

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2016

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT

Patricia Ekechi (Mayor), Bernadette Lappage (Deputy Mayor), Abdul Abdullahi, Daniel Anderson, Ali Bakir, Dinah Barry, Yasemin Brett, Alev Cazimoglu, Nesil Cazimoglu, Erin Celebi, Lee Chamberlain, Bambos Charalambous, Jason 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, Robert Hayward, Suna Hurman, Jansev Jemal, Doris Jiagge, Eric Jukes, Nneke Keazor, Adeline Kepez, Joanne Laban, Michael Lavender, 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, Jim Steven, Claire Stewart, Doug Taylor, Haydar Ulus, Ozzie Uzoanya and Glynis Vince

ABSENT

Chris Bond, Elaine Hayward, Ertan Hurer and Dino Lemonides

111

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

112

MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING

Rabbi Daniel Epstein, from the Cockfosters and North Southgate Synagogue, gave the blessing.

113

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ORDINARY COUNCIL BUSINESS

The Mayor thanked Rabbi Daniel Epstein for his blessing.

She then informed members about the sad deaths of former Councillor, Mayor and Freeman of the Borough, Bill Price and of Lord Parkinson who served as

MP for Enfield West from 1970-1974. She asked members to join with her in sending condolences to their families.

A minutes silence was held in their memories.

Councillor Neville said a few words in memory of Bill Price and Lord Parkinson. Councillor Taylor added his memories of Bill Price.

The Mayor then made the following announcements:

1. Update on Mayoral Engagements

The Mayor advised that she had attended many different engagements since the last Council meeting including:

- The London New Year's Day Parade – Enfield's entry this year finished in eighth position.
- The Lord and Lady Mayoress's Children's Fancy Dress Party attended with two young Enfield residents.
- The London Government Dinner.
- Welcoming representatives from the Youth Parliament to the Mayor's Parlour.
- Being part of the audience for the opening of the new St Anne's Catholic High School's Sixth Form Centre.
- The Holocaust Memorial Day Commemoration at the Dugdale Centre, on 27 January 2016.

2. London Healthy Workplace Charter Award

The Mayor was pleased to announce, following the presentation of evidence at the London Healthy Workplace Charter Accreditation Day, that Enfield had been awarded the top level "excellence" award - the first London borough to be accredited at this level.

The workplace charter provided a framework and process for accreditation in workplace health and wellbeing. The Charter had been developed by the Greater London Authority from the national workplace wellbeing charter. Accreditation was open to London based organisations in the public, private and charity sectors.

The charter standard placed an emphasis on health and safety, occupational health, human resources, wellbeing policies and practices, along with health initiatives such as healthy eating and sport.

The Mayor congratulated all involved and invited John Griffiths (Head of Occupational Health and Safety), Julie Mimmagh (Head of Human Resources – Operations) and Geoff Norburn (Senior Administrator Health, Housing and Adult Social Care) to come forward and formally receive the award.

3. Lawyers in Local Government (LLG) Awards

The Mayor announced that the following officers had received Lawyers in Local Government awards. Keiley Broadhead, legal officer, had been named Junior Lawyer of the Year. Duncan Creevy had been a runner up in the Fellow of Chartered Legal Executives Category and Enfield's Legal Team had been runners up in the Legal Team of the Year category. She congratulated all involved for doing so well.

Keiley Broadhead was formally presented with her award.

4. Display of Enfield Vestry Minute Books

The Mayor drew members attention to the display of Enfield Vestry Minute Books from St Andrew's Church, dated 1671 to 1744, set out on the table by the entrance to the Council Chamber.

The display had been provided by Enfield's Library and Museum's Service. At the time St Andrew's was the administrative and religious centre for Enfield. These could therefore be said to be the earliest form of Enfield Council minutes.

The Mayor thanked the Library and Museum Service for putting on the display and hoped that as many members as possible would take the opportunity look at a very interesting piece of local history.

5. Mayor's Charity Ball – 12 March 2016

The Mayor reminded members that tickets were now available for her charity ball on 12 March 2016 at Forty Hall, in support of Dementia Care. Tickets could be bought from Alison Brookes in the Mayor's Office. She hoped that everyone would attend.

114 MINUTES

AGREED that the following minutes be confirmed and signed as a correct record:

- (1)** Ordinary Council Meeting – Wednesday 11 November 2015; and
- (2)** Extraordinary Council Meeting – Tuesday 7 December 2015.

115 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Bond, Ertan Hurer and Elaine Hayward.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Lee David-Sanders and Toby Simon.

116

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Before inviting members to declare any interests, the Mayor asked John Austin (Assistant Director Governance Projects) to make a short statement regarding dispensations and the declaration of interests requirements, in relation to Item 8 (Council Tax Support Scheme and Tax Base).

He reported that following a request from the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition, the Monitoring Officer had agreed to grant dispensations for all members under Section 33 (a) and (b) of the Members Code of Conduct in relation to the declaration of any disclosable pecuniary interest they may have relating to agenda items 7 (Opposition Business on Cycle Enfield) and 13.4 (Motion 13.4 on the Housing and Planning Bill)..

The Monitoring Officer was satisfied that were likely to be sufficient members with a disclosable pecuniary interest which would adversely affect the transaction of business that evening. The political representation in the chamber would be similarly affected so as to alter the outcome of any vote on the matter. Members were informed that any who may have a disclosable interest could on this occasion take part in the debates and vote on these matters. The dispensations only related to this meeting.

He also reported that in accordance with guidance from the Secretary of State, there was no requirement for members to declare disclosable pecuniary interests in Item 8 on the agenda, even though they may pay council tax within the borough, or may be in receipt of council tax support.

He advised that there was, however, a legal requirement for any member who was two months or more in arrears on their Council Tax to declare that fact and not vote on any issue that could affect the calculation of the budget or council tax more specifically. No declarations were made in this respect.

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

Agenda Item 7 (Opposition Business on Cycle Enfield):

- Councillor Joanne Laban declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as a result of her employment in the office of one of the Deputy Mayors for London.

Agenda Item 13 (Motions):

Motion 13.1 (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) in the name of Councillor Barry

- Councillor Michael Lavender declared a non-pecuniary interest as he worked for an American company.

117

OPPOSITION BUSINESS - CYCLE ENFIELD

Before the start of this item Councillor Stewart moved, and Councillor Neville seconded a proposal that the time available for opposition business should be extended by 45 minutes, as there was so much public interest in the issue.

This was agreed without a vote.

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

1. That this was a major issue for the borough and it was very important that it be debated fully in terms of local democracy.
2. Although the initial funding bid had been signed by the Opposition Group, this had been on the basis that the final scheme proposals would be subject to extensive consultation. The Opposition were not opposed to enhanced cycle provision but felt that the final schemes would need to demonstrate wide public support.
3. Concerns were raised in relation to the consultation process on the A105 scheme in terms of:
 - a. The membership of the partnership boards and resident involvement in them;
 - b. The complex nature of the consultation proposals;
 - c. The lack of hard copy consultation documents and the distribution of them;
 - d. That the opening up of the consultation on line invited too many comments from outside the borough.
4. Concerns were raised in relation to the way the outcome of the consultation process had been presented. It was felt that there had not been a clear majority in support of either the A105 or the Enfield Town schemes.
5. It was felt that the consultation carried out by David Burrowes MP's better reflected the views of local residents. Out of 17,000 letters sent, 2,800 responses had been received with 75% of these against. It was also pointed out that the former leader of the Labour Group had expressed opposition in the local media.
6. Concerns were raised that the consultation documents on Enfield Town had not included Option 4, which in his view was more likely to have received support.
7. This was a scheme that would not reduce pollution and traffic congestion, as suggested.

8. The Mayor of London was saying that there should be more extensive engagement with the public and local businesses.
9. The Opposition Group had concerns about the scope of the economic impact assessment.
10. In view of the concerns raised he called on the whole Council to reject the implementation of the current A105 and Enfield Town proposals and to support the four recommendations set out in the Opposition Priority Business Paper. He felt that the Council should respond to the views of local businesses and residents, the majority of whom, in his opinion, were against the proposals.

