

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 25 MARCH 2015

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT

Ali Bakir (Mayor), Patricia Ekechi (Deputy Mayor), Abdul Abdullahi, Daniel Anderson, Dinah Barry, Chris Bond, Yasemin Brett, Alev Cazimoglu, Erin Celebi, Bambos Charalambous, Jason Charalambous, Lee David-Sanders, Dogan Delman, Nick Dines, Guney Dogan, Christiana During, Nesimi Erbil, Turgut Esendagli, Peter Fallart, Krystle Fonyonga, Achilleas Georgiou, Alessandro Georgiou, Ahmet Hasan, Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward, Jansev Jemal, Doris Jiagge, Eric Jukes, Nneka Keazor, Adeline Kepez, Joanne Laban, Bernie Lappage, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Derek Levy, Mary Maguire, Donald McGowan, Andy Milne, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Ahmet Oykenner, Anne-Marie Pearce, Daniel Pearce, Vicki Pite, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Toby Simon, Alan Sitkin, Edward Smith, Andrew Stafford, Claire Stewart, Jim Steven, Doug Taylor, Haydar Ulus, Ozzie Uzoanya, Glynis Vince and Lee Chamberlain

ABSENT

Katherine Chibah, Sarah Doyle, Christine Hamilton, Ertan Hurer, Suna Hurman and Rohini Simbodyal

160

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

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

161

MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING

Rabi Levy from Palmers Green and Southgate Synagogue gave the blessing.

162

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

The Mayor made the following announcements:

(a) Review of Mayoral Year in Office

As this was the final ordinary meeting of Council prior to the Annual Council Meeting, the Mayor provided a brief review of his year in office. He highlighted how much he had enjoyed carrying out his duties in every corner of the borough as well as events outside Enfield. Being first citizen of the borough had been an honour and he thanked Council for nominating and supporting him throughout the year.

He could not estimate how many events he had attended but pointed out that he had been very busy, as had Councillor Ekechi in support as Deputy Mayor. He thanked her for attending the functions he had been unable to.

He had enjoyed meeting a wide variety of people, young and old along with many different voluntary and community groups who did so much good work for the people of Enfield.

He advised it was not possible to pick out a single highlight, as there had been so many, but had particularly enjoyed visiting many junior and secondary schools and welcoming lots of children into the Council Chamber for various debates and visits.

Finally he took the opportunity to thank officers for their support over the year with special mention of Melanie Harris, Peter Stanyon, Lisa McEwan, Alison Brookes, Norman, Andy and Mark, as well as John Austin, Asmat Hussain and James Kinsella for their help on Council itself.

(b) Local Government Chronicle Award for Community Involvement.

The Mayor advised that earlier in the month Enfield had won the top accolade for Community Involvement at the prestigious Local Government Chronicle awards.

The work recognised innovation in partnership working with projects that directly sought out and involved the active participation of customers and service users to drive quality improvements. Four service areas had been highlighted in the award.

- Adults: Quality Checkers – users, family and friends acting as critical friends to enable service improvement.
- Schools and Children's Services: (a) Youth Engagement Panel – A partnership programme with the police to develop a Youth Engagement Panel that worked to move young people from a position of disaffection to one of active involvement, social responsibility and achievement; (b) Young Inspectors – youth service participants as inspectors of provision, undertaking training alongside professionals and raising standards in youth based centres across the council; and (c) Parent Engagement Panel – the development of a network of peer support panels serving parents across the whole borough, preventing isolation and enabling greater participation in community based activities and services.

The Mayor informed Members that in each case these initiatives had facilitated the development of a skilled, aspirational, confident, resilient and self-supporting community. Participants had developed a greater understanding of what the council did, how it worked and how they could play a part in service improvement. This had enabled the creation of opportunities

for work, enterprise, education and training and a community who were knowledgeable about and an asset to Enfield.

The Mayor presented the award to Eve Stickler (Assistant Director Commissioning and Community Engagement – Schools and Children's Services) who had led the Council's bid submission.

(c) Enfield Public Safety Centre Awards

The Mayor advised he was also pleased to announce that the Enfield Public Safety Centre had been nominated for 7 awards from the Metropolitan Police and that Alan Gardner, who managed the CCTV function with Community Safety had received individual recognition as the CCTV Manager of the Year.

Other operators were awarded for their efforts in capturing suspected and known criminals, which had helped to make Enfield a safer place.

Amongst the incidents for which Enfield received recognition were those that led to the arrest of a wanted prisoner, suspects for attempted murder and kidnapping and safe recovery of over £30,000 worth of stolen vehicles.

The first ever ceremony of awards by the Metropolitan Police Service had been held at New Scotland Yard on 20 March 2015 and the winning of these awards was seen as recognition of the quality of CCTV services in Enfield, and was also felt to demonstrate the hard work and dedication of staff in reducing crime, and improving safety in Enfield.

The Mayor presented the award to Alan Gardner, in recognition of his work and those of the other CCTV monitoring staff.

