

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2016**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care), Nneka Keazor (Cabinet Member for Public Health and Sport), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration), Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development), Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) and Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community Organisations and Culture)

Associate Cabinet Members (Non-Executive and Non-Voting): Vicki Pite (Enfield North) and George Savva MBE (Enfield South East)

ABSENT Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield West)

OFFICERS: Rob Leak (Chief Executive), Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration and Environment), Bindi Nagra (Assistant Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services), Jenny Tosh (Interim Chief Education Officer), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Mohammed Lais (Senior Asset Management Surveyor), Gary Barnes (Business Development), Doug Ashworth (Development Manager - Property Services), Nicholas Bowater (Programme Manager - Enfield 2017), Jemma Gumble (Health, Housing and Adult Social Care) and Laura Berryman (Press Officer) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillor Derek Levy (Chair – Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield West).

2

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

3

URGENT ITEMS

NOTED, that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012, with the exception of Report No.155 – Approval of Non-Minor Amendments to the Inter Authority Agreement and Replacement of Levy System with Menu Pricing Arrangements for Waste Disposal (Minute No.13 below refers). These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear days in advance of meetings.

AGREED, that the above report be considered at this meeting.

4

DEPUTATIONS

NOTED, that no requests for deputations had been received for presentation to this Cabinet meeting.

5

ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

AGREED, that the following item be referred to full Council:

1. Report Nos. 154 and 156 – Upper Secondary Autism Provision

6

SECTION 75 AGREEMENT - INTEGRATED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Councillor Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.150) seeking agreement for a revised Partnership Agreement between Enfield Council and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust.

NOTED

1. that this agreement formalised the Integrated Mental Health Service joint working arrangements, facilitating ongoing effective partnership working between the two parties. In addition, it ensured that the two parties continued to work together to deliver access to high quality health and social care services for local people, improving outcomes for health and social care in the borough.
2. That within the period of the extension, the Council and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust would work together with the Enfield

2017 programme to identify areas of business process and IT systems that could be redesigned and re-engineered to improve outcomes at lower cost.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED that a number of alternative options had been considered and these had included the following:

- Do Nothing – this had been viewed as unviable as the 2008 Section 75 agreement was outdated and no longer represented the partnership arrangements which were currently in place. By implementing a new agreement both parties could maintain integrated provision for delivery of services to people with mental health difficulties for whom the Trust and Council had a responsibility to provide health and social care.
- Terminate the 2008 Section 75 agreement and end partnership arrangements – this had been viewed as unviable as both parties wished to continue to deliver the integrated service provision and it was therefore necessary to formalise the arrangements to safeguard service delivery.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Endorse the formal termination of the 2008 Section 75 Agreement and that it be replaced by the revised Section 75 Agreement between Enfield Council and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust to formalise arrangements for the Integrated Mental Health Service.
2. Delegate to the Assistant Director of Strategy and Resources in conjunction with the Clinical Director for Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust responsibility for varying the schedules in line with joint working arrangements between Enfield Council and the Trust.
3. Delegate to the Assistant Director of Strategy and Resources in conjunction with the Clinical Director for Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust responsibility for working with the Enfield 2017 programme to identify and implement efficiencies within the service that improve outcomes and increase value for money.

Reason: Enfield Council and the Trust had a history of joint working to deliver an Integrated Mental Health Service. The current Section 75 Agreement was produced in 2008 and was therefore not representative of the arrangements currently in place. Through the implementation of a revised Section 75 agreement, both parties were committed to ensuring the continued delivery of the service, while recognising that efficiencies and improvements could be made.

(Key decision – reference number 4128)

7

APPROVAL OF THE ENFIELD ENFORCEMENT POLICY

CABINET - 20.1.2016

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.151) seeking approval of the Enfield Enforcement Policy.

