

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2014**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader), Donald McGowan (Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration), Rohini Simbodyal (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport, Youth and Public Health), Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Development), Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance) and Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community Organisations)

Associate Cabinet Members (Non Executive and Non-Voting): Bambos Charalambous and George Savva MBE

ABSENT Chris Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety)

OFFICERS: Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration & Environment), Andrew Fraser (Director of Schools & Children's Services), Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director - Legal and Governance Services), Sally McTernan (Assistant Director Community Housing Services), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Detlev Munster (Head of Property Programmes), Mohammed Lais (Senior Asset Management Surveyor), Antonia Makanjuola (Senior Lawyer), Suzanne Linsey (Press Officer) and Ann Crowne (Project Manager - Property Procurement) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

Also Attending: Mr Constantinos Regas, Mr Graham Collier, Mr Ian Littlewood (for the deputation on Report No.114 – the minutes below refer)
Mr John Jewson and Councillor Erin Celebi (for the deputations on Report No.115 – the minutes below refer)
Councillors Lee Chamberlain and Derek Levy
Members of the public in support of the deputations received

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Chris Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety) and Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting).

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director – Legal and Governance Services) advised Members that she had granted a dispensation, as Monitoring Officer, to the Cabinet Members tonight in respect of Report No.114 – Proposal to Implement a Borough-wide Additional Licensing Scheme for Private Sector Landlords (Minute No.8 below refers).

The dispensation had been granted in accordance with the Council's Constitution as members under the Code of Conduct had declared a disclosable pecuniary interest.

The dispensation had been granted to allow the Cabinet to ensure that it was quorate, and that the Cabinet could participate in this item and not impede on the transaction of the business tonight.

3 URGENT ITEMS

NOTED that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012, with the following exceptions:

Report No. 112 – Revenue Monitoring Report 2014/15: September 2014 and 2015/16 Financial Update (Minute No.6 below refers)

Report No.114 – Proposal to Implement a Borough-wide additional licensing scheme for private sector landlords (Minute No.8 below refers)

These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear working days in advance of meetings.

AGREED that the above reports be considered at the Cabinet meeting.

4 DEPUTATIONS

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) advised Members that deputations were to be received at the meeting in respect of the following items:

1. Report No.114 – Borough-wide Additional Licensing Scheme for Private Sector Landlords (Minute No. 8 below refers)

CABINET - 12.11.2014

2. Report No.115 – Bury Street West – Development Options for the Former Parks Depot Site, N9 9LA (Minute No.9 below refers)

The deputations were received in consideration of the above reports and the minutes below refer (Minute Nos. 8 and 9).

5

ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

AGREED that the following reports be referred to the Council:

1. Report Nos. 115 and 116 – Bury Street West – Development Options for the Former Parks Depot Site, N9 9LA

6

SEPTEMBER REVENUE MONITORING 2014/15 AND FINANCIAL UPDATE

Councillor Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.112) setting out the Council's revenue budget monitoring position based on information to the end of September 2014.

NOTED

1. The new savings proposals for 2015-16 as detailed in Appendix D of the report.
2. That Schools and Children's Services were currently projecting a pressure of £1.842m as set out in section 5.5 and Appendix A5 of the report.
3. The detailed achievement of savings and the savings monitor set out in section 8 and table 3 of the report.
4. The level of savings required over the next four years as set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan. The budget position following the initial savings review as detailed in section 10.7 of the report. 2015/16 was currently showing a budget gap of £7.8m but this might change if new pressures or opportunities were identified including any changes to the illustrative Local Government Finance Settlement 2015/16 provided so far by the Government.
5. That Appendix E to the report set out the Enfield 2017 savings agreed by the Cabinet at its meeting on 30 October 2014.

Alternative Options Considered: Not applicable to this report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To note the £2.5m overspend revenue outturn projection.

2. To note that specific work was in hand to identify mitigating actions for the projected overspends within Schools and Children's Services and Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
3. To note the progress made to date in the preparation of the 2015/16 budget.
4. The new savings proposals for 2015-16 set out in Appendix D of the report.