(d) 50th Anniversary of the London Boroughs

The Mayor reminded members that 2015 was the 50th anniversary of the creation of the London Boroughs in their current form which meant in effect that Enfield as a borough would be 50 years old. He advised Members of the plans being developed for a programme of LBE50 activities running throughout the year, which would begin with the unveiling of a commemorative plaque donated by London Councils outside the Civic Centre on Monday 30 March 2015 at 10.30am. Members were invited to attend the ceremony.

(e) Mayor's Charity Ball

Finally the Mayor reminded members of his forthcoming charity ball which was to take place on Saturday 18 April at La Royale. Tickets were £50 each, with the money raised being used to support children with learning difficulties. He encouraged all members to attend.

Before moving on, Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council, took the opportunity to thank Councillor Bakir, as Mayor, on behalf of the Council,

acknowledging the hard work that accompanied the role and thanking him for his efforts over the year. As this was his final business meeting of Council as Mayor he wished him a successful continuation in his role as an elected member for the remainder of his term of office.

Councillor Neville, Leader of the Opposition, endorsed Councillor Taylor's comments, thanking the Mayor and highlighting the fairness with which he had chaired meetings of the Council. He also wished him a successful remainder of his term as Mayor in the run up to the Annual Council Meeting.

**163
MINUTES**

AGREED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 25 February 2015 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**164
APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Katherine Chibah, Sarah Doyle, Christine Hamilton, Ertan Hurer, Suna Hurman and Rohini Simbodyal.

**165
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

The Mayor invited John Austin (Assistant Director Governance Projects) to make a short statement relating to the declaration of interests in respect of Agenda Item 7: Opposition Business – The cost of temporary accommodation and what can be done about it:

Members were advised that notice had been received by the Monitoring Officer, signed by the Leaders of both Groups, requesting that a dispensation be granted enabling all members to participate in the debate and decision on this item at the Council meeting. The request had been made in view of the number of members who would otherwise be prevented from participating in the debate due to them needing to declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, on the grounds this was likely to (a) impede the transaction of business; and (b) so upset the representation of different political groups on Council as to alter the outcome of any vote. Having considered the request the Monitoring Officer had agreed to grant the dispensation which it was noted would only apply for this meeting.

The following interest were declared in relation to other items on the agenda:

Agenda Item 8: Update on the Strategy for the Provision of Secondary School Places

- Councillor Laban declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as a close family member was employed as a headteacher of a Secondary School operating within the Borough.

Agenda Item 10: Establishing a Local Pensions Board

- Councillor Maguire declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as a full time employee of UNISON;
- Councillor Stewart declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest given the interest declared by Councillor Maguire as a “close family member”.

166

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Before moving the first item listed on the main Council agenda, the Mayor advised Members that he had agreed to the inclusion of two urgent items for consideration at the meeting. He then invited John Austin (Assistant Director Governance Projects) to make a brief statement advising how it was intended to deal with both items.

John Austin referred members to the Supplementary Council Agenda, which contained a report from the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services (No.213) detailing two petitions, which although still subject to final verification, appeared to contain the required number of signatures for debate at Council. The required figure was 3124 (1% of the assessed population based on the 2011 census population).

Members were advised that the first petition related to the site of the Green Dragon Public House and the second to the former Middlesex University site in Trent Park. It was confirmed that the Mayor had agreed to deal with both petitions as urgent items (pursuant to Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended) on the grounds that they had firstly been received after the dispatch of the main Council agenda and secondly as both petitions concerned live applications under the Assets of Community Value nomination process and could not therefore await consideration at the next ordinary business meeting in July 2015.

In addition, members were advised that the main Council agenda included a motion (Agenda Item 14.4) submitted in the name of Councillor J.Charalambous which also directly related to the petition on the former Middlesex University site in Trent Park.

Council was informed that the Leaders of both Groups had therefore agreed to recommend a change in the order of the agenda (under paragraph 2.2 (page 4-6) of the Council Procedure Rules) in order to enable both petitions to be considered as follows:

- Firstly to receive and consider the petition on the Green Dragon Public House, in accordance with the Council’s Petition Procedure. Under the procedure the lead petitioner (Mike McLean) would have 5 minutes to

address Council. This would be followed by a 15 minute period for debate by Council, prior to Members being asked to consider the recommendations in the report circulated with the Supplementary Agenda.

- Having dealt with the petition on the Green Dragon Public House, Council would then move on to consider the petition relating to the former Middlesex University site in Trent Park as part of the motion submitted on the same issue with Councillor J.Charalambous (as lead petitioner) having agreed to combine both items. The normal rules of debate in relation to motions would apply for this item.

The change in the order of agenda (as set out above) was agreed unanimously without a vote with the minutes reflecting the order in which the items were dealt with at the meeting.

167

PETITIONS - SAVE THE GREEN DRAGON PUBLIC HOUSE & SAVE TRENT PARK

Councillor Taylor moved and Councillor Stewart seconded the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.213) circulated as a Supplementary Council agenda which detailed two petitions being submitted for consideration by Council as urgent items, under the Petitions Procedure.