NOTED

1. That the Enforcement policy set out the Council's approach to dealing with non-compliance robustly and swiftly and, covered a range of services, as detailed in the report.
2. That enforcement was a key tool for the Council in protecting the quality of life of its residents. Robust enforcement was essential for public confidence in upholding the integrity of the regulatory regimes that the Council administered to protect residents, the public, businesses and workers. The Council also recognised that good regulation was supportive to the economic vitality and growth of the economy and local businesses.
3. That if there was a serious or imminent risk of harm, danger, nuisance or injury the Council would take formal enforcement action immediately as required, as detailed in the report.
4. That the Enforcement Policy had been placed on public consultation for a period of 16 weeks, the feedback received as part of the consultation was set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
5. Members discussed the importance of publicising enforcement action (as referred to in section 3.6 of the report). A discussion took place on methods that could be considered for future publicity including the potential use of CCTV footage.
6. The number of complaints and service requests typically received each year as detailed in section 3.2.3 of the report. It was noted that there were relatively few prosecutions for certain breaches, however, this would be affected by, for example, instances when fixed penalty notices were accepted.
7. Members discussed the effectiveness of the pilot "Tidy Gardens Programme" and highlighted the need for proportionate enforcement action to be taken.
8. Members were supportive of robust enforcement and appropriate publicity of action taken, as set out in the report.

Alternative Options Considered: There were no appropriate alternative options.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed that the Enfield Enforcement Policy be approved.

Reason: Services such as Environmental Health, Licensing and Trading Standards were required by the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 to have regard to the Regulators' code (published by the Better Regulation Delivery Office) which specified that the Council should have an enforcement policy and have regard to the principles set out in the Regulators' Code in undertaking enforcement activities. In addition, other statutory guidance also required that the council had an enforcement policy such as the Food Standards Agency's "Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Controls by Local Authorities", made under the Food Standards Act 1999.

(Key decision – reference number 4040)

8

ASSET MANAGEMENT - POTENTIAL DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL OWNED PROPERTIES - TRANCHE 6

Councillor Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.152) seeking approval in principle to the sale of various Council properties listed in the report for the reasons outlined.

NOTED

1. That a plan was circulated at the meeting illustrating the location of the proposed disposals across the Borough. The report set out 8 potential disposals, 6 within the Borough and 2 out of borough. Robust tests had been applied to identify the properties as now surplus to the Council's requirements.
2. That the proceeds from the sales would be used to offset the borrowing requirements of the Council's capital programme.

Alternative Options Considered: Retention of property without regular review was clearly not in the Council's business interests. If property was not disposed of, it would cause a reduction in capital spending or increased borrowing. However evaluation of individual cases might result in retention being the better option.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. That approval be given in principle to the disposal of those properties listed in the Appendix to the report.
2. To delegate the method of sale and the approval of provisionally agreed terms of sale to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.

Reason: Potential disposal of the properties was recommended as being in the Council's best financial interests balanced against service and community needs.

(Key decision – reference number 3989)

9

FLEXIBLE HOUSING

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.153) setting out proposals for the provision of flexible housing in the Borough.

NOTED

1. The significant pressure on temporary accommodation in the Borough and the continuing difficulty in identifying quality, affordable leased accommodation. Over the last few years a number of initiatives had been introduced to alleviate some of this pressure, including the purchase and renovation of properties by Housing Gateway, the development of new build units by Enfield Innovations and borough wide negotiations on the cost of nightly paid accommodation. However, the expected rise in temporary accommodation required consideration of other solutions.
2. That the report identified key priorities that could be applied in moving forward. Approval was being sought to start a procurement process and to identify potential sites.
3. The need to ensure the provision of high quality flexible housing. Members asked that they be given an opportunity to view examples of potential units to be used. This would preferably be of flexible housing already in place in other Boroughs; but if this was not possible then a viewing be arranged with the manufacturers as appropriate.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, the alternative options which had been considered as set out in full in section 4 of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Agreed the principle of providing flexible accommodation in response to increasing budget pressures and housing demand, subject to individual schemes being financially viable and providing a cost effective alternative to Nightly Paid Accommodation.
2. Agreed the principles for the units and site requirements to inform the procurement specification and site search, as outlined in section 3.21 of the report.
3. Noted that the subsequent award of a contract for the provision of units and the allocation of funding would be subject to Cabinet approval.