Reason: To ensure that Members were aware of the projected budgetary position for the Authority for the current and future years including all major budget pressures and underspends which had contributed to the present monthly position and that were likely to affect the Council's finances over the period of the Medium Term Financial Plan. The recommendations would allow the Authority to move forward with the development for the 2015-16 budget and Medium Term Financial Plan.

(Key decision – reference number 3950)

7

ENFIELD JOINT ADULT MENTAL HEALTH STRATEGY

Councillor Don McGowan (Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.113) presenting the Enfield Joint Adult Mental Health Strategy.

NOTED

1. That improving the mental health and wellbeing of adults living in Enfield had been prioritised by Enfield Council and NHS Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), as set out in the report. The priorities set out in the Enfield Joint Adult Mental Health Strategy 2014-2019 were highlighted.
2. That on average one in four people would be affected by mental health issues.
3. That the Strategy would bring together the services of the Council and the CCG and would provide greater opportunities for the development of effective joined up services.
4. Councillor Orhan complemented Councillor McGowan and the officers involved for the presentation of an excellent report and strategy. Support was expressed for the strategy and the focus on early intervention measures.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED that the Strategy sets out how (a) care pathways would be reshaped and (b) services and support would be improved for Mental Health Service Users and Carers in the future. It also

supported the Council and NHS Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group to work in partnership. It proposed an approach to commissioning and developing services for mental health service users and carers that were consistent with current legislation and guidance, and was in line with existing Council and NHS Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group strategies.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve the strategic direction, priorities and objectives for adult mental health care in Enfield, as detailed in the Joint Enfield Mental Health Strategy provided at appendix 1 of the report.
2. Note that the Strategy was also being considered by the Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group Executive Team prior to submission by the Governing Body in October 2014.

Reason: The Strategy was intended to meet the government's key objectives for the delivery of mental health services and to improve mental health service locally. A Joint Strategy between the Clinical Commissioning Group recognised the inter-dependency of health and social care and the impact of wider determinants of good mental health.

(Key decision – reference number 3938)

8

PROPOSAL TO IMPLEMENT A BOROUGH-WIDE ADDITIONAL LICENSING SCHEME FOR PRIVATE SECTOR LANDLANDS

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) invited Mr Constantinos Regas to present his deputation to the Cabinet. Mr Regas was accompanied by Mr Graham Collier and Mr Ian Littlewood.

Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director of Legal and Governance Services) reminded Mr Regas that he had been permitted to attend Cabinet tonight with his deputation and to make representations to the Executive. However, this permission might be withdrawn if the Council's legal advisers considered that any representations he made strayed into the merits of the current live judicial review claim, in relation to which the sub judice rule continues to apply.

Mr Regas advised Members that he was the claimant for a judicial review against the Council following the Cabinet's previous decision on this matter taken in April 2014.

Mr Regas noted the dispensation that had been granted to Cabinet Members as detailed in Minute No.2 above. Mr Regas raised a number of questions for Members' consideration. He noted Professor Mayhew's further report on anti-social behaviour in Enfield appended to Report No.114 but felt that it did not support the case for Additional Licensing in Enfield.

CABINET - 12.11.2014

Mr Regas quoted from extracts, paragraphs 55 and 65, from permission hearing judgement of Mr Justice Ouseley, 3 October 2014 – The Queen (on application of Regas) v London Borough of Enfield as follows:

“55. Although the legal section of the report set out the criteria, it is for those reasons arguable that the local authority had not applied its mind to the statutory requirements for an additional licensing scheme.

65. Having concluded that part of the claim is arguable, and recognising that it is important that an arguably unlawful scheme should not be visited upon the landlords’ HMOs in Enfield unless there was very good reason why the proceedings should not go ahead, I have decided, notwithstanding the want of promptness, but having regard to the absence of prejudice, to permit the challenge in relation to the additional licensing scheme to proceed”.

Mr Regas stated that the Cabinet’s previous decision was arguably unlawful. It was felt that the Council had all the powers necessary to address anti-social behaviour within the Borough. He expressed the view that the consultation undertaken had been inadequate.