The Petitions were dealt with in the following order:

1.1 Petition: Green Dragon Public House

NOTED

1. The background and history of the site on which the Green Dragon Public House had been located.
2. The current use of the building on the site as a discount retail store, which had been converted from the public house under Permitted Development Rights.
3. The Assets of Community Value nomination process, which Members were informed the property was now subject to following an application submitted on 6 March 2015. The nomination process was governed by set criteria, which included as one element an assessment regarding the strength of local community feeling. The nomination would be considered by an Evaluation Panel made up of officers with relevant knowledge and professional skills and it was therefore felt reasonable for the petition to be referred on to the Panel for consideration as part of that process.
4. In terms of any further action in relation to the petition, it was not felt appropriate (whilst the application was subject to the live nomination

procedure) for the Council to agree anything further outside of that procedure. Should the property be successful in its nomination as an Asset of Community Value it would lead to a moratorium, in respect of any future disposal of the asset.

The Mayor then invited Mike McLean (as lead petitioner) to address the meeting, who highlighted the following issues:

- The petition contained approximately 4,200 signatures which had been gathered in support of protecting the site from redevelopment and its continued use as a public house.
- The long history of the site in terms of its use as a public house and its iconic status as a building at the centre of the local community.
- Although business had declined in recent years it was felt that its use as a public house could generate significant interest, under the right style of management given its location at the heart of the community and good transport links.
- Members of the local community had been disappointed at what they felt to have been the secretive nature of the sale of the site to the current owner, with other companies who specialised in the pub sector having since expressed potential interest in continuing to run the property as a public house.
- Concerns were expressed at the current viability of the property in terms of its use as a “pop up” discount retail store and impact this may have on any future development or use.
- The need to recognise the local community value of the premises and to support, in any way possible, the aims of the petition in safeguarding and protecting its future use as a public house and preventing any other form of development on the site.

The Mayor thanked Mr McLean for his presentation, which was then subject to a short debate. Issues highlighted during the debate included:

- (a) the rich heritage and iconic landmark status of the premises and site within Winchmore Hill.
- (b) whilst previously a popular destination the need was recognised, given its recent decline, to demonstrate sufficient demand for the premises to remain as a public house and viable business which supporters of the petition felt was possible given the right investment, product and management.
- (c) the importance in maintaining community hubs as a place where the local community could congregate and serve as a focus for the local neighbourhood

Following this debate members were asked to consider the recommendations in the report and what action they wished to take in response to the petition, with the following actions agreed unanimously, without a vote.

AGREED

- (1) To note and acknowledge the importance of the issue and strength of community feeling on the issue, highlighted within the Petition.
- (2) To note that the property was subject to a live application under the Asset of Community Value procedure and to refer the petition to the Asset of Community Value Nomination Panel for consideration under that process.

1.2 Petition & Motion re Former Middlesex University site in Trent Park

Councillor J.Charalambous moved and Councillor Neville seconded the following motion, which was also considered alongside the petition submitted on the same matter:

“In light of uncertainty over the future ownership of the former Middlesex University campus in Trent Country Park and overwhelming public support for the Save Trent Park Campaign, Enfield Council will take immediate steps to fulfil the requirements of the petition set up by the campaign group , which currently has over 3500 signatures – namely to grant the former Middlesex University campus the status of an Asset of Community Value (as per the application submitted by the Friends of Trent Country Park and Christ Church Cockfosters); amend planning rules to grant permanent public access across the grounds (as enjoyed for decades during Middlesex University’s ownership); actively encourage a long term public use for the listed mansion and grounds which will also promote the important role the Estate played in World War II; and re-evaluate the management and strategic vision of Trent Country Park as a whole.”

In jointly presenting the motion and petition, Councillor J.Charalambous highlighted the following issues, as lead petitioner:

- The historic significance of the mansion and grounds, which it was felt were now at risk.
- The need to safeguard and preserve the mansion and grounds long term future, which had also now been identified as a high national priority by English Heritage.
- The cross party support expressed in relation to consideration of the Save Trent Park petition.
- The opportunity identified by the Save Trent Park campaign for the Council to assist in protecting what was regarded as a valuable asset by

supporting the actions identified in both the petition and motion and in supporting the future long term public use of the site. It was felt these actions would also assist in the process of attracting a suitable owner for the site who would work to maintain the property whilst also ensuring public access.

Following presentation of the petition and the motion being moved and seconded Councillor Taylor then moved and Councillor Neville seconded the following amendment to the original motion:

To delete the wording of the original motion and replace with the following:

“Council notes the petition presented to Council on behalf of the Save Trent Park Campaign on Wednesday 25th March containing over 3700 signatures from members of the public.

It highlights concerns over the current state of the heritage assets of the former Middlesex University campus in Trent Country Park, uncertainty over their current and future ownership and requirements for their public use and management.

Council further notes the requests contained in the petition:

- (i) To grant the former Middlesex University campus site the status of an Asset of Community Value (as per the submitted application which is currently being considered by the Council's Nomination Panel against the published ACV Evaluation Criteria).
- (ii) To grant permanent public access across the grounds.
- (iii) The request to actively encourage a long term public use for the listed mansion and grounds
- (iv) The request for a re-evaluation of the management and strategic vision of Trent park on a whole

Council will:

- (1) look for a positive future for the heritage assets at the site that will protect and promote their historic value and involve Members in the decision making process where possible.
- (2) establish a Working Group with equal representation from both political parties to consider how best to secure the long term public use and maintenance of the listed mansion and grounds.”