Councillor B.Charalambous, Associate Cabinet Member for Enfield West responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

1. There was a need for change to make Enfield a better place to live and work. The Council had a responsibility to provide new services which would make Enfield fit for the twenty first century. Cycle Enfield was such a proposal.
2. He believed that an online consultation was more effective than a paper based one, as it could be accessed by more people. He added that not everyone who would be affected by the scheme would necessarily live in the borough.
3. The population of Enfield was increasing and transport needs were changing. Traffic speeds in London were now the same as over 100 years ago. Building more roads was not an option, therefore better rail and cycling facilities were needed to improve transport links.
4. A different approach to the problem was needed. He argued that the opposition group had not put forward any constructive alternatives to the Cycle Enfield proposals. He acknowledged that change was not always easy, but in this case it was necessary.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- a. The need highlighted by the members of the Opposition Group:
 - To recognise that while they were not opposed to cycling in general, it was felt to be necessary to address the concerns of residents and to change the current proposals to ensure that they had the support of all stakeholders.
 - To recognise the outcome of David Burrowes referendum which they believed had clearly set out the arguments for and against the proposals in relation to the A105 scheme.

COUNCIL - 28.1.2016

- In relation to the Enfield Town scheme, to abandon the proposal to change the traffic flows around Church Street as it was felt that they would lead to increased congestion, pollution, noise and damage Enfield Town as a shopping centre.
- To alter the proposals so that people getting off a bus would not have to step into a cycle lane.
- To accept that a proposal originating from within the local community would be preferable to that proposed and would improve buy in to the schemes.
- To understand the view that the Southbury Road proposals would result in a loss of parking spaces, would cause even more congestion than exists at present, encourage rat running in neighbouring streets, and result in loss of business for the retail parks on the A10.
- To acknowledge the impact on vulnerable and disabled people. There was a fear that disabled parking bays would be lost, that the scheme would penalise disabled people as it would delay buses. It would only benefit fit and healthy people.
- To accept the concern that there had not been enough consultation with the business community.
- To acknowledge that the health benefits of cycling had been overstated.
- To acknowledge that only 0.7% of people currently cycle and that people will always want to travel by car and the majority of road users were car drivers. Proposals which were not universally accepted would be difficult to implement. Providing cycle lanes would not make people use them. Most journeys would take too long.
- To accept that many vibrant businesses would be affected, including through the reduction in the number of parking spaces available. Enfield's record on regeneration was felt to be not as good as other boroughs and that this scheme would drive businesses away.
- To recognise that there was a lack of awareness locally about the Hertford Road scheme.
- To recognise concerns about the operation and membership of the Cycle Enfield Partnership Boards.

- To realise that there was support for cycling as long as it did not damage the local economy or create additional congestion.
- b. The need highlighted by members of the Labour Group:
- To recognise that there was evidence the cycling proposals would bring custom to the town centres, not drive it away. Seventy five percent of visitors currently arrive by methods other than by car. It was felt a pleasant street scene, with less through traffic would only encourage more to visit town centres.
 - To recognise that it was clear in the original cross party bid that the proposals always included the need for two miles of continuous segregated cycle lanes along Green Lanes, and that the original bid had had the clear support of the opposition leadership at the time.
 - To acknowledge, especially during this time of significant budget pressures, that £42m for Cycle Enfield was a major external investment which would enable a transformation in the borough's infrastructure, provide safer streets, better transport connections and improve the health of the community.
 - To be aware that the consultation process had been nominated for a Local Government Chronicle Award.
 - To acknowledge that the current proposals were initial drafts, a basis for consultation, not a final plan. Revised proposals for the A105 scheme, which were being extensively reshaped following this initial consultation, would be presented to Cabinet on 10 February 2016.
 - To recognise the importance of increasing physical activity and the amount of money spent by the NHS on coping with diseases which were often the result of a lack of physical activity. People who cycle were four times more likely to do the recommended weekly amount of physical activity necessary to live a healthy life. Cycling also promoted wellbeing and was good for everyone. It also helped young people gain independence and avoided isolation among the old.
 - To acknowledge that more cycling would result in cleaner air leading to less pollution related deaths.
 - To recognise that there were currently 110,000 cars for 312,000 residents. Future predictions indicate that by 2032 the number of cars would exceed 141,000 leading to a further increase in congestion.