Mr Regas also quoted from an extract from Enfield Council’s submission to the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Select Committee Inquiry into the Private Rented Sector in January 2013 in relation to the Housing Act 2004.

In conclusion Mr Regas stated that the Council was attempting to approve a scheme that had been “found wanting” by a High Court Judge. He felt that further discussion was required to address the issues without the introduction of an additional licensing scheme.

Councillor Taylor then provided an opportunity for Mr Collier or Mr Littlewood to address the Cabinet.

Mr Littlewood stated that he was a landlord in Enfield and other London Boroughs. He had always complied with legislation and had received no complaints against him. He felt that existing and new legislation provided the Council with adequate powers to tackle the issues highlighted. He did not support the Council’s Additional Licensing Scheme for Private Sector Landlords and outlined his reasons for this view. He drew Members’ attention to paragraph 5.1 of the report with regard to the possibility of designating a particular area as subject to additional licensing, as set out in the report. The actions that had been taken in Blackpool were highlighted for Members’ consideration.

Councillor Taylor thanked the deputation and invited Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration) and Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care) to respond.

CABINET - 12.11.2014

Councillor Oykenner reiterated the Council's commitment to work with landlords and their representatives. Good landlords would have nothing to fear from the introduction of the Scheme.

Ray James raised a number of issues in response, including the following:

1. Tackling anti-social behaviour and improving the environment in the area of Enfield was a priority for the council. One of the ways in which it had resolved to achieve this was by the introduction of Additional Licensing of HMOs below 3 storeys and selective licensing for other privately-rented dwellings.
2. On 9 April 2014 Enfield's Cabinet had decided, following a consultation which had commenced in November 2013 and ended on 28 February 2014, and the gathering of evidence to assist its decision making, to approve proposals to designate the area of Enfield for both additional and selective licensing.
3. A claim for judicial review had been issued by a landlord who had asserted that the decision to designate Enfield for such purposes was unlawful. Permission to apply for judicial review had been granted on 3 October 2014 in relation to additional licensing only because the Judge, Mr Justice Ouseley, considered aspects of that claim to be "arguable".
4. The full hearing of the judicial review would take place on 26 November 2014. As there were pending proceedings it would be inappropriate and in breach of the sub-judice principle for there to be discussion as to the merits of the legal challenge.
5. In light of the determination that the claim with regard to additional licensing was "arguable", the proposal before Cabinet was for it to ratify the decision made on 9 April 2014 in that respect alone. This was felt to be prudent as a responsible local authority, to ensure that Cabinet had taken into account the correct legal principles applicable to additional licensing in its decision making. As Cabinet was being asked to ratify its decision, updated evidence was also before it as set out in the Report (No.114). Debate about the proposal would be welcomed, but for the reasons given earlier, there could not be discussion about the merits of the pending legal proceedings.
6. The report sought to draw out the evidence that had been considered in recommending to Cabinet that a significant proportion of the HMOs of the description in Annex 1 of the report were being managed sufficiently ineffectively as to give rise, or to be likely to give rise, to one or more particular problems either for those occupying the HMOs or for members of the public. It was felt that the Council had demonstrated this through previous evidence base; the previous and current reports

of Professor Mayhew and the anecdotal evidence from Council Officers.

7. As set out in the report, the Council had received independent legal advice that given the extent of the consultation carried out to date, a further consultation exercise was not considered to be reasonable or proportionate.
8. Therefore with this report drawing out the evidence to support the ways in which the requirements of the Housing Act had been satisfied, supported by evidence from independent experts and council officers, Cabinet were asked to agree the recommendations set out in Report No.114.

Councillor Taylor then invited any questions from the Cabinet Members and further comments from Ray James, as follows:

- (a) Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Development) sought reassurance that the Scheme was consistent with Enfield's Housing Strategy.

Sally McTernan (Assistant Director Community Housing Services) provided reassurance to Members on this issue and stated that the Council's Housing Strategy (2012-2017) set out the key areas for the Borough's approach to the wider housing sector and the private rented sector. A key objective in the strategy was to "improve standards and management of homes in the private rented sector". This included a focus on anti-social behaviour. A number of approaches to deal with anti-social behaviour had been taken by the Council, as outlined at the meeting. As the scale of the private rented sector grew it was clear that existing measures were not sufficient. The Scheme was therefore compliant with the Council's Housing Strategy.