In moving the amendment and responding to the petition Councillor Taylor highlighted the following issues:

- The Assets of Community Value nomination process, which Members were informed the property was now subject to following an application submitted earlier in March 2015. The nomination process was governed by set criteria, which included as one element an assessment regarding the strength of local community feeling. The nomination would be considered by an Evaluation Panel and it was therefore felt reasonable for the petition to be referred on to the Panel for consideration as part of that process. It would not be possible for Council to predetermine any decision under the Assets of Community Value procedure.
- The need to recognise that the granting of unfettered public access could also work against the identification of any potential new owner for the site in terms of future use.
- The need to recognise that the Council would not be in a position to financially support any acquisition of the site. He was however keen for the Council to assist in looking to secure, working on a bi-partisan basis across both political groups, a positive solution that would not only secure, protect and promote the long term future for the heritage assets on the site but also their public use and ongoing maintenance.

The comments and approach outlined by the Leader of the Council were supported by Councillor Neville who also highlighted:

- The cross party support for the amended motion and difficulty recognised in having to deal with heritage assets.
- The need, whilst recognising the financial constraints on the Council, to ensure that its responsibilities in relation to safeguarding of the building and enforcement activity were fully applied.
- The opportunity available to harness and bring together support in order to find a viable solution that would protect and safeguard the future long term public use of the assets.

Following a debate the amendment to the motion was agreed unanimously, without a vote.

The substantive motion (as amended) was then put to the vote with members also asked to consider any further action they wished to take in response to the petition. The substantive motion was agreed unanimously, without a vote along with the following additional recommendations in relation to the petition:

AGREED

- (1) To note and acknowledge the importance of the issue and strength of community feeling on the issue, highlighted within the Petition.
- (2) To note that the property was subject to a live application under the Asset of Community Value process and to refer the petition to the Asset

of Community Value Nomination Panel for consideration under that procedure.

168

OPPOSITION BUSINESS - THE COST OF TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

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

1. The opportunity was being taken to raise housing as an area for debate in view of the spiralling cost of Temporary Accommodation and action being taken to address this issue both in terms of managing supply and reducing the overall level of demand.
2. The complexity of the issues to be addressed were recognised, with the paper looking to highlight the work also being undertaken by officers and members involved in the review currently being undertaken by the Temporary Accommodation Scrutiny Work Stream who had been looking at what could be done to resolve the issues around the rising level of need for temporary accommodation in Enfield.
3. The cost of providing temporary accommodation for households accepted as homeless was now the single largest cost pressure facing the Council over the next financial year, with the cost pressure identified for 2015/16 identified as £7.7m.
4. Whilst the obvious solution would be to provide more affordable homes the measures in place to increase housing supply were expensive and would also take time to deliver. The Opposition Group were also not supportive of the approach being taken under the Housing Gateway initiative given the impact on the local housing market. The paper had not, however, focussed on these measures as the need to build more housing was accepted between political parties at both a local and national level. In addition the paper had not focussed on the impact of "Right to Buy" as an issue, given this was current Government policy that the Council had little, if any influence over. Another major issue highlighted related to population increase and migration, although again it was accepted this was something beyond the immediate control of the Council.
5. The Opposition Group had identified a number of more locally focussed measures which they felt would assist in addressing the current position and managing the overall cost of temporary accommodation. These related to the following areas (as detailed within the Opposition Business Paper):
 - a. acting to reduce the number of households accepted as homeless by tightening the burden of proof in relation to the criteria laid down in government guidelines;

- b. providing greater financial and more targeted incentives to private landlords; and
- c. increasing the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation being placed in accommodation outside of the Borough. This would need to be based on a targeted approach which recognised the associated legal issues but it was felt could be achieved with the necessary political will by the Majority Group. It was pointed out that more homeless households were placed in Enfield by other Councils than any other London Borough last year, with the exception of Lewisham and Croydon.

Whilst recognising that the issue was complex with no simple solutions and was not something for which the Council was entirely responsible, Councillor Smith concluded by highlighting the need for difficult decisions to have to be made and implemented in order to address the situation and urged the Administration to seriously consider the measures identified within the Opposition Business Paper.

Councillor Oyken, Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration, responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

1. that whilst pleased to focus on housing as an issue, he was concerned about the use of evidence and data provided in relation to an ongoing scrutiny review being used as the basis for the Opposition Business Paper. He felt this could be seen to undermine the scrutiny process and potentially impact on the consensual way in which the Temporary Accommodation work stream review had been undertaken to date.
2. the need to recognise the impact of the current coalition government's housing and welfare reform policies, especially in relation to "Right to Buy" and the increase in discount, which since 2012 had led to the sale of 320 properties in Enfield.
3. Due to the complexities of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) formula it would be virtually impossible to replace units lost under Right To Buy with new stock on a one to one basis. A recent nationwide study, carried out by Shelter, found that a Council would have to sell eight properties under the current HRA formula in order to replace one.
4. The restrictions currently placed on HRA borrowing limits had also limited the ability for local authorities to be able to build new stock.
5. The pressure on temporary accommodation was fully recognised, but some of the information referred to in the opposition business paper was incorrect e.g. figure quoted on the cost pressure and housing subsidy. Not to do anything about housing would present a risk to the Council and the Administration was working hard to increase the supply of housing

using initiatives such as the Housing Gateway and small housing sites schemes.