COUNCIL - 28.1.2016

- To realise that only 6% of people met the current guidelines for physical activity, and that to improve these figures, it was essential to change travel behaviour to encourage more physical activity. The scheme should be supported purely on health grounds.
- To recognise the fact that so many people were attending the meeting, had put forward their views and had responded to the consultation showed that they were, contrary to opposition concerns, informed about Cycle Enfield and were engaged in the consultation. 28,000 people had visited the consultation on the Council website.
- To understand that the annual air quality limit had already been breached this year indicating an urgent need to do something to reduce fumes from vehicles and improve air quality. Many school children in the borough were affected by poor air quality. One of the most polluted places in the borough was the junction of Green Lanes with the North Circular in Bowes Ward. Concerns were raised that residents in Bowes ward appeared not to have been consulted as part of David Burrowes MP's "referendum".
- To recognise that cycling saved money, improved health and was not only good for those who cycle but for everyone, as it improved the local environment. It was not enough that it should just be a leisure activity it needed to become a realistic alternative mode of transport.
- To be aware that the old way of shopping was in decline. More and more people now shopped on line and there had to be other ways of encouraging people to visit shopping centres. Parking spaces would still be maintained for car drivers.
- To acknowledge that there were currently routes for pedestrians, trains and cars, but nothing for cyclists. It should be a duty to provide safe routes for everyone. Safe cycle routes would save lives.
- To be aware that local ward councillors were the means by which local issues could be brought forward. This discussion was a good example of local democracy in action. Southbury ward councillors have been fully involved with local residents participating in discussions about the schemes and taking any concerns forward. They have been actively promoting the consultation.
- To recognise that cities like Copenhagen were flourishing because of the cycling culture and that these proposals would stimulate the local retail economy.
- Cycle Enfield had the power to revolutionise cycling in Enfield and we should seize this opportunity to improve Enfield's infrastructure. The current traffic situation was unpleasant and could not continue.

During the course of the debate, the time for Opposition Business was extended by another 15 minutes and then for a further 20 minutes.

At the end of the debate Councillor Neville summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group as follows:

- In his view, it was clear following the recent meeting of the Cycle Enfield Partnership Board, that the proposals for the A105 scheme would be presented to Cabinet in the form considered by the Board.
- The consultation pages on the Council website may have had 28,000 hits, but only 1846 people actually responded, reflecting the complexities of the consultation.
- Experts had concluded that there was no evidence that the scheme would improve air quality. In fact, he felt that air pollution would increase because of the increased delays and congestion at junctions caused by the proposals.
- There was no real majority for the two main schemes for the A105 and Enfield Town. He believed that the current administration was ignoring people's concerns.
- In conclusion, although not opposed to cycling, he could not support the schemes as currently proposed in the light of what he felt to be the lack of clear public support and concerns raised around the consultation process.

Councillor Taylor then summed up on behalf of the majority group by highlighting that the proposals were a joint partnership between the Conservative Mayor of London and officers. They were built on an aspiration to improve the urban infrastructure, giving pedestrians, drivers, bus passengers and cyclists equal status.

In relation to the recommendations in the Opposition Priority Business Paper, he felt:

- It was counter intuitive to suggest that work should be halted on the mini Holland part of the scheme while suggesting that there should be more consultation. It was difficult to understand whether the opposition wanted more consultation or not.
- The Council would be engaging with all stakeholders including those who live and work in Enfield as well as those travelling through. All those who have an interest in the proposals.
- Option 4 in relation to Enfield Town, could not progress as it was not a scheme that Transport for London had indicated that they would be willing to fund. He felt that it would be a sham to consult on a scheme that could not be implemented. The provision of segregated cycle lanes,

along Green Lanes, was a central part of the bid. Its transformational nature was the reason it had been successful.

- Cabinet would be considering the Green Lanes proposals on 10 February 2016 and if agreed these would then be put out again for statutory consultation. Transport for London would then take a final decision on whether or not to fund the scheme.