- (b) Councillor Rohini Simbodyal (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport, Youth and Public Health) questioned whether the Council had shown that a significant proportion of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) were suffering from poor management.

In response Sally McTernan advised that it had. There had been sufficient evidence before Cabinet in April 2014 to make the decision however, it had been considered prudent for the Cabinet to be asked to satisfy itself on the previous evidence and the new evidence that a significant proportion of HMOs in the area were being managed sufficiently ineffectively as to give rise, or to be likely to give rise to one or more of the particular problems for those occupying the HMOs or for members of the public.

- (c) Councillor Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community Organisations) asked whether the consultation undertaken had been adequate.

Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services) advised that the Council was satisfied that adequate consultation had taken place prior to the April 2014 Cabinet meeting. Independent legal advice had been sought and confirmed that consultation was in line with statute.

- (d) Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care) took this opportunity to respond to some of the points which had been raised in the deputation. It was prudent action for the Cabinet to ratify its previous decision for the reasons which had been outlined at the meeting and in the report being presented to Members. He noted the Blackpool illustration and reminded Members that they should only be considering Enfield factors. He reiterated the Council's commitment to work with landlord representatives on the implementation and operation of the scheme, as detailed in recommendation 2.4 of the report.

Members then considered the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.114) seeking ratification and/or review/approval of its earlier decision to implement additional licensing of houses in multiple occupation across the Borough.

Alternative Options Considered: None stated.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Ratify the decision to designate an additional licensing area of the district of the London Borough of Enfield as described and delineated on the map at Appendix 1 of the report.
2. Review and approve the proposed actions:
 - 2.1 Delegate authority to the relevant Directors to manage the introduction of the additional licensing scheme to come into force on 1 April 2015 with a team in place to process licenses from December 2014.
 - 2.2 Delegate authority to the relevant Directors to agree changes to the proposed implementation where necessary and ensure that all statutory notifications were carried out in the prescribed manner for those designations.
3. Consider and agree the proposed (annual) frequency of reviews within the five-year period for each designation, when the Cabinet would receive an update on progress and impact.
4. Reiterate the Council's commitment to work with landlord representatives on the implementation and operation of the scheme.

Reason: The detailed reasons for the recommendations were set out in full in section 6 of the report.

(Key decision – reference number U189/4026)

9

BURY STREET WEST - DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS FOR THE FORMER PARKS DEPOT SITE, N9 9LA

Councillor Taylor invited Mr John Jewson to present his deputation to the Cabinet.

Mr John Jewson, Vice Chair of FERAA, stated that he was representing the local community with regard to the proposed redevelopment of the Bury Street West Depot site and wanted to bring a number of concerns to Members' attention. His deputation included the following issues:

- Whilst the need for housing in the area was recognised it needed to blend in with the surrounding area. He was opposed to the overdevelopment of the site and highlighted the need for homes of sufficient size that residents would be proud of.
- The need for adequate parking provision for such a large development site was highlighted. It was already a busy area.
- The site was adjacent to Salisbury House, the Bowls Club and Bury Lodge Park. Edmonton School had also been expanded. There would be a need for effective traffic control in the area.
- The local community would have preferred to have seen the development of private housing which would attract high prices in the area. This revenue could then be used by the Council to build low cost rental accommodation elsewhere.
- A community hall would be welcomed.
- The need for easy access for emergency vehicles was stated.
- The increased pressure on local GP surgeries, schools and dentists was a matter of concern.
- Safety concerns were highlighted with regard to the proposed additional bridge over Salmons Brook.
- Reassurances were sought with regard to the future of the Bowls Club and the bungalow located at 294 Bury Street West.
- It was stated that it had previously been anticipated that extra ground would be provided to the park for recreational equipment for older children.
- Councillors were encouraged to visit the site before making any decisions.

Councillor Taylor thanked Mr Jewson for his deputation and invited Councillor Erin Celebi to present her deputation to the Cabinet.