CABINET - 20.1.2016

4. Noted that initial financial analysis indicated that a flexible housing scheme had the potential to be financially viable; however, viability was influenced by a number of variables so a robust financial model would be produced for each scheme based on accurate costs.
5. Agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency (and where the sites relate to HRA land, in addition the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration and the Director of Regeneration and Environment), to approve the site selections for flexible housing, subject to obtaining necessary planning consents.
6. Agreed to approve a variation in the remit of Housing Gateway to permit the purchase of flexible accommodation and delegate to the shareholder representative, the Assistant Director of Legal and Governance, to notify the company of this decision.

Reason: There was a shortage of cost effective, value for money temporary accommodation in the borough, so rents were increasing, placing significant budgetary pressure on the Council. The full reasons for the recommendations were set out in section 5 of the report.

(Key decision – reference number 4238)

10

UPPER SECONDARY AUTISM PROVISION

Councillor Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer (No.154) providing a strategy and solution to the rising need in school places for the Autistic Spectrum Disorder cohort of pupils in the Borough.

NOTED

1. That Report No.156 also referred as detailed in Minute No.12 below.
2. That the report sought agreement to the strategy which would allow additional school places for children and young people and provide an opportunity to stay within the Borough, as detailed in the report. Authority was sought for the freehold acquisition of the former Minchenden School site to fulfil the requirements of the rising ASD places that were needed in the Borough.
3. That a further report to Cabinet and Council was anticipated for July 2016, outlining the detailed business case to support the delivery proposals.
4. The detail provided within figures 4 and 5 of the report setting out the cumulative cost avoidance over the course of a six year period of providing the required places within the borough rather than out-

CABINET - 20.1.2016

borough. The annual cost difference in year 6 was projected to be £3,988,241 and the accumulated difference £13,511,511.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED the alternative options which had been considered as set out in section 5 of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed the following decisions and recommendations to full Council:

1. Noted the rise and demand for places at the higher end of the Autistic Disorder Spectrum and associated costs.
2. Agreed to approve the Council's acquisition of the freehold interest in the land and buildings that form all of Minchenden School (as shown in appendix 1 of the report) which were owned by the Barnet and Southgate College on the terms detailed within the part 2 report (Report No.156, Minute No.12 below referred) and further approved, subject to the approval of Council, the total acquisition budget also detailed within the part 2 report and:
 - (i) To recommend that Council approve the addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed in the part 2 report for the acquisition of land and;
 - (ii) To recommend that Council approve the addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed within the part 2 report 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.
 - (iii) Agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Members for Finance and Efficiency and, Education, Children's Services and Protection, in conjunction with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer to approve the final terms and structure of the transaction in accordance with the Council's Property Procedure Rules.
3. Agreed to approve in principal (subject to feasibility and a further report to Cabinet) the Council's redevelopment options of Southgate Circus Library and approves the option on Southgate House as detailed within the part 2 report, and:
 - (i) To recommend that Council approve the addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed within the part 2 report to carry out the detailed feasibility of associated Council assets as shown in appendix 2 of the part 2 report.
 - (ii) Agreed to approve the grant of a 125 year lease to Barnet and Southgate College for accommodation of 1,000sqm on the Southgate Circus Library site at a premium noted in the part 2 report.
 - (iii) Agreed to approve the Public Library function to relocate to Barnet and Southgate College's Learning Resource Unit at

Southgate College with delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection in conjunction with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to approve the final structure of the partnership.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL to approve

1. The addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed within the part 2 report (Report No.156, Minute No. 12 below referred) for the acquisition of land and:
2. The addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed within the part 2 report 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.
3. The addition of funds to the Capital Programme as detailed within the part 2 report to carry out the detailed feasibility of associated Council assets as shown in Appendix 2 to the part 2 report.