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 Priority 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:

AGREED not to approve the following recommendation within the Opposition Business Paper:

- (1) Recommendation 1 - Halt work on the Mini Holland part of the Cycle Enfield.
- (2) Recommendation 2 - Engage properly with our real stakeholders on the design of the schemes.
- (3) Recommendation 3 – Produce new plans based on:
 - (a) Option 4 for Enfield Town
 - (b) A different approach for A105;
 - (c) Abandoning the Southbury Road Scheme; and
 - (d) Revisiting the proposed Cycling Schemes for Edmonton and the Hertford Road.
- (4) Recommendation 4 - If a suitable outcome is not achieved, then accept that the schemes which do not have both resident and business support cannot be implemented and notify the Mayor of London accordingly.

In support of the recommendations (1) – (4) above: 19

Councillor Erin Celebi
Councillor Lee Chamberlain
Councillor Jason Charalambous
Councillor Lee David Sanders
Councillor Dogan Delman
Councillor Nick Dines
Councillor Peter Fallart
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou
Councillor Robert Hayward
Councillor Eric Jukes
Councillor Michael Lavender

COUNCIL - 28.1.2016

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 recommendations (1) – (4) above: 36

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi
Councillor Daniel Anderson
Councillor Ali Bakir
Councillor Dinah Barry
Councillor Yasemin Brett
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu
Councillor Bambos Charalambous
Councillor Katherine Chibah
Councillor Gurney Dogan
Councillor Sarah Doyle
Councillor Christiana During
Councillor Nesimi Erbil
Councillor Turgut Esendagli
Councillor Krystle Fonyonga
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou
Councillor Christine Hamilton
Councillor Ahmet Hassan
Councillor Suna Hurman
Councillor Jansev Jemal
Councillor Doris Jiagge
Councillor Nneka Keazor
Councillor Adeline Kepez
Councillor Derek Levy
Councillor Mary Maguire
Councillor Don McGowan
Councillor Ayfer Orhan
Councillor Ahmet Oykenner
Councillor Vicki Pite
Councillor George Savva
Councillor Toby Simon
Councillor Alan Sitkin
Councillor Andrew Stafford
Councillor Claire Stewart
Councillor Doug Taylor
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya

Abstentions: 0

Councillor Joanne Laban declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as a result of her employment in the office of one of the Deputy Mayor's for London. She left the meeting during the debate and did not take part in the discussion.

118

COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME FOR 2016/2017 AND 2017/18 AND COUNCIL AND BUSINESS RATE TAX BASES 2016/17

Councillor Stafford moved and Councillor Brett seconded the report (Report No.168) of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services reviewing and seeking approval to changes in the local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2016/17, which Council was required to produce under section 13(A)(a) and 1A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. In addition approval was being sought to the Council Tax and Business Rate Taxbases for 2016/17.

NOTED

1. As part of the Government's welfare reform programme, the Council had adopted (in January 2013) a local Council Tax Support Scheme and was now required, on an annual basis, to consider whether it wished to revise or replace the scheme.
2. Having reviewed operation of the scheme and undertaken a programme of consultation (as detailed in sections 4 and 5 and Appendix C of the report) along with an Equalities Impact Assessment (as detailed in Appendix B of the report) a number of amendments had been recommended to the Council Tax Support Scheme, as detailed in section 6 of the report.
3. The following key amendments proposed to the Council Tax Support Scheme for 206/17:
 - a. To reduce the savings threshold from £16,000 to £6,000;
 - b. To increase the minimum contribution for working age households, not in a protected group, from 19.5% to 25%. This would increase to 26.5% in 2017/18 to reflect a year's worth of wider council funding reductions;
 - c. The Council would continue to provide a level of subsidy to the scheme, in order to reflect the full loss in government grant from the Council Tax benefit scheme. In order to ease transition and ensure the scheme remained self-financing a one off contribution of £500,000 had been recommended to the Council Tax Hardship Scheme reserve, which would be reviewed in January 2017.
4. The full Council Tax Support Scheme had been included as Appendix A to the report.

5. The amendment to the amount calculated as the Council's Tax Base for 2016/17 from 93,432 Band D equivalents, as stated in the report, to 94,317.
6. In response to initial concerns raised regarding consultation on the proposed reduction in savings threshold, the Leader of the Opposition advised that he had received confirmation that the proposal had been included as part of the consultation process and the Opposition Group were therefore minded to support the proposed amendments on the basis they had been subject to full consultation.