6. The Council had written to Ian Duncan Smith (Secretary of State for Work and Pensions) and Brandon Lewis (Minister of State for Housing and Planning) about the cost pressures faced by the Council as well as the impact of cuts to the Discretionary Housing Payment. The response from ministers had been disappointing, only stating that they would continue to monitor the situation.
7. The efforts being made by the Council to manage the pressure in relation to the placing of households in temporary accommodation
8. The need for the opposition to respect the scrutiny process. As Cabinet Member for Housing he had sought to involve the opposition lead on Housing in consultation around policy development, such as on the Housing Allocation Policy. He was happy to attend scrutiny work stream sessions to provide information on the Administration's approach towards tackling the issue of temporary accommodation and called upon the opposition to work with the current Administration in order to look for positive ways in which the problem could be tackled.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- (a) The need highlighted by members of the Opposition Group:
 - to recognise that the information from the scrutiny review used to inform the opposition business paper had been provided in an open public meeting and was therefore within the public domain. The criticism in relation to an undermining of the scrutiny process was not therefore accepted.
 - to carefully consider the recent history in relation to housing policy, which had not seen the "Right to Buy" legislation repealed by the previous Labour Government and the smallest number of houses built (according the Office for National Statistics) during the same period since the 1920's.
 - to recognise that the current housing shortage had been created not only as a result of the limited building programme under the previous Labour Government but also as a result of what was regarded as a failure to secure transitional arrangements and properly plan for the expansion of the European Union and associated levels of migration experienced as a result.
 - to challenge the limited progress being made on delivery of the housing development at Meridian Water and failure of the Council to secure 2nd tranche Housing Zone status for the development.

COUNCIL - 25.3.2015

- to look for ways to increase the level of affordable housing at the same time as looking for more targeted approach in terms of the provision of financial incentives to landlords as a means of securing rented accommodation and preventing evictions. Enfield currently paid landlords at Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rent levels but support was expressed for the proposal within the opposition business paper to consider offering higher rents than LHA in return for longer term security of tenure and lower turnover.
 - for the Council, given the increase in the number of households being accepted as homeless within the Borough, to adopt a more sceptical and rigorous approach towards assessing applicants. Support was expressed for more focus on the burden of proof under homelessness guidelines to be placed on the claimant rather than on the Council.
 - for serious consideration to be given to the proposal that the Council should seek to significantly increase the number of households in more expensive temporary accommodation placed in permanent accommodation out of the borough where the difference between rental costs and the LHA was lower than Enfield. It was recognised this would need to be in accordance with DCLG guidance and in suitable locations to avoid disrupting employment, caring responsibilities and children's education but a number of potential areas had been identified outside of the M25, which the opposition felt needed to be seriously considered.
- (b) the need identified by members of the Majority Group:
- to recognise the decrease in value of housing investment in relation to building over the past 30 years.
 - to highlight what was felt by the Majority Group to be the main cause of the current housing problems which was the government's programme of welfare reform and unintended consequence of the benefits cap.
 - To highlight what was felt to be the flawed nature of the opposition business paper in terms of not seeking to address the main causes of the current housing problem and only the symptoms.
 - To recognise that the opposition's proposal in relation to increasing the burden of proof on households presenting themselves as homeless was illegal under current legislation and homelessness guidance. It was also felt that the proposal to incentivise landlords was also flawed and would only serve to further distort the private rented sector housing market.
 - To avoid stigmatising or blaming those homeless households currently placed in temporary accommodation for the situation in

which they found themselves or to blame this entirely on the issue of migration. Often these were the poorest and most vulnerable households and the placing of those in temporary accommodation out of borough was something that required careful and sensitive approach.

- For a more rounded approach towards addressing not only the symptoms but also the causes of the current housing situation and for this to be focussed on the review currently being undertaken by the Temporary Accommodation scrutiny work stream rather than subject to political debate.

Councillor Smith summed up, on behalf of the Opposition Group, by highlighting that it had not been his intention in preparing the paper to disrespect scrutiny or the work of the Temporary Accommodation scrutiny work stream. His aim had been to raise the profile of what he felt to be an important subject, and not to make political points. He did not personally agree with every aspect of the government's current housing policy and welcomed the approach agreed by Cabinet in March relating to the Right to Buy One for One Replacement Scheme. The intention was not to stigmatise the poor but to look for solutions that would help to address a complex and difficult situation, which it was felt the recommendations in the report would all assist in doing.

In response, Councillor Taylor (Leader of the Council) highlighted the progress being made by the current Administration in seeking to increase the level of housing supply within the Borough. It was felt that the way households presenting as homeless were managed was proportional and fair and the proposals within the opposition business paper in this respect were felt to be unlawful, unworkable and also undesirable and were not something the Majority Group could support. In terms of the other proposals, it was felt these could best be considered as part of the ongoing review being undertaken by the Temporary Accommodation scrutiny work stream, which would be able to apply the necessary rigour and challenge to their consideration. For these reasons the recommendations in the Opposition Business paper were not supported.