Councillor Celebi supported the points raised by Mr Jewson and expressed her concerns over the proposed housing scheme. It was recognised that there was a housing shortage in the Borough. Councillor Celebi stated her view that 3/4/5 bedroom houses should be provided which could be used to release pressure on the provision of temporary accommodation in the Borough. It was

CABINET - 12.11.2014

suggested that the proposed scheme would be better suited to other sites in the Borough as it was out of character with the surrounding area. Concerns were reiterated over adequate parking facilities and the congestion in the area.

Councillor Celebi raised a number of further issues in her deputation including: Salisbury House was a listed building which needed to be protected and reassurances were sought on what measures the Council would be taking; pressures on the local infrastructure including GP surgeries and schools were highlighted; the future of the Bowls Club was questioned; the protection of wildlife around Salmons Brook was raised together with the safety concerns around the area; it was suggested that the site would be best suited to fewer properties of a larger size; Bury Lodge Park should continue to be used to provide recreational facilities for local residents.

Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Celebi for her deputation and invited questions from Cabinet Members.

Councillor Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance) assured those present that the Council made its decisions carefully following detailed discussions and numerous site visits by those concerned. The report being presented to Members today was the result of significant work to date. The proposed development was on contaminated land on the previous depot site. The Council would undertake the necessary decontamination work. Discussions had taken place with the Bowls Club and the Friends of Bury Street and studies had been undertaken on Salisbury House.

Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Development) drew Members' attention to paragraph 3.10 of the report regarding the Mayor's London Plan and Housing Strategy. A minimum target had been set by the Mayor for 7,976 new homes to be built between 2015 and 2025 in the London Borough of Enfield.

Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader) reported that he knew the site well and had been a regular visitor to Bury Lodge Park. He sought assurances from the officers concerned that the standards to be applied to the housing development were as required by the Mayor of London's development plan. The need for additional housing in the Borough was recognised. Whilst a significant amount of new housing was proposed for Meridian Water, the Borough still had additional housing requirements to meet. The Council would not wish to use the Bury Lodge site development for temporary accommodation housing, this would not be cost effective for the Council for reasons which he outlined at the meeting.

Councillor Ahmet Oyken (Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration) was encouraged by the interest of residents in the proposed scheme. Details of the scheme were yet to be drawn up. A number of the issues raised were items to be addressed as part of the planning processes. The Council would be working closely with the local community and consulting with residents. Councillor Oyken drew attention to the regeneration

CABINET - 12.11.2014

developments taking place in the Borough and the examples of consulting with residents and building stronger communities. The Council needed innovative ways of generating revenue income in supporting the provision of Council services and also meeting the need for the provision of affordable housing in the Borough. Many of the issues which had been raised would be considered further during the consultation process and development of the scheme.

Detlev Munster (Head of Property Programmes) confirmed that proposed housing would be compliant with the London Design Guide, the Council's policies and Lifetime Homes Standard.

Mr Jewson and Councillor Celebi were invited to make closing statements to the Cabinet Members. Mr Jewson reiterated the need to build housing that residents would want to live in and that would not cause social problems in the future. The housing should be of a high standard.

Councillor Taylor asked when it came to it whether Councillor Celebi was opposed to housing on the site and she stated she was.

Councillor Celebi stated that the housing should be in keeping with the local area, with no high rise flats and some private as well as rented housing. She reiterated her view that Bury Lodge Park should remain as a park and urged Members to consider alternative sites for housing development.

In conclusion Councillor Taylor summarised the issues which had been raised by the deputations and noted that a number of the concerns would be addressed further through the planning process. The report indicated that there was still a significant amount of work to be done on the development of the scheme. The points raised with regard to Salisbury House and the Bowls Club had been noted.

Members then considered the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.115) setting out development options for Bury Street West, the former parks depot site.

NOTED that Report No.116 also referred as detailed in Minute No.17 below.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED the alternative options that had been considered as set out in full in section 5 of the report. These had included alternative uses, layouts and delivery mechanisms. The alternative delivery mechanisms would be the subject of another report to Cabinet and that report would also outline the various legal forms the delivery mechanism could take (Section 5 of the report referred).