The recommendations in the report were then put to the vote and agreed as follows:

AGREED

- (1) To approve the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2016/17 to provide financial support for households on low incomes in paying their Council Tax as detailed in Appendix A of the report, taking into account the consultation responses (detailed in Appendix C of the report) and the Equality Impact Assessment (detailed in Appendix B of the report).
- (2) For the 2016/17 scheme, the minimum contribution for working age households, not in a protected group, be increased to 25% and the savings threshold reduced to £6,000. For the 2017/18 scheme, the minimum contribution would increase to 26.5% to ensure that the scheme retained the principle of being a fully-funded scheme.
- (3) The statutory regulation amendments and national uprating of social security benefit rates that had been incorporated into the scheme, as set out in Section 6 of the report.
- (4) In recognition of the potential for increased hardship a one-off contribution be made to the Council Tax Hardship Scheme reserve of £500,000. This would be reviewed in January 2017.
- (5) Pursuant to the report (as detailed in Appendix D) and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of the Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the London Borough of Enfield as its Council Tax Base for 2016/17 shall be 94,317 (as amended) Band D equivalents.
- (6) The Department for Communities and Local Government NNDR1 Business Rate base return for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix E to the report.

In accordance with the requirements introduced in February 2014, under the Standing Order Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken in relation to decisions 1-6 above, given their relevance to the budget setting process, with the result as follows:

For 51

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi
Councillor Daniel Anderson
Councillor Ali Bakir
Councillor Dinah Barry
Councillor Yasemin Brett
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu
Councillor Erin Celebi
Councillor Lee Chamberlain
Councillor Bambos Charalambous
Councillor Jason Charalambous
Councillor Katherine Chibah
Councillor Lee David-Sanders
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 Suna Hurman
Councillor Jansev Jemal
Councillor Doris Jiagge
Councillor Nneka Keazor
Councillor Adeline Kepez
Councillor Joanne Laban
Councillor Michael Lavender
Councillor Derek Levy
Councillor Mary Maguire
Councillor Don McGowan
Councillor Andy Milne
Councillor Terence Neville
Councillor Ayfer Orhan
Councillor Ahmet Oykenner
Councillor Daniel Pearce
Councillor Vicki Pite
Councillor Michael Rye
Councillor Toby Simon
Councillor Alan Sitkin
Councillor Edward Smith
Councillor Andrew Stafford
Councillor Claire Stewart

Councillor Jim Steven
Councillor Doug Taylor
Councillor Ozzie Uzoanya
Councillor Glynis Vince

Against: 0

Abstention: 0

119

UPPER SECONDARY AUTISM PROVISION

Councillor Orhan moved and Councillor Stafford seconded the report (No.154) from the Director of Finance Resources and Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer setting out a strategy and solution to the rising need in school places for the Autistic Spectrum Disorder cohort of pupils within the borough.

NOTED

1. That the report had been considered and approved by Cabinet on 20 January 2016.
2. As a result of 1. above, Council was being asked to approve the recommended addition of funds to the Council's Capital Programme (detailed within the accompanying Part 2 & Super Part 2 report) relating to the acquisition of land and associated feasibility works. Final confirmation of any decision would be subject to consideration of Report No.156 on the Part 2 & Super Part 2 report (Min.130 refers).
3. The opportunity provided to address the needs of the increasing number of pupils with autism across the borough and acquire a much needed resource that would not only provide additional school places but also allow them to remain in the borough, thus reducing the reliance on more costly out of borough placements. The proposal would also enable the Council to obtain a freehold interest in the former Minchenden School site with it being estimated that the associated costs could be recouped within a 5-6 year period.
4. The increasing demand for school places for people with autism which the Council had a statutory responsibility to meet.
5. The thanks offered by the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection to officers for their efforts in delivering the increase in provision of both mainstream and special needs school places across the borough and to parents, carers and the Autism Society for their ongoing support in development and delivery of the Special Educational Needs Strategy.

6. Whilst congratulating the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection for the efforts being made to address the increasing demand for Special Educational Need provision across the borough, the Opposition Group highlighted specific concerns regarding the proposals in relation to:
 - a. the financial implications in relating to funding of the wider elements of the scheme; and
 - b. the potential impact of any associated housing development on the surrounding area.