As an outcome of the debate the Leader of the Opposition requested that a vote to be taken on the following recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper:

- (1) That the Council reduce the number of households being accepted as homeless by placing the burden of proof on claimants to demonstrate that they meet the tests laid down in Government guidelines.
- (2) That the Council incentivise private landlords to let to Enfield Council at rents that more closely reflect market levels in order to reduce the use of more expensive emergency accommodation.

COUNCIL - 25.3.2015

- (3) That the Council take steps to move significant numbers of households currently in emergency accommodation to cheaper areas outside the M25.

The above recommendations were put to the vote and not approved. In accordance with section 15.4 of the Council Procedure Rules the Opposition Group requested a roll call vote, with the result as follows:

For: 21

Councillor Erin Celebi
Councillor Lee Chamberlain
Councillor Jason Charalambous
Councillor Lee David-Saunders
Councillor Don Delman
Councillor Nick Dines
Councillor Peter Fallart
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou
Councillor Elaine Hayward
Councillor Robert Hayward
Councillor Eric Jukes
Councillor Joanne Laban
Councillor Michael Lavender
Councillor Andy Milne
Councillor Terry Neville
Councillor Anne Marie Pearce
Councillor Daniel Pearce
Councillor Michael Rye
Councillor Edward Smith
Councillor Jim Steven
Councillor Glynis Vince

Against: 35

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi
Councillor Daniel Anderson
Councillor Dinah Barry
Councillor Chris Bond
Councillor Yasemin Brett
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu
Councillor Bambos Charalambous
Councillor Gurney Dogan
Councillor Christiana During
Councillor Pat Ekechi
Councillor Nesimi Erbil
Councillor Turgut Esengali
Councillor Krystal Fonyonga
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou
Councillor Ahmet Hassan
Councillor Jansev Jemal

Councillor Doris Jiagge
Councillor Nneka Keazor
Councillor Adeline Kepez
Councillor Bernie Lappage
Councillor Dino Lemonides
Councillor Derek Levy
Councillor Mary Maguire
Councillor Don McGowan
Councillor Ayfer Orhan
Councillor Ahmet Oykenen
Councillor Vicki Pite
Councillor George Savva
Councillor Toby Simon
Councillor Alan Sitkin
Councillor Andrew Stafford
Councillor Claire Stewart
Councillor Doug Taylor
Councillor Haydar Ulus
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya

Abstentions: 0

169

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Following on from Opposition Business, Councillor Stewart moved and Councillor Taylor seconded a proposal to move the order of the items on the agenda under paragraph 2.2 (page 4-6) of the Council Procedure Rules to enable the meeting to consider the following as the next items of business:

- Emergency Motion: – in the name of Councillor Orhan
- Motion 14:5: Motion -in the name of Councillor Stewart

The change in the order of the agenda was agreed, after a vote with the following result:

For: 30

Against: 21

Before considering either of the above items, Councillor Lavender then moved and Councillor Rye seconded a further change in the order of business in order to enable Agenda Item 9: Child Sexual Exploitation Task Group – Terms of Reference and Operational Arrangements to be considered in advance of the above motions.

This further change in the order of agenda was put the vote and not agreed, with the following result:

For: 21

Against: 30

Please note the minutes reflect the order in which the agenda items were dealt with at the meeting.

170

EMERGENCY MOTION

The Mayor advised that he agreed to accept the following item as an emergency motion, with copies tabled for members at the meeting. This had been on the basis of the reasons for urgency provided in advance of the meeting.

Having welcomed the Mayor's decision, Councillor Orhan moved and Councillor Neville seconded the following motion:

"This Council calls for cross party support of the 20 March 2015 online petition by Londra Gazette against the short sighted decision announced by the Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Exam Board (OCR) to drop the Turkish Language 'A' Level examination, particularly as there is strong evidence that the participation of students sitting the Turkish Language exams are higher than for German or Spanish which will not be discontinued.

Given that Turkish is one of the most spoken languages in Enfield, this Council calls on Nicky Morgan, the Education Secretary, to apply pressure on OCR to reverse the decision to scrap 'A' Level Turkish Language."

Cross party support was expressed for the motion although as a result of the debate, Councillor J. Charalambous moved and Councillor Neville seconded as an amendment the inclusion of the following additional wording at the end of the motion:

"and also calls for pressure to be applied into reversing the decision to scrap other language subjects that have been dropped."

The amendment, as set out above was agreed without a vote, and the substantive motion (as amended and set out below) was then agreed unanimously without a vote:

"This Council calls for cross party support of the 20 March 2015 online petition by Londra Gazette against the short sighted decision announced by the Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Exam Board (OCR) to drop the Turkish Language 'A' Level examination, particularly as there is strong evidence that the participation of students sitting the Turkish Language exams are higher than for German or Spanish which will not be discontinued.

Given that Turkish is one of the most spoken languages in Enfield, this Council calls on Nicky Morgan, the Education Secretary, to apply pressure on OCR to reverse the decision to scrap 'A' Level Turkish Language and also

calls for pressure to be applied into reversing the decision to scrap other language subjects that have been dropped.”

171

MOTION

Councillor Stewart moved and Councillor Jagge seconded the following motion:

“This Council believes that, since the General Election in 2010, the current Government has presided over one of the most devastating attacks on our society. Our communities in Enfield have felt the effect of the Conservative led coalition government’s destructive policies and ideology to shrink the state and rely on market forces. We now live in a borough that has over 1,000 claimants affected by the bedroom tax, two food banks operating in the borough to feed the rising number of hungry families, and an increase in homelessness. These are just some of the indicators of a failed Government. Enfield Council has been left to pick up the pieces, while facing increasing financial pressures imposed by Central Government.

This Council calls upon the next Government elected on 7 May 2015 to put an end to this callous way of governing and to take responsibility for supporting the vulnerable and the rebuilding our society.”

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

For: 32

Against: 21

Abstentions: 0

172

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Councillor Stewart then moved and Councillor Rye seconded a further proposal to change the order of business on the agenda under paragraph 2.2 (page 4-6) of the Council Procedure Rules to enable the meeting to take the following as the next item of business:

Item 9 Child Sexual Exploitation Task Group – Terms of Reference and Operational Arrangements.

The change in the order of the agenda was agreed, without a vote.

Please note the minutes reflect the order in which the agenda items were dealt with at the meeting.

173

**CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION TASK GROUP - TERMS OF REFERENCE
& OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS & DURATION OF COUNCIL
MEETING**

Councillor Orhan moved and Councillor Abdullahi seconded the report from the Director of Schools and Children's Services (No. 206) setting out the proposed Terms of Reference and operating arrangements for the Child Sexual Exploitation Task Group, established by Council on 25 February 2015.

NOTED

1. That in establishing the Task Group, Council had requested that a further report be submitted, setting out the detailed Terms of Reference and operational arrangements for the group, following initial consideration by members of the Task Group.
2. The innovative and trailblazing nature of the Task Group in terms of Enfield's approach towards strengthening the governance arrangements and political oversight around the safeguarding of vulnerable children and young people.
3. The Terms of Reference proposed for the Task Group, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report, which had been subject to consultation with members of the Task Group.
4. Membership would consist of non-Executive Members with the Task Group required to report to full Council twice a year.
5. The cross party support for the establishment of the Task Group and its role, as set out within the proposed Terms of Reference, including the need identified to undertake a review of relevant legislation.
6. The need identified to ensure, in terms of maintaining political proportionality on the Task Group, that reference to its membership avoided mention of specific political groups and was instead based on members from the Majority and Opposition Group.
6. Whilst supportive of the proposed remit of the Task Group, the need was also recognised to avoid any complacency in terms of the approach adopted towards investigating and tackling concerns raised in relation to the safeguarding of vulnerable children and young people within the Borough. An assurance was provided by the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection that all concerns raised were taken seriously and subject to robust investigation procedures.

There then followed a short debate on the report. Given the time available before the meeting was due to end and number of members who had indicated they still wished to speak Councillor Taylor moved and Councillor Stewart seconded a procedural motion during the debate under Council

Procedure Rule 11 (m) to extend the meeting for an additional period of 15 minutes. This was agreed unanimously without a vote.

The recommendations in the report were then put to the vote and agreed unanimously without a vote.

AGREED to approve the Terms of Reference for the Task Group, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report subject to its composition being amended to read 4 members of the Majority Group and 2 members of the Opposition Group.

174

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.

175

UPDATE ON THE STRATEGY FOR THE PROVISION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PLACES

RECEIVED a report from the Director of Schools and Children's Services (No: 205) providing an update on the strategy for the provision of secondary school places across the borough.

NOTED that the update was requested by Council (8 October 2014) as one of the outcomes of the debate on the strategy and approach towards the delivery of school places in Enfield, with agreement that the update be provided before the end of the current Municipal year.

AGREED to note the report provided.

The Leader of the Opposition asked for his Groups concern to be noted that it had not been possible to debate the report at the meeting.

Councillor Laban declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item. As the matter was dealt with under the guillotine procedure she did not withdraw from the meeting but took no part in the decision made on the report.

176

ESTABLISHING A LOCAL PENSIONS BOARD

RECEIVED a report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No: 207) regarding the introduction of a new pension governance structure, for implementation with effect from 1 April 2015.

NOTED that the report had been considered and recommended on to Council by the Members and Democratic Services Group on 18 February 2015, in order to approve the changes required to the Constitution,.

AGREED to approve the establishment of the Pension Board and Pension Policy and Investment Committee with the terms of reference as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report and to amend the Council's Constitution accordingly.

The Leader of the Opposition asked for all members of the Opposition Group present at the meeting to be recorded as voting against the above decision, given concerns relating to the composition of the Local Pension Board.

Councillors Maguire and Stewart declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item. As the matter was dealt with under the guillotine procedure they did not withdraw from the meeting but took no part in the decision made on the report.