Reason: This was a rare opportunity in the Enfield property market. The acquisition would mean that there would be a sufficient supply of pupil places to match the anticipated demand within the Borough for several years to come. This was the only viable site now available and possibly in the future that could support this type of need. The acquisition of the Minchenden site would satisfy the requirements for space standards as set out within the guidance set by the Department for Education. The outline Business Case set out in the part 2 report demonstrated that the funding arrangements for this project were achievable and the Council should explore further with higher level feasibility for each project.

(Key decision – reference number 4209)

Members agreed at this point of the meeting to move into part two and exclude the press and public in order to consider the part two report on this matter, No.156, Minute No.12 below refers.

11

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the item listed on part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that it involves 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) (Minute No.12 below refers).

12

UPPER SECONDARY AUTISM SPECTRUM

CABINET - 20.1.2016

Councillor Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer (No.156).

NOTED

1. That Report No.154 also referred as detailed in Minute No.10 above.
2. That further super part 2 information was provided at the meeting under restricted circulation (Report No.156A). The tabled report was collected in again following consideration by the Cabinet.
3. That the recommendations set out in Report Nos. 156 and 156A were reflected in the recommendations to Council and the decisions of Cabinet below.
4. The potential financial benefits to the Council in the provision of school places to out borough pupils.
5. The financial implications of the proposals and how it was proposed to fund the project, as set out in the report.
6. The significant work which had been carried out to date and the detailed negotiations which had taken place.
7. The detailed proposals for moving forward with the project as set out in full in the report and outlined by officers at the meeting. A further report would be presented to a future Cabinet meeting for Members' consideration and agreement.

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No.154, Minute No.10 above refers.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL to approve

1. The acquisition of the freehold interest in the land and buildings that form all of Minchenden School (shown in appendix 1 to the part 1 report) at the price set out in recommendation 2.1 of the report.
2. The total acquisition budget which included the amount detailed in recommendation 2.1 of the report and the initial feasibility budgets as set out in recommendation 2.2 of the report, and that this amount be added to the Council's capital programme as detailed within the report and:

Minchenden Site

- (i) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme to an upper limit, set out in recommendation 2.2 (i) of the report, for the acquisition of the land at Minchenden.

- (ii) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme, as detailed in recommendation 2.2 (ii) of the report, for the Planning, Procurement Phases and internal design feasibility for the ASD Provision at Minchenden.

Southgate Circus Library

- (iii) The addition of funds to the Capital Programme, as detailed in recommendation 2.2 (v) of the report for the feasibility work for the Southgate Circus Library Site

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed, in addition to the recommendations to Council set out above, to:

Minchenden Site

1. Agree the decision set out in recommendation 2.2 (iii) of the super part 2 report (No.156A).
2. Agree the decision set out in recommendation 2.2 (iv) of the super part 2 report (No.156A).

Southgate Circus Library

3. Note that the initial budget would be used to appoint consultants to assist in preparing scheme designs, feasibility studies, other investigations, site preparation and public consultation to support the preparation and submission of a planning application and appropriate documents to assist in the procurement of a developer/contractor and inform the main business case (recommendation 2.2 (iv) of Report No.156).
4. Note that a further Cabinet report would be presented prior to the submission of planning with updated cost and capital return projections to inform the main business case for the provision of the school (recommendation 2.2 (vii) of Report No.156).
5. Agree the appointment of the company detailed in recommendation 2.2 (viii) of Report No.156 to work on the scheme(s) (Key decision 4196) to Planning Stage (RIBA Stage D+)
6. Agree the decision set out in recommendation 2.2 (ix) of the super part 2 report (No.156A).

Reason: As detailed in Report No.154, Minute No.10 above refers.
(Key decision – reference number 4209)

At the conclusion of Members' consideration of Report Nos.156 and 156A, the meeting moved back into part one and dealt with the remaining part one agenda items as set out in the minutes below.

13

APPROVAL OF NON-MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT AND REPLACEMENT OF LEVY SYSTEM WITH MENU PRICING ARRANGEMENTS FOR WASTE DISPOSAL

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.155) seeking approval of the revised Inter Authority Agreement.