It was pointed out that the decision made by Cabinet was subject to a call-in from the Opposition Group in order to provide further opportunity to scrutinise the detailed proposals particularly as they related to the funding and proposals for redevelopment of the wider council assets in the Southgate Circus area.

Following a short debate Council was then asked to consider the recommendations made by Cabinet.

AGREED

- (1) To note the decision made by Cabinet in relation to the report on 20 January 2016.
- (2) Subject to consideration and confirmation of the figures detailed within the Part 2 and Super Part 2 report, to approve the following recommendations made to Council in relation to the capital funding of the scheme:
 - (a) The addition of the total acquisition budget to the Capital Programme
 - (b) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme for the acquisition of land at the Minchenden site;
 - (c) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme for the additional feasibility work to the Farbey Building, the Mews Building and part of Leigh Hunt Drive Car Park for the Minchenden ASD provision; and
 - (d) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme to carry out the detailed feasibility of associated Council assets, as shown in Appendix 2 of the Part 2 report.

In view of the concerns highlighted by the Opposition Group, the decision in relation to **2 (c)** and **(d)** above were subject to a vote, with the following result:

For: 36
Against: 19
Abstentions: 0

Please note the decision in relation to the accompanying Part 2 item was subject to a separate vote (Min.130 refers).

120

DURATION & EXTENSION OF COUNCIL MEETING

The Mayor advised, at this stage of the meeting, that the time available to complete the agenda was shortly due to expire. In order to provide sufficient time to consider the Upper Secondary Autism Provision report on the Part 2 agenda it was agreed (unanimously), having been proposed by the Mayor:

- (1) that the guillotine procedure, under Council Procedure Rule 8, should be applied to the remaining items of business on Part 1 of the Council agenda meaning they would be considered without debate; and
- (2) having completed the business on the Part 1 agenda, to extend the time available for the meeting by an additional period of 15 minutes (under Council Procedure Rule 11m) to allow completion of the business listed on the Part 2 agenda.

121

**REFERENCE FROM MEMBER & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES GROUP:
STRUCTURE OF COUNCIL MEETINGS AND AMENDMENTS TO COUNCIL
PROCEDURE RULES**

The Mayor advised that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

122

**REFERENCE FROM MEMBER & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES GROUP:
ENFIELD'S CORPORATE PARENTING BOARD FOR LOOKED AFTER
CHILDREN - CHANGES TO TERMS OF REFERENCE**

RECEIVED a report from the Interim Director of Children's Services (No.170) seeking agreement to an increase in representation of elected members on the Council's Corporate Parenting Group and deputy chairing arrangements.

NOTED that the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference had been considered and recommended to Council by the Member and Democratic Services Group on 13 January 2016.

AGREED that the proposal to increase the representation of elected members on the Council's Corporate Parenting Board from two to four (split 2:2 between both groups) along with the deputy chairing arrangements be approved, as detailed in the Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

123

COUNCILLOR'S QUESTION TIME (TIME ALLOWED 30 MINUTES)

1.1 Urgent Questions

There were no urgent questions.

1.2 Questions by Councillors

NOTED the seventy nine questions on the Council agenda and written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Members.

124

MOTIONS

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

1.1 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.”

1.2 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 flagpole to the right of the Mayor.”

1.3 In the name of Councillor Maguire:

“This council is appalled that the services that our local communities rely on continue to face deep cuts in Government funding. Enfield Council has already shouldered £118m of cuts since 2010 and is faced with further cuts in excess of £50m by 2020.

This Labour Administration, in partnership with officers, has worked hard to find innovative ways to save money, to continue to deliver services and to give best value to the people of Enfield. This Council thanks officers and members for their dedication and commitment in dealing with those cuts in a sensitive and constructive manner.

However, further cuts to funding will leave this Council struggling to deliver the services that the people of Enfield need and deserve.

This Council resolves to work with the Local Government Association, politicians, community organisations, the charity and voluntary sector, to expose the damaging and dangerous nature of these cuts and impress on the Government the need to reverse them and to fund local government properly.”

1.4 In the name of Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu:

“The country, particularly London, is facing a housing crisis and residents in Enfield are feeling the effects. This Council believes that the government’s Housing and Planning Bill will only make the situation worse; and 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.