177

**REFERENCES FROM MEMBERS & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES GROUP:
(A) AMENDMENT TO THE POLICY ON FILMING AT MEETINGS; (B)
ADOPTION OF A PROTOCOL OF MEMBER APPOINTMENT PANELS AND
UPDATE TO APPOINTMENT PANEL TERMS OF REFERENCE AND
PROCEDURE RULES**

RECEIVED a report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No: 208) seeking approval to:

- a. amend the Council's policy on filming at meetings; and
- b. adopt a protocol for Member Appointment Panels and update the Appointment Panel Terms of Reference and Officer Employment Procedure Rules.

NOTED that the proposed amendments and protocol had been considered and approved for recommendation on to Council by the Members and Democratic Services Group on 18 February 2015.

AGREED

- (1) The amendment to section (c) of the policy for filming at Council meetings, as set out in para 3.1.7 of the report and to the administrative change in terms of how the policy is cross referenced within the remainder of the Constitution, as detailed in section 3.1.8 of the report.
- (2) To adopt the Member Appointment Panel Protocol and approve the amendments to the Terms of Reference for the Appointments Panel and Officer Employment Procedure Rules, as detailed in section 3.2 and Appendix 1 of the report.

178

MEMBERS ALLOWANCES SCHEME 2015/16

Members were asked to consider an update from the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services, listed on the agenda as Item 11 relating to the Members Allowance Scheme for 2015/16.

NOTED

1. The Members Allowances Scheme (Part 6 of the Constitution - Paragraph 6.3 (c)) stated that "Annual Increases in allowances will be linked to average earnings, for the period ending the previous March of each year. New rates will be effective from the new municipal year."
2. When considering the scheme for the 2014/15 financial year, Council had resolved "That the current Members Allowance Scheme is re-approved and that the automatic increase in allowances by the average earnings as at March not be implemented for the 2014/15 financial year. At the same time it be acknowledged that following the elections in May 2014, the administration may wish to review allowances within the overall budgetary figure and in accordance with the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel".
3. The need, following on from 2.above, to now consider the level of allowances payable under the scheme for 2015/16.

AGREED to re-approve the current Member's Allowances Scheme for the 2015/16 financial year, as set out in Part 6 of the Constitution, and to confirm that the automatic increase in allowances by the average earnings as at March be not implemented again.

179

COUNCILLORS' QUESTION TIME (TIME ALLOWED - 30 MINUTES)

1.1 Urgent Questions

None received

1.2 Questions by Councillors

NOTED the sixty one questions on the Council's agenda and written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Member, Associate Cabinet Members and Scrutiny Work Stream Chair.

180

MOTIONS

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

1.1 In the name of Councillor Neville:

"It has recently come to light that Councillor Nesimi Erbil was convicted of two fraud related offences in relation to his license to drive a London taxi (black cab), the convictions having occurred last September.

The council is of the view that these offences, being offences of dishonesty render Councillor Erbil unfit to serve on the council and accordingly calls upon him to resign his seat forthwith."

1.2 In the name of Councillor Laban:

"The Council calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety to improve its relationship with the Friends of the Parks Groups by agreeing to consult them on council projects and decisions that relate to the parks in our borough in recognition of their status as a key partner in the delivery of our parks service."

1.3 In the name of Councillor Laban:

"In light of recent events in relation to consultation, the Council calls upon the Leader of the Council to implement a review across all departments in order to provide residents with greater confidence in the way Enfield Council conducts consultation."

1.4 In the name of Councillor Sitkin:

"Under this pro-enterprise Labour Administration, Enfield Council commits to remaining open for business."

1.5 In the name of Councillor Maguire:

"This Council calls on Conservative Members and Enfield Conservative MPs Nick De Bois and David Burrowes to exert maximum pressure on the Conservative led Government to reverse its tax cut for millionaires.

This Council believes that the decision to cut the top rate of tax from 50p to 45p was misguided and irresponsible.

This Council agrees that the money raised from reinstating the 50p top rate of tax should be used to invest in Council and Health Services that would benefit all the people, including the many thousands in Enfield who rely on them."

181

MEMBERSHIPS

AGREED the following changes to committee memberships:

- (1) Child Sexual Exploitation and Associated Risks to Children and Young People Task Group**

To note the membership appointed following the last Council meeting had been as follows - Councillors Abdullahi, Chibah, E Hayward, Jemal, Lappage and Vince.

(2) Deaf Forum

Councillor Simbodyal to cease serving as a member of the Forum as a result of the membership being reduced from 7 to 6 members.

(3) Pension Policy & Investment Committee

6 members to be appointed (names to be notified) split 4 Majority: 2 Opposition.

(4) Local Pension Board

3 members to be appointed (names to be notified) split 2 Majority: 1 Opposition.

182

NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

AGREED the following changes to nominations on outside bodies:

(1) Lee Valley Heat Network Ltd

Councillor Oykenor to replace Councillor Lemonides. The Chief Executive and Director of Regeneration and Environment be added and the Assistant Director of Legal and Governance be removed from the membership list.

183

CALLED IN DECISIONS

None received.

184

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED the next meeting of the Council would be held at 7.00pm on Wednesday 13 May 2015 at the Civic Centre. This would be the Annual Council meeting and Mayor Making Ceremony.