NOTED

1. That the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) was the legal document that governed the interface between the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) and the seven constituent Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) (of which Enfield Council was one) for waste disposal.
2. That the Menu Pricing Mechanism (MPM) within the IAA was the proposed process by which NLWA would recover its waste disposal and operating costs from WCAs. The current system was a levy based approach whereby costs were apportioned between WCAs in proportion to the tonnage of household waste delivered. The proposed MPM apportioned costs across actual delivered tonnages relating to waste streams and services. If approved by all WCAs the new process would begin from 1 April 2016.
3. The rationale for a menu pricing arrangement as set out in section 3.10 of the report.
4. The detailed amendments to the IAA as set out in full in section 3 of the report.
5. The benefits to Enfield as set out in section 5.4 of the report, which included the mitigation of financial pressures and, that the proposed plant at Edmonton would utilise air cooling technology rather than water cooling meaning there would be no visible plume from the facility and this would benefit Enfield residents.
6. Councillor Stafford expressed his appreciation to Councillor Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) and Ian Davis (Director – Regeneration and Environment) for successfully securing the benefits detailed in the report for the benefit of Enfield residents.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED the alternative options which had been considered as detailed below and in section 4 of the report:

1. Not to sign the revised IAA and Menu Pricing Mechanism (MPM). This would result in the Levy not changing in 2016. This might have a negative impact on recycling rates across North London as there would be reduced financial incentive for Boroughs to increase recycling and might also result in difficulties delivering partnership projects going forward. NLWA was the statutory Waste Disposal Authority for the North London area which meant the Council was legally obligated to dispose of their municipal waste through the NLWA arrangements.

CABINET - 20.1.2016

2. The original proposal included transitional arrangements before 2016 for phasing in menu pricing early. This was intended to provide financial incentives for Boroughs to increase recycling as early as possible. LBE felt that this was not an options as the proposal gave rise to significant financial pressure for the Borough and that the basis for the MPM costs should be revisited.
3. The option to base the levy on a per capita charge had also been explored however this approach would not be financially viable for the Borough and would not encourage sustainable waste management approaches and so had been discounted.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve in principle the change from the current levy process for payment of waste disposal and associated costs, to the Menu Pricing process included at Appendix 1 of the report.
2. Approve the revised Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) document attached at Appendix 1 of the report of which the amendments were detailed at section 3.11 to 3.41 of the report, subject to decision 3 below.
3. Delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Director of Regeneration and Environment to approve, subject to any minor changes, the version of the revised IAA document attached to the report and following the approval, to enter into the IAA.

Reason: The Council had been working with the NLWA and the other 6 Waste Collection Authorities (WCA) since 2004. NLWA was legally obligated to provide disposal services for the WCAs within its area and had the power both to raise levies from the WCAs for this and to direct WCAs to deliver waste to NLWA contractors. The proposed IAA and Menu Pricing Mechanism provided a transparent and equitable method for apportioning costs across all WCAs. The IAA was intended to promote and enable collaborative working and therefore benefit all partners to the agreement in the longer term (section 5.3 of the report referred). It was recommended that LBE enter into the revised IAA and MPM as under the agreement a number of benefits would be secured, as set out in paragraph 5.4 of the report.

(Key decision – reference number 4032)

14

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

NOTED, that no issues had been submitted for consideration at this meeting.

15

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

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

**16
MINUTES**

AGREED, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 16 December 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**17
MINUTES OF LOCAL PLAN CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 14 DECEMBER 2015**

NOTED, for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee held on 14 December 2015.

**18
MINUTES OF ENFIELD COMMUNITY SUPPORT FUND CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE**

NOTED, for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Enfield Community Support Fund Cabinet Sub-Committee held on 16 December 2015.

**19
ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

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

**20
DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED, that the next meeting of the Cabinet was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 10 February 2016 at 8.15pm.

AGREED, following consultation with Cabinet Members, that the March Cabinet meeting be rescheduled to take place on Tuesday 15 March 2016. This change in date was due to the LGC Awards having been scheduled to take place on Wednesday 16 March, the original Cabinet meeting date.