The Housing and Planning Bill would:

- Forces ‘high-value’ council homes to be sold on the open market;
- Extend the right-to-buy to housing association tenants and

- Undermine section 106 requirements on private developers to provide affordable homes

There is no commitment in the Bill that affordable homes will be replaced like-for-like in the local area.

This Council resolves that the Bill undermines localism by granting the Secretary of State the power to override local plans, to mandate rents for social tenants and to impose a levy on stock-holding councils, violating the terms of the Housing Revenue Account self-financing deal.

This Council calls on the government to grant local authorities the powers and financial ability to increase the supply of housing for our residents. Councils must be given the financial flexibilities they need to be able to scale up housing development, both in partnership and directly.”

125

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

AGREED to confirm the following changes to committee memberships:

1. Conservation Advisory Group

Councillor Kepez to be replaced by Councillor Hurman.

126

NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

There were no nominations to outside bodies.

127

CALLED IN DECISIONS

None received.

128

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that the next meeting of the Council will be held at 7.00pm on Wednesday 24 February 2016 at the Civic Centre.

129

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

AGREED in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for consideration of Item 1 listed on Part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as

amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

130

UPPER SECONDARY AUTISM PROVISION

Councillor Orhan moved and Councillor Stafford seconded a report from the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer (No.156) providing additional detail in support of the Capital funding approvals being sought under the strategy for addressing the rising need in school places for the Autistic Spectrum Disorder cohort of pupils within the borough.

NOTED

1. The report had been submitted in conjunction with Report No 154 on the Part 1 agenda (Min.119 refers). The recommendations in the report had been agreed and referred on to Council, at the Cabinet meeting held on 20 January 2016.
2. Council was being asked to approve the addition of funds to the Capital Programme for the elements of the strategy detailed in the report.
3. Further information in support of the strategy and financial approvals was circulated at the meeting under restricted circulation in accordance with the Council's Super Part 2 procedure.
4. Whilst aware of the need to maintain confidentiality in relation to the commercial terms of the proposed land transactions, concerns were raised by the Opposition Group at the restricted circulation of the additional detail contained within the Super Part 2 report and associated financial implications. This was on the basis the information had only been tabled once the Council had moved into Part 2 of the agenda and at the limited time this had provided for members to consider the additional details provided.

Although recognising the concerns raised by the Opposition Group, the Leader of the Council confirmed that a briefing on the Super Part 2 report had been provided, in advance of the Cabinet meeting, for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and that it would not be possible (given the timing of the decisions required) for consideration of the recommendations to be deferred.

Having received the additional information provided within the Super Part 2 report Council was then asked to consider and confirm the inclusion of the additional costs identified for the scheme within the Capital Programme in accordance with the recommendations made by Cabinet and supporting information in Report No.154 on the Part 1 agenda.

The recommendations were then put to the vote, with the Opposition Group advising that on the basis of the additional information provided within the Super Part 2 report and limited time available to consider it, they would no longer be prepared to confirm any of the recommendations considered under the accompanying Part 1 agenda item (Min.119 refers).

Having been put to the vote the recommendations were agreed with the following result:

For: 36
Against: 14
Abstentions: 2

AGREED having considered the additional supporting information within the Part 2 and Super Part 2 report to confirm, further to the decision in relation to Report No154 on the Part 1 agenda:

- (1) The addition of the total acquisition budget for acquisition of the Minchenden site and associated feasibility studies (as detailed within 2.2 of the Part 2 & Super Part 2 report) to the Council's Capital Programme.
- (2) The addition of funds to the Council's Capital Programme (to the upper limit identified within 2.2(i) of the Part 2 and Super Part 2 report) for the acquisition of land at Minchenden.
- (3) The addition of funds to the Council's Capital Programme (as detailed in section 2.2 (ii) of the Part 2 and Super Part 2 report) for the planning, procurement phases and internal design feasibility work to the Farbey building, Mews building and part of Leigh Hunt Drive car park for the ASD provision at Minchenden.
- (4) The addition of funds to the Council's Capital Programme (as detailed in section 2.2 (v) of the Part 2 and Super Part 2 report) for the detailed feasibility work in relation to the Southgate Circus Library site and associated Council assets.

(Exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended)