

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 11  
NOVEMBER 2015**

**COUNCILLORS**

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

**ABSENT** Jason Charalambous, Mary Maguire, Vicki Pite and Toby Simon

**83**

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

Before the meeting began the Mayor announced that the meeting was being filmed so that it could be watched by those members of the public who could not be accommodated in the public gallery and were being seated in the Conference Room.

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

**84**

**MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING**

The Reverend John Hookway, from St Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church, gave the blessing.

**85**

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ORDINARY  
COUNCIL BUSINESS**

The Mayor thanked the Reverend John Hookway for offering the blessing and asked members to join her in a minutes silence in recognition of Remembrance Day.

A minutes silence was held.

The Mayor then made the following announcements:

## **1. Update on Mayoral Engagements**

The Mayor advised that she had attended a number of events since the last Council meeting including:

- A visit to RAF Northolt and the Battle of Britain exhibition, including the Nuclear Bunker.
- A visit to Chase Farm Hospital.
- Attending the Edmonton Eagles event as they received their Queen's Award for Voluntary Services.
- A Remembrance Day Service at St Demetrios's Church
- The Remembrance Sunday events at the Edmonton War Memorial, Chase Side War Memorial in Enfield, and at Southgate.
- Hosting a dinner for a visiting dignitary from France.
- Armistice Day commemorations in Broomfield Park.

## **2. Clean Britain Gold Award**

The Mayor announced that Enfield had won the Clean Britain Gold Award in the large local authority category. The award had been received at the Chartered Institute of Waste Management Clean Britain Awards 2015, held the week previously, in recognition of the work undertaken by the Council in keeping the streets clean for residents, businesses and visitors.

The awards reflected the work done by local authorities across England as well as volunteers and private companies in keeping public spaces clean and had been achieved in recognition of the Council's commitment to keeping the borough clean and for the hard work of its staff on a day to day basis in clearing litter, and dealing promptly with fly tipping and graffiti. The award also recognised the innovative ways in which the council directed its resources to target areas most in need.

A Gold Award in the large population category was one of the most challenging groups and demonstrated the Council's commitment to providing a well presented, safe and clean environment for residents and businesses which in turn played an important role in fostering civic pride and reducing anti-social behaviour.

The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, thanked all staff engaged in the service, many of whom started their working day in the early hours of the morning or late at night and congratulated them on receiving the award.

She formally presented the award to Nicky Fiedler (Assistant Director Public Realm) and David Coventry (Street Scene Section Manager).

### **3. Future Engagements**

The Mayor invited members to join her at the following events:

- The Arctic Convoy Commemoration on 14 November 2015 at 2.45pm, at the Civic Centre;
- A Dementia Awareness Seminar on Saturday 28 November, at the Civic Centre – For more details she asked members to contact Koulla Panaretou in Democratic Services.;
- An Open Day at the Registrars Service - Saturday 28 November at Gentleman's Row.

### **4. Anniversary Exhibition - Celebrating Enfield's 50 years as a London Borough**

As part of the celebrations, in honour of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Enfield becoming a London Borough, an exhibition had been set up in the Conference Room Display Cabinets. The Mayor encouraged members to take a look when passing through.

### **5. Trustees Meeting – Councillor Ali Bakir's Year as Mayor**

The Mayor advised members that the Mayor's Charity trustees had met that evening to finalise the accounts from Councillor Ali Bakir's Mayoralty. She was pleased to report that Councillor Bakir had raised £43,843 during his year in office.

The Mayor invited Councillor Bakir to say a few words and he took the opportunity to thank colleagues and everyone else who had contributed towards his fundraising activities as Mayor for their support. He was pleased to announce that the amount raised had now been allocated between 13 voluntary groups, schools, associations and charities across the borough.

The Mayor ended her announcements by reminding members that invitations had recently been sent out for her Christmas Celebration Evening on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2015, and asking them to respond to Alison Brookes in the Mayor's Office as soon as possible.

## **86 MINUTES**

**AGREED** that the minutes of the Council meeting held on Thursday 24 September 2015 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **87 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jason Charalambous, Mary Maguire, Vicky Pite and Toby Simon,

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Fonyonga and Uzoanya.

**88**

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

Agenda Item 7: Petition – Protection of the Green Belt Land and Wildlife at Enfield Road

- Councillors Lee David-Saunders, Alessandro Georgiou, Joanne Laban, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Terence Neville, Ann-Marie Pearce, Michael Rye, Edward Smith and Glynis Vince declared non pecuniary interests in this item as they had signed the petition. They remained in the meeting and took part in the debate on this item.
- Councillor Jansev Jemal declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. She withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the consideration of this item.

Agenda Item 8: Opposition Business – Safeguarding the Green Belt from Residential Development

- Councillor Joanne Laban declared a non-pecuniary interest as a result of her employment in the office of one of the Deputy Mayors for London.
- Councillor Jansev Jemal declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. She withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the consideration of this item.

Agenda Item 15: Motions

- a. Motion 15.3 (Trade Union Bill) in the name of Councillor Chibah:
  - The Mayor advised Members that following a request from the Leader of the Council the Monitoring Officer had agreed to grant a dispensation under Section 33 (a) and (b) of the Members Code of Conduct for all members of the Majority Group in relation to the declaration of any disclosable pecuniary interest they may have relating to trade union sponsorship. Members noted that declarations would still need to be made in relation to any interests not involving sponsorship.
  - Disclosable pecuniary interests were declared by Councillors Daniel Pearce (company engaged by Trade Union) and Claire Stewart (employed by a Trade Union). Both Members withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the consideration of this item.

- Non pecuniary interests were declared by Councillors Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward and Michael Rye declared a non-pecuniary interest given their membership of a Trade Union.
- b. Motion 15.4 (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) in the name of Councillor Chibah – Councillor Michael Lavender declared a non-pecuniary interest given his employment by an American company.
- c. Motion 15.7 (London Living Wage) in the name of Councillor Sitkin - non-pecuniary interests declared by Councillor Ertan Hurer (as an employer in borough) and Peter Fallart (due to the nature of his employment)

**89**

**PETITION - PROTECTION OF GREEN BELT LAND AND WILDLIFE AT ENFIELD ROAD**

Before moving on to deal with this item the Mayor invited John Austin, (Assistant Director, Governance Projects) to provide a brief statement providing advice for Members regarding consideration of the Petition and also Opposition Business (items 7 & 8 on the agenda).

Members were informed that the advice should be taken in the context that no planning application for the development on the green belt land at Enfield Road had been received but it was likely that one would be submitted in the near future.

Council was informed that members of the Planning Committee had been advised that they would need to exercise caution in relation to views they expressed on the issue at the meeting. As such, it was important that they avoided any appearance of having predetermined the assessment of any planning application by making any definitive statements for or against the acceptability of any development at Enfield Road.

He informed members that they could still take part in the debates and indicate a view. However any contributions made, must not indicate that they had a closed mind on any planning application. They must remain open to the consideration of any proposal on its individual merits as well as all other relevant factors, such as committee reports, supporting documents and the views of objectors.

Members noted the advice provided and Council then moved on to receive the report (No.120) of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services detailing the petition, which had met the criteria (in terms of number of signatures) for debate at Council.

The Mayor invited Madeleine Betton and Ian D'Souza, the lead petitioners, from Enfield Roadwatch Action Group, to present their petition to the Council, who having thanked Members for receiving the petition highlighted the following issues:

- The need to recognise the background and context to the petition in terms of the reasons why so many families chose to settle in Enfield given the community spirit and cohesive nature of a large multicultural society; love of green spaces and high standards of education.
- That over 4,000 people had signed the petition, which it was felt showed the level of passion in terms of protecting the green belt and objection to what it was felt would be an inappropriate development that had the potential to endanger the reasons why Enfield was such an attractive place to live.
- All Enfield's strategies, reports and plans had upheld the green belt status of the site at Enfield Road that was the subject of the petition. The site had also been listed as an area of special character, with the reasons for protecting the green belt having grown rather than diminished over the years.
- Although the draft proposals had included the development of a school, this was not felt to be needed in the area given its proximity to existing provision at Highlands School. Similarly the need for additional housing in the specific area was not recognised meaning, the petitioners felt, there were no special circumstances which could be used to justify development of the site.
- The potential extent of the impact any development would have on existing residents and the surrounding area. The petitioners were keen to protect the environment, keep the area light and open, with clean air and pollution free roads and it was felt elected representatives needed to take account of the strength of these concerns and local opposition to the potential development.
- Whilst recognising the demand for additional housing across the South East of England, local residents felt that Enfield should only have to accommodate its fair share, with the focus for these type of developments on brown rather than greenfield sites and residents not required to make sacrifices in order to maximise returns for developers. There was also a need to recognise and take account of the additional infrastructure requirements that would be associated with any large scale residential development.
- Members were urged to protect the quality of life for residents within the borough and to demonstrate the same level of creativity and vision as displayed by those who had originally created the green belt in considering these type of approaches from developers.
- The need to safeguard and avoid the gradual erosion of the green belt and other open spaces in the borough, recognising their contribution in making Enfield such a unique and attractive place to live.

- The need to recognise that Enfield's four star reputation was in part based on how it decided to manage its assets and there was a need to ensure, even in times of increasing pressure from a growing population, the Council was able to consider the bigger picture and work with integrity.

The petitioners concluded by urging the Council to recognise the strength of feeling and level of opposition to any proposed development on the site at Enfield Road and to ensure that all necessary steps were taken to protect green belt sites from future development for the future benefit of all those living in the borough.

The Mayor thanked Madeleine Betton and Ian D'Souza for their presentation, which was then subject to a short debate. Issues highlighted during the debate included:

- (a) Members advised they recognised the concerns raised and thanked the petitioners for highlighting the strength of feeling and views for Council to consider.
- (b) The need to recognise that Enfield was one of the greenest boroughs in London, with the green belt space one of its defining features. As well as local residents, many organisations including the Campaign for Rural England and Federation of Enfield Ratepayers and Residents Association (FERRA) were keen to ensure that this green belt space was protected, with the Council having a key role as its custodian.
- (c) The support of the local ward councillors in relation to the petition and need to preserve the special character of the site at Enfield Road.
- (d) The following issues highlighted in specific response to the petition by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Leader of the Council:
  - The Council deeply valued and appreciated the borough's network of green spaces;
  - The need to recognise that the Council's current planning policy was to resist development in the green belt unless extraordinary circumstances could be demonstrated. Any applicant who wished to build would therefore have to make a case which would be subject to robust assessment and independent scrutiny;
  - Decisions on any planning application would be the responsibility of the Planning Committee. Members who served on Enfield's Planning Committee were not subject to political whipping and would need to consider each application on its merits, taking account of the statutory planning framework, national, regional and local planning policy, site circumstances as well as the views of residents and other key stakeholders;

- The current outline development proposal for the Enfield Road site, including the proposals for an academy school, had been submitted by a private developer and not by the Council. At this stage no formal planning application had been submitted;
  - Any proposal for residential development on the green belt would generally be considered inappropriate, as it would represent a departure from the Council's own Local Plan. It was important to recognise, however, that the Council would not have the final say on whether or not to grant planning permission in these circumstances, as any application of this nature would normally have to be referred to the Mayor of London or possibly the Secretary of State, for final decision.
- (e) The need to avoid the matter becoming a party political issue.
- (f) The green belt was an area of bio diversity and home to significant amounts of wildlife and ancient trees, which contributed towards its special character. The impact of any proposed development on these issues would need to be treated as a material consideration as part of the assessment of any subsequent planning application, with detailed scrutiny also likely from outside organisations such as the London Wildlife Trust.
- (g) The need to recognise the wider health benefits and associated impact of any potential reduction in green space and of current national policy in relation to management of the green belt and open space with the Council looking to actively encourage sustainable transport, walking and cycling schemes.

In concluding the debate the Leader of the Council thanked the petitioners for their presentation. Whilst noting the views expressed and level of support for the petition he reiterated that the final decision on any development proposals could only be made once a formal planning application had been received and had been assessed and considered in the normal way.

The following was therefore unanimously agreed as an outcome of the debate.

**AGREED** that Council receive and note the petition along with the fact that any planning application received in relation to development of the site would need to be assessed against relevant national, regional and local planning policy having regard to site circumstances and representations received and in accordance with the statutory planning framework.

Councillors Lee David-Saunders, Alessandro Georgiou, Joanne Laban, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Terence Neville, Ann-Marie Pearce, Michael Rye, Edward Smith and Glynis Vince declared non pecuniary interests in this item as they had signed the petition. They remained in the meeting and took part in the debate on this item.



Councillor Jansev Jemal declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. She withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the consideration of this item.

**90**

**OPPOSITION BUSINESS - SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT FROM RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

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

1. The strength of local opposition towards development on the green belt, as highlighted in the petition considered in relation to the Enfield Road site.
2. The increased interest, which the Opposition Group claimed to have recently noted, in the development of sites in the green belt for residential development and need identified to consider the issues raised and ensure the necessary steps were taken to maintain the current safeguards against these type of developments.
3. The principles and protection established within National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan towards the function and acceptable use of the green belt.
4. Whilst recognising the rapid population increase within Enfield over the last decade and need to consider, as part of the imminent Local Plan review, how this level of growth could be accommodated the Opposition Group were keen to ensure that consideration of the issues raised regarding protection of the green belt were included as part of the process. In addition they did not support the recent figures quoted by the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development relating to the level of future ongoing population growth anticipated by 2032 and associated number of new homes identified as required (50,000). It was highlighted that based on the current projections within the Greater London Assembly London Plan the target for Enfield had been assessed as a minimum of 798 new homes per annum (an increase from 560).
5. The recognised contribution of the green belt in terms of combatting pollution, maintaining biodiversity, improving the quality of life and protecting the environment.
6. The need to recognise the current restrictions within the National Planning Policy Framework and principles established under case law in terms of alteration of established green belt boundaries and the fact this should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and linked to review of the Local Plan. As a principle it was felt the construction of new buildings in the green belt should continue to be regarded as inappropriate and proposals for these type of developments resisted.

7. Whilst recognising the increasing demand for new housing and associated infrastructure within the borough and targets within the London Plan it was felt these should not be regarded as exceptional circumstances in terms of potential green belt development. The Opposition Group felt there was a need to make clear that large scale residential development of the green belt was not permissible with a clear steer to developers on this point and within its planning policy and guidance.
8. The need to consider alternative options in terms of suitable sites for large scale housing developments, including the potential for development on brownfield land as a means of ensuring the Council was able to meet its targets within the London Plan. In response to a Council Question submitted on this issue, the Opposition Group had noted that according to the Council's Housing Trajectory (2014) approx. 110 hectares (270 acres) had been identified as brownfield land available for residential development across the borough and felt the priority should be focussed on these sites as opposed to the green belt.
9. The specific concerns highlighted within the Opposition Business paper:
  - a. in support of the petition already considered, in relation to any proposed residential development on the Enfield Road site; and
  - b. in relation to the acquisition of Sloeman's Farm by the Council and its potential future use; and
  - c. the purchase of the former Middlesex University site in Trent Park and assurances sought in relation to the impact on conservation of the green belt as a result of any future development proposals relating to the site.

As a result of these issues, the Opposition Group had identified a number of issues within the Opposition Business paper on which responses were sought designed to clarify the Administration's position in relation to the specific sites highlighted and overall stance in relation to protection of the green belt.

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

1. It would not be appropriate for him, as part of the response to the debate to comment on specific or potential planning applications.
2. The need to recognise that population growth was a fundamental issue that needed to be addressed within Enfield. The figures quoted by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Business Regeneration had come from the Office for National Statistics, with the population in London projected to grow by over 1.5m over the next 15 years. The impact on Enfield, in terms of meeting this additional housing and associated infrastructure need would therefore need to be carefully

considered and planned and he therefore welcomed the debate. It was important to recognise, however, that the identification and use of brownfield sites would not be sufficient on its own to meet all of the projected need identified.

3. Whilst recognising and supporting the benefits and success of the green belt, there were challenges that needed to be addressed in relation to meeting the additional housing need identified and all options would therefore need to be considered. As an example reference was made to the recent suggestion by The London Society, who had originally campaigned for establishment of the green belt, around the concept of green wedges.
4. The major challenge identified in relation to the provision of green space not only in terms of the green belt but also in terms of development across the borough with, for example, provision for domestic gardens no longer a key feature in many housing developments. As a result the need to achieve some balance had been identified, particularly in the more developed areas of the borough with the example provided of Angel Gardens in Upper Edmonton where a small open space had been created on a site that could have potentially accommodated 120 residential properties.
5. The need to recognise that any development would involve a range of considerations needing to be taken into account. The consultation shortly to be commenced on the Local Plan would provide an opportunity to consider all options in a structured way, taking account of the overall level of development needed within the borough, available sites and targets for the provision of housing that the Council had to meet in accordance with the London Plan.
6. The need to address the growth in population across London and within the borough could not be ignored and would require all options to be considered in terms of how the borough was shaped for the future. It was hoped that this debate could be undertaken in a mature and reasonable way, taking an evidence based.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- (a) The need highlighted by members of the Opposition Group:
  - To recognise the desire of developers to acquire green belt land, on the basis that it would often be less costly to develop than brownfield sites. It was felt a clear message needed to be provided to developers that the Council was strongly opposed to development on the green belt in order to discourage potential applications.
  - To recognise the contribution that the green belt made to the unique character of Enfield as a borough. Both the Conservative

and Labour Party candidates for London Mayor had expressed views against development of the green belt.

- The note the work being undertaken by the London Land Commission to develop a register of brownfield sites suitable for potential residential development, which included a range of unused sites owned by public sector organisations.
  - To recognise the extent of new house building achieved under the current Conservative Government, which had been achieved without encroaching on the green belt.
  - To ensure that the benefits of the green belt were recognised, along with the fact (as part of any debate) that alternative options were available in terms of addressing the population growth currently being experienced including the Government's focus on the economic development of areas outside London and immigration, as part of the wider debate on the European Referendum.
  - To highlight concerns in relation to delays in the delivery of the residential developments at Meridian Water and on the small housing site programme.
  - To recognise that allowing development on the green belt would not only destroy the environment, but could increase flooding, and also result in the need for more infrastructure: for roads, drainage, health facilities, and shops. It would also increase traffic congestion.
  - To ensure that the figures provided in relation to future projections for population growth and housing development within the borough were accurate and evidence based. Given the concerns raised and need identified to consider all available options the suggestion was also made that the Council consider setting up a Joint Commission to consider how best to ensure the Council was able to meet current and future demands in terms of the need for housing development.
- (b) The need identified by members of the Majority Group:
- To recognise that the Council had not built anything on the green belt and that current policy within the Local Plan and London Plan precluded development on the green belt, which in order to proceed would therefore require approval via the Mayor for London or Secretary of State.
  - To recognise the obligation on the Council in terms of having to plan for an increase in the borough's population and the number of new homes required to meet the projected level of demand. This

would require full and careful consideration of population data and projected trends as provided by the Office for National Statistics and Mayor for London and all available options in order to properly address the significant challenge identified.

- To recognise the duty on the Council to review its Local Plan and ensure this was done to the satisfaction of the Planning Inspectorate taking account of the projected increase in population and including consultation on all available development options within the borough.
- To recognise the negative impact of the Conservative Government's benefit reforms in terms of the growth in population within the borough.
- To recognise that the Administration were not in favour of development on the green belt, but had identified a need to consider all available options in terms of addressing the projected increase in population and level of new residential and associated infrastructure development that would be required. This process would need to recognise the finite extent of development site options and balance needing to be struck between managing the level of development in already densely populated areas against the availability of alternative brownfield or other sites within the borough.
- To recognise the significant contribution which the Meridian Water development would make towards the provision of additional residential accommodation within the borough. Any debate on available options would also need to consider the mix of high as well as low rise units that could be provided within any potential development opportunities.
- To highlight, in relation to the concerns raised about the former Middlesex University site in Trent Park, that the site had originally been vacated by the University as a result of proposals for its development not having been approved by the then Conservative Administration. The site had now been sold to a Housing Developer with a planning application anticipated, which would be subject to the usual planning assessment and decision process.
- To highlight that in relation to the Enfield Road site, any planning application received would be also subject to the usual assessment and independent decision making process by the Planning Committee. It was however, important to note that any application would be from a private developer and not the Council. Any associated proposals to create a free school would also require approval from the Secretary of State, although this would be in accordance with Conservative Government policy.

During the above debate the Mayor advised that the time available for Opposition Business had expired. In view of the nature of the discussion and number of members who had indicated they still wished to speak it was agreed that the time available should be extended for a further 15 minutes.

At the end of the debate, Councillor Smith summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group by highlighting what he felt had been a useful debate. The view which he felt had been outlined by the Majority Group - that whilst reluctant to develop on the green belt this may be inevitable given projected population growth and the limited number of other alternative sites, was not one shared by the Opposition Group. It was felt this stance would send the wrong message to developers and that the position was not supported by the uncertain nature of future population projections. In addition the Opposition Group felt that there were other alternative development sites which could be explored as a priority in order to ensure that the future character of the green belt continued to be maintained and protected.

Councillor Taylor then summed up on behalf of the Majority Group by focussing on the recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper.

In relation to recommendation 9.1 (providing a response on the issues highlighted relating to the Enfield Road site) he felt these matters had already been considered during the debate and in considering the petition under agenda item 7 (Min.\*refers). He was not therefore minded to provide any further response.

He advised that the Majority Group were willing to support:

- (a) recommendation 9.2 (agree to comply with the criteria laid down by Government and the Mayor for London to protect the rural character of the green belt and not allow residential or other inappropriate development on it); and
- (b) recommendation 9.3 (to confirm the details of the Local Plan review, including the proposals relating to public consultation and to publish its terms and scope) recognising the desire to engage in a full and open debate on the issues.

In terms of the remaining recommendations he advised that the Majority Group were not minded to support:

- (a) recommendation 9.4 (publishing a list of significant brownfield sites within the borough available for residential development) given the potential commercial sensitivity of the information and fact that the details of many sites were already in the public domain.
- (b) recommendation 9.5 (the statement that the green belt remains safe under a Conservative Government) given the fact that according to figures he had obtained 6 times as many new homes had been built in

the green belt under the current Conservative Government than under the previous Labour Government.

- (c) recommendation 9.6 (to provide a development plan for the former Middlesex University site at Trent Park detailing the Council's requirements) on the basis that the Council had already established a cross party Working Group to focus on plans for future use of the site.
- (d) recommendation 9.7 (agrees to support a call on the next Mayor for London to tighten provisions relating to development on metropolitan green belt) given the imprecise nature of what was being sought.

As an outcome of the debate the Leader of the Opposition requested that a vote be taken on each of the recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper. In accordance with section 15.4 of the Council Procedure Rules this was on a roll call basis, with the results as follows:

The following recommendations within the Opposition Business Paper were approved:

- (1)** (Recommendation 9.2) The Administration agreed to comply with the criteria laid down by Government and the Mayor to protect the rural character of the Green Belt and not allow residential or other inappropriate development on it;
- (2)** (Recommendation 9.3) The Administration agree to publish the terms and scope for the Local Plan review, including the start and proposed completion dates and when public consultation would be undertaken;

For: 56

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi  
Councillor Daniel Anderson  
Councillor Ali Bakir  
Councillor Dinah Barry  
Councillor Chris Bond  
Councillor Yasemin Brett  
Councillor Erin Celebi  
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu  
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu  
Councillor Lee Chamberlain,  
Councillor Bambos Charalambous  
Councillor Katherine Chibah  
Councillor Lee David-Sanders  
Councillor Dogan Delman  
Councillor Nick Dines  
Councillor Guney Dogan  
Councillor Sarah Doyle  
Councillor Christiana During  
Councillor Nesimi Erbil

Councillor Turgut Esendagli  
Councillor Peter Fallart  
Councillor Krystle Fonyonga  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou  
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou  
Councillor Christine Hamilton  
Councillor Ahmet Hasan  
Councillor Elaine Hayward  
Councillor Robert Hayward  
Councillor Ertan Hurer  
Councillor Suna Hurman  
Councillor Doris Jiagge  
Councillor Eric Jukes  
Councillor Nneka Keazor  
Councillor Adeline Kepez  
Councillor Bernadette Lappage  
Councillor Michael Lavender  
Councillor Dino Lemonides  
Councillor Derek Levy  
Councillor Donald McGowan  
Councillor Andy Milne  
Councillor Terence Neville OBE JP  
Councillor Ayfer Orhan  
Councillor Ahmet Oykenner  
Councillor Anne-Marie Pearce  
Councillor Daniel Pearce  
Councillor Michael Rye  
Councillor George Savva  
Councillor Alan Sitkin  
Councillor Edward Smith  
Councillor Jim Steven  
Councillor Andrew Stafford  
Councillor Claire Stewart  
Councillor Doug Taylor  
Councillor Glynis Vince  
Councillor Haydar Ulus  
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The following recommendations were not approved:

- (3)** (Recommendation 9.1) The Administration agrees to provide a response to the issues highlighted within section 4 of the Opposition Business paper relating to Enfield Road.

In support of recommendation 9.1: 19



Councillor Erin Celebi  
Councillor Lee Chamberlain  
Councillor Lee David-Sanders  
Councillor Nick Dines  
Councillor Peter Fallart  
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou  
Councillor Elaine Hayward  
Councillor Robert Hayward  
Councillor Ertan Hurer  
Councillor Eric Jukes  
Councillor Joanne Laban  
Councillor Michael Lavender  
Councillor Andy Milne  
Councillor Terence Neville  
Councillor Daniel Pearce  
Councillor Michael Rye  
Councillor Edward Smith  
Councillor Jim Steven  
Councillor Glynis Vince

Against recommendation 9.1: 32

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi  
Councillor Daniel Anderson  
Councillor Ali Bakir  
Councillor Chris Bond  
Councillor Yasemin Brett  
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu  
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu  
Councillor Bambos Charalambous  
Councillor Katherine Chibah  
Councillor Guney Dogan  
Councillor Sarah Doyle  
Councillor Christiana During  
Councillor Nesimi Erbil  
Councillor Turgut Esendagli  
Councillor Krystle Fonyonga  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou  
Councillor Christine Hamilton  
Councillor Suna Hurman  
Councillor Doris Jiage  
Councillor Nneka Keazor  
Councillor Adeline Kepez  
Councillor Bernie Lappage  
Councillor Dino Lemonides  
Councillor Don McGowan  
Councillor Ayfer Orhan  
Councillor Ahmet Oykenner  
Councillor Alan Sitkin  
Councillor Andrew Stafford

Councillor Claire Stewart  
Councillor Doug Taylor  
Councillor Haydar Ulus  
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya

Abstentions in respect of recommendation 9.1: 5

Councillor Dinah Barry  
Councillor Don Delman  
Councillor Ahmet Hassan  
Councillor Derek Levy  
Councillor George Savva

- (4) (Recommendation 9.4) The Administration agrees to publish the list of significant brown field sites within the Borough that are available for residential development as has been asked for by the Opposition on a number of occasions.
- (5) (Recommendation 9.5) The Administration agrees, given that a Labour Government under Ed Milliband was not elected and that the green belt remains safe under a Conservative Government, to provide a timetable for the disposal of Sloeman's farm to the private sector.
- (6) (Recommendation 9.6) The Administration agrees, in order to reassure local residents and protect the environmental and civic amenity of Trent Park, to provide a development plan for the campus site setting out the Council's requirements in terms of public access to the listed House and grounds; whether the educational use of the House will be preserved; the heights and density of the residential development and the design standards that will apply; and
- (7) (Recommendation 9.7) The Administration agrees to support a call to the next Mayor of London to tighten further the provisions relating to the metropolitan Green Belt so that it becomes impossible for development to take place in the Green Belt for other than specified exceptions.

In support of recommendations 9.4 – 9.7: 20

Councillor Erin Celebi  
Councillor Lee Chamberlain  
Councillor Lee David-Sanders  
Councillor Nick Dines  
Councillor Don Delman  
Councillor Peter Fallart  
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou  
Councillor Elaine Hayward  
Councillor Robert Hayward  
Councillor Ertan Hurer  
Councillor Eric Jukes  
Councillor Joanne Laban

Councillor Michael Lavender  
Councillor Andy Milne  
Councillor Terence Neville  
Councillor Daniel Pearce  
Councillor Michael Rye  
Councillor Edward Smith  
Councillor Jim Steven  
Councillor Glynis Vince

Against recommendations 9.4 – 9.7: 34

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi  
Councillor Daniel Anderson  
Councillor Ali Bakir  
Councillor Chris Bond  
Councillor Yasemin Brett  
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu  
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu  
Councillor Bambos Charalambous  
Councillor Katherine Chibah  
Councillor Guney Dogan  
Councillor Sarah Doyle  
Councillor Christiana During  
Councillor Nesimi Erbil  
Councillor Turgut Esendagli  
Councillor Krystle Fonyonga  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou  
Councillor Christine Hamilton  
Councillor Suna Hurman  
Councillor Doris Jiagge  
Councillor Nneka Keazor  
Councillor Adeline Kepez  
Councillor Bernie Lappage  
Councillor Dino Lemonides  
Councillor Derek Levy  
Councillor Don McGowan  
Councillor Ayfer Orhan  
Councillor Ahmet Oykenner  
Councillor George Savva  
Councillor Alan Sitkin  
Councillor Andrew Stafford  
Councillor Claire Stewart  
Councillor Doug Taylor  
Councillor Haydar Ulus  
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya

Abstentions in relation to recommendations 9.4 – 9.7: 2

Councillor Dinah Barry  
Councillor Ahmet Hassan

Councillor Joanne Laban declared a non-pecuniary interest as a result of her employment in the office of one of the Deputy Mayors for London. She remained in the meeting and participated in the debate and decision on this item.

Councillor Jansev Jemal declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. She withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the consideration of this item.

## 91

### **CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Following on from Opposition Business, Councillor Elaine Hayward moved and Councillor Neville seconded the following proposal to change the order of business on the agenda under paragraph 2.2 (b) of the Council's procedure rules as follows:

- To consider item 15.3 (Motion in the name of Councillor Chibah regarding the Government's new trade union legislation) as the next item of business.

The change in the order of the agenda was not agreed after a vote, with the following result:

For: 16

Against: 30

Abstentions: 0

Councillor Stewart then moved and Councillor Taylor seconded a separate proposal under paragraph 2.2(b) of the Council Procedure Rules to change the order of items on the agenda so that the following were dealt with as the next items of business:

- Item 10: Child Exploitation Task Group – Progress Update;
- Motion 15.3: In the name of Councillor Chibah regarding the Government's new trade union legislation;
- Motion 15.5: In the name of Councillor Barry regarding Individual Electoral Registration (IER).

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

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

92

**CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION TASK GROUP - PROGRESS UPDATE**

Councillor Jemal moved and Councillor Elaine Hayward seconded the report of the Child Sexual Exploitation Task Group (No.122) updating members on the work undertaken by the group to date and its programme for the remainder of the year.

**NOTED**

1. The task group had been established by Council on 25 February 2015 with a requirement to report back to Council on a bi-annual basis regarding their work.
2. The key areas of focus for the Task Group and significant level of work undertaken to date, as detailed in section 3 of the report. Members of the Task Group had expressed particular admiration for the work being undertaken by the various agencies and expertise and commitment of staff involved in protecting vulnerable young people and keeping them safe. At the same time the Task Group had acknowledged the complex nature of this area of safeguarding and level of partnership working required and had recognised the need to avoid any complacency in terms of the ongoing focus in ensuring that the necessary arrangements were in place to protect vulnerable young people.
3. Following on from 3. above the Task Group had established a work programme of activity for the remainder of the year, detailed within Appendix 1 of the report. Whilst recognising the proactive nature of work being undertaken by the Task Group a number of ongoing challenges had been recognised as requiring detailed consideration given the increasing focus on tackling child sexual exploitation across the UK.
4. The Task Group were keen to encourage all members to raise their awareness around safeguarding and ensure they took up the opportunities available to attend relevant briefings and training, which had formed one of their key interim recommendations.
5. The thanks to all members of the Task Group for their work to date.
6. The Task Group was due to produce an annual report outlining the work undertaken and key recommendations as an outcome of the review, which would be submitted to Cabinet and Council in 2016.

Following a short debate, the recommendations in the report were agreed unanimously (without a vote).

**AGREED**

- (1) To note the complex nature of this area of safeguarding and to thank the partnerships and front line staff for their commitment to tackling Child Sexual Exploitation.
- (2) That all members be actively encouraged to get involved by increasing their awareness of this matter and attending future safeguarding presentations that are being put into place specifically for members.

## 93

### MOTIONS

1.1 Councillor Chibah moved and Councillor N.Cazimoglu seconded the following motion:

“That this Council recognises the positive contribution that Trade Unions and Trade Union members make in our workplaces. This Council values the constructive relationship that we have with our Trade Unions and we recognise their commitment, and the commitment of all our staff, to the delivery of good quality public services.

This Council notes with concern the Trade Union Bill which is currently being proposed by the Government and which would affect this Council’s relationship with our Trade Unions and our workforce as a whole. This Council rejects this Bill’s attack on local democracy and the attack on our right to manage our own affairs.

This Council is clear that facility time, negotiated and agreed by us and our Trade Unions to suit our own specific needs, has a valuable role to play in the creation of good quality and responsive local services. Facility time should not be determined or controlled by Government in London.

This Council is happy with the arrangements we currently have in place for deducting Trade Union membership subscriptions through our payroll. We see this as an important part of our positive industrial relations and a cheap and easy to administer system that supports our staff. This system is an administrative matter for the Council and should not be interfered with by the UK Government.

The Council resolves to support the campaign against the unnecessary, anti-democratic and bureaucratic Trade Union Bill.

The Council further resolves to seek to continue its own locally agreed industrial relations strategy and will take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy with regard to facility time and the continuing use of check-off.”

During the debate on this motion proceedings were interrupted as a result of comments made by Councillor Stafford.

Given the nature of the language used, the Mayor immediately asked Councillor Stafford to apologise for the comments made or advised that she would move that the member be asked to leave the Chamber.

Councillor Stafford offered an immediate apology, however the Leader of the Opposition did not feel this was sufficient and the Opposition Group subsequently withdrew from the Chamber for the remainder of the meeting.

The debate then continued, without the Opposition present, before the motion was put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 33  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

It was noted that Councillors Daniel Pearce and Claire Stewart had declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in the above motion and neither were therefore present during the debate on this item.

It was noted that Councillors Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward and Michael Rye had declared non-pecuniary interests in the above motion. They were present during the debate, up until the Opposition Group withdrew from the meeting.

1.2 Prior to commencing the debate on Motion 15.3 Councillor Barry (as the Member who had given notice and would be moving the motion) drew members attention to the following alterations that she wished to make to the wording of the original motion listed on the agenda. The proposed alterations had been tabled as part of the update sheet at the meeting:

- (a) To replace the figure of 9,000 with the figure 8,700.
- (b) To delete the words “the Government wants to end the transition period for” in the third paragraph and replace with the words “the Government has ended the transition period to”.
- (c) To replace the word “role” with the word “roll” at the end of the fourth paragraph.
- (d) To delete the remainder of the wording following “fundamental human right” in the final paragraph and replace with “It condemns Government’s action which has been taken at the expense of democracy for political advantage”

The proposed amendments were accepted by Council and Councillor Barry then moved and Councillor Jemal seconded the following motion, as altered above:

“Many people in Enfield may soon be disenfranchised.

In May, 217,537 people were registered to vote in Enfield. Now, over 8,700 of those are at risk of being removed from the register on 30 November.

Acting against the advice of the Electoral Commission, the Government has ended the transition period to the new Individual Electoral Registration (IER) system in December 2015. This is one year earlier than originally planned.

On 1 December those people that have yet to provide the necessary evidence to remain registered will be taken off the electoral role.

This Council believes that the right to vote is a key foundation of our democracy and a fundamental human right. It condemns government's action which has been taken at the expense of democracy for political advantage."

Due to limited time available the motion was put straight to the vote and agreed, with the following result:

For: 34  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

**94  
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.

**95  
APPROVAL OF ENFIELD'S GAMBLING ACT 2005 POLICY AND 'NO CASINOS' RESOLUTION**

RECEIVED a report from the Director – Regeneration and Environment (No. 121) seeking approval to the Statement of Principles (policy) under the Gambling Act 2005, following a public consultation process.

NOTED that the policy has been referred on to Council for formal approval following consideration by the Licensing Committee on 14 October 2015.

**AGREED**

- (1) To note the results of the public consultation and amendments made thereafter to the proposed Statement of Principles (policy) under the Gambling Act 2005.



- (2) To approve the Statement of Principles (policy), under the Gambling Act 2005 as attached in Appendix 1 of the report.
- (3) To resolve not to issue casino premises licenses under the Gambling Act 2005.

**96**

**ENFIELD SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

RECEIVED the report from the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.78A) presenting the Enfield Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2014-15.

NOTED that the report was considered and approved by Cabinet on 21 October 2015. As part of this process Cabinet agreed that the Annual Report should also be referred on to Council for information.

**AGREED** to note the progress being made in protecting vulnerable adults in the borough as set out in the Annual Report of the Safeguarding Adults Board.

**97**

**ENFIELD'S SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

RECEIVED a report from the Interim Director of Children's Services (No.79A) presenting the Enfield Safeguarding Children's Board Annual Report 2014-15.

NOTED that the report was considered and approved by Cabinet on 21 October 2015. As part of this process Cabinet agreed that the Annual Report should also be referred on to Council for information.

**AGREED** to note the Enfield Safeguarding Children's Board Annual Report, including the summary of achievements.

**98**

**REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO 6 MONTH RULE ON COUNCILLOR ATTENDANCE**

Members noted that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**99**

**COUNCILLORS' QUESTION TIME (TIME ALLOWED - 30 MINUTES)**

1.1. Urgent Questions

There were no urgent questions.

1.2. Questions by Councillors

NOTED the sixty eight questions on the Council agenda and written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Members.

**100  
MOTIONS**

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

15.1 In the name of Councillor Orhan:

“Following the campaign in the Londra Gazette and my letter to the Schools Minister urging him to intervene and force the AQA and OCR exam boards to reconsider the decision to scrap “A” levels and GCSEs of certain community languages such as Bengali, Gujarati, Punjabi, Polish, Greek and Turkish, it has been disappointing that other than a reprieve of a year no firm announcement of a commitment has been made by the Government that a u-turn has been achieved. It begs the question who is in charge of education in the UK and if this Government is committed to providing language skill opportunities much in demand in business and much in need by an outward facing country.

As this is of a huge interest for Enfield residents I ask the Council to fully support me in a letter urging the government to make a public statement that community languages will be taught in school beyond 2017.”

15.2 In the name of Cllr N.Cazimoglu:

“The country, particularly London, is facing a housing crisis and residents in Enfield are feeling the effects. This Council believes that the only real solution is to build more homes.

House building is at its lowest since the 1920’s; private rents have increased by 37% in the past five years and the government continue to use billions of pounds of public money to subsidise private landlords through housing benefit.

This Council believes that government is complacent about the housing crisis which is affecting many of our residents in Enfield.

We call on the government to grant local authorities the powers and financial ability to increase the supply of housing for our residents. The government should go further than they already have in lifting the cap on borrowing for Housing Revenue Accounts. Council’s must be given the financial flexibilities they need to be able to scale up housing development, both in partnership and directly.”

15.4 In the name of Councillor Barry:

“If the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is agreed, the people of Enfield will lose many of the regulations that protect their environment, their food and their rights as workers.

A report commissioned by the Government concluded that TTIP offers “few or no benefits to the UK while having meaningful economic and political costs.”

This Council resolves:

- To call on the Government to put the national interests of our people above those of big businesses and to reject this agreement.
- To write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, local MPs, MLAs, and all London MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process.
- To write to the Local Government Association to raise our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and ask them to raise these with Government on our behalf.
- To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities.
- To publicise the Council’s concerns about TTIP; join with other local authorities which are opposed to TTIP across Europe and work with local campaigners to raise awareness about the problems of TTIP.
- To contact the local authorities of municipalities twinned with Enfield asking them to consider passing a similar motion on TTIP.”

15.6 In the name of Councillor Alessandro Georgiou:

“This Council recognises that the Union Flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a symbol of Freedom and represents all that is great about the United Kingdom.

The Council will therefore have the Union Flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland present in all full Council meetings. The flag will have a prominent place either hanging behind the Mayor of Enfield’s chair or on a flag poll to the right of the Mayor.”

15.7 In the name of Councillor Sitkin:

“This Council calls upon companies operating in Enfield to work with us to explore mechanisms for paying their employees the London Living Wage.”

15.8 In the name of Councillor Celebi:

“Council resolves that a review be undertaken of the decision to digitise the Museum Archives. No final decision should be made until stake holders are fully consulted and the digitising programme is fully costed. Until such review is completed all staff redundancies should also be put on hold.”

**101  
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS**

There were no changes to committee memberships.

**102  
NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

**AGREED** to confirm the following nominations on outside bodies:

**(1) Old Enfield Charitable Trust**

Councillor Bond to be re-appointed for a further term as the Labour Group nominated representative.

**103  
CALLED IN DECISIONS**

None received.

**104  
DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED that the next meeting of the Council would be held at 7.00pm on Thursday 28 January 2016 at the Civic Centre.

As this was scheduled to be the final Council meeting before the Christmas and New Year break the Mayor took the opportunity to wish all members and officers a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.