



Contact: Jacqui Hurst  
Cabinet Secretary  
Direct : 020 8379 4096  
or Ext:4096  
e-mail: jacqui.hurst@enfield.gov.uk

## **THE CABINET**

**Wednesday, 14th December, 2016 at 7.00 pm in the Conference Room, Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA**

### **Membership:**

Councillors : Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader of the Council), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health & Social Care), Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health), Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration & Business Development)

### **Associate Cabinet Members**

Note: The Associate Cabinet Member posts are non-executive, with no voting rights at Cabinet. Associate Cabinet Members are accountable to Cabinet and are invited to attend Cabinet meetings.

Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting), George Savva MBE (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting) and Vicki Pite (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting)

### **NOTE: CONDUCT AT MEETINGS OF THE CABINET**

Members of the public and representatives of the press are entitled to attend meetings of the Cabinet and to remain and hear discussions on matters within Part 1 of the agenda which is the public part of the meeting. They are not however, entitled to participate in any discussions.

Cabinet are advised that any recommendations included within the reports being considered by Cabinet as part of this agenda, that are for noting only, will not be subject to the Council's call-in procedures. Such recommendations are not deemed to be decisