to provide, social care, housing and education for these families and their children.

There is an estimated cost to the Council of £1,037,408.00 for the financial year 2013/2014.

The Council agrees that the Leader of the Council should pursue this with the objective of resolving the situation for these families, and gaining reimbursement from the Government for costs the Council has incurred.”

1.4 In the name of Councillor Neville:

"The Council welcomes the Chancellor's Budget which will benefit all sections of our community, incentivise investment and help to create much needed new jobs.”

1.5 In the name of Councillor Laban:

“Enfield Council acknowledges the concern of local residents with regard to the increasing numbers of Betting Shops, Pawn Brokers and Pay Day Loan Companies and will act to implement local measures to stop the proliferation of these establishments on the High Streets of Enfield.”

**149
MEMBERSHIPS**

No changes were notified.

**150
NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

No changes were notified.

151
CALLED IN DECISIONS

None received.

152
DATE OF NEXT MEETING

As this was the final Council meeting of the current Administration, the Mayor took the opportunity to end the meeting by thanking, on behalf of all members of the Council, the Directors and officers for their support.

NOTED that the next meeting of the Council would be the Annual Meeting and Mayor Making Ceremony, which had been scheduled for 7.00pm on Wednesday 11 June 2014 at the Civic Centre.