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL to approve a total budget of £33m as detailed within Report No.116 (as detailed in Minute No.17 below) and that this figure be included in the Capital Programme for the delivery of a proposed housing scheme at the Bury Street West Depot.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. Subject to full Council approving the addition of the budget for the project in the Capital Programme detailed above (recommendation 2.1 of the report), to approve the budget for Stages 1 and 2 of the project and, to approve the commencement of the procurement of consultants to prepare plans for the schemes as detailed within Report No.116 (detailed in Minute No.17 below), and to delegate approval for the appointment of consultants to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration in consultation with the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
2. To approve the details of the scheme and its expenditure within the approved total budget subject to a further report being submitted to Cabinet.
3. To delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration in consultation with the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to approve a mix of house types and tenure arrangements in advance of a planning application submission.
4. To delegate authority to the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and with the Assistant Director of Strategic Property Services to submit a planning application for the redevelopment of the site.
5. To approve the commencement for the procurement of a developer/contractor to take forward a scheme on receipt of planning permission and award of contract would be subject to further Cabinet approval.
6. To note that a further in depth report would be presented to Cabinet updating the progress to date with the preferred delivery option for the site that had been detailed for consideration within Report No.116 (Minute No. 17 below refers).

Reason: This was a rare opportunity for the Council to develop a large site within its own portfolio. It did come with the risks detailed within Report No.116 (Minute No.17 below); however the benefits to the Council would outweigh the associated risks and bring much needed revenue funding to the Council. The indicative scheme was considered to be viable and the best fit given the site's current environmental and policy constraints. The development would deliver a key proportion of affordable housing that was in high demand within the Borough, in particular key worker and shared ownership properties. The site would deliver key environmental enhancements and produce a sustainable exemplar Council development.

(Key decision – reference number 3959)

10

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

There were no issues arising from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration at this meeting.

11

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

NOTED the provisional list of items scheduled for future Cabinet meetings.

12

MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 22 October 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

13

MINUTES OF LOCAL PLAN CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 15 OCTOBER 2014

NOTED the minutes of the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee held on 15 October 2014.

14

ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

NOTED that there were no written updates to be received at this meeting.

15

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that the next meeting of Cabinet was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 10 December 2014 at 8.15pm.

Councillor Taylor gave his apologies for lateness for this meeting.

16

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed on part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of confidential information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access for Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

17

BURY STREET WEST - DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS FOR THE FORMER PARKS DEPOT SITE, N9 9LA

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.116).

NOTED

1. That Report No.115 also referred as detailed in Minute No.9 above.
2. That the principles and merits of the proposed scheme had been discussed in full as detailed in Minute No.9 above.
3. That the capital funding was subject to the approval of full Council.
4. That there was a typographical error in the report on the numbering of the recommendations. The decisions below set out the recommendations presented for agreement of the report.
5. That decision 2 below was an “in principle” decision.
6. The financial information set out within the report.

Alternative Options Considered: As set out in Report No.115, Minute No.9 above, and the details set out in section 5 of this report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. That subject to full Council approving the addition of the budget for the project in the capital programme in recommendation 2.1 of the part one report (No.115, detailed in Minute 9 above), to approve an initial budget of the sum detailed in recommendation 2.1 of this report (which was a part of the £33m project cost), and to authorise the project to proceed and that further expenditure of the remaining project budget would be subject to a further report to Cabinet.
2. To approve in principle the acquisition of the property detailed in recommendation 2.3 of the report, if agreed with the owners, and to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Finance with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to negotiate and agree the Heads of Terms for the acquisition.
3. To note that the initial budget would be used to appoint consultants to assist in preparing scheme designs, feasibility studies, other investigations, site preparation and public consultation to support the preparation and submission of a planning application and appropriate

CABINET - 12.11.2014

documents to assist in the procurement of a developer/contractor and for land assembly purposes if required.

4. To note that the recommendations detailed in Report No.115 also referred (Minute No.9 above referred).

Reason: As set out in Report No.115, Minute No.9 above.
(Key decision – reference number 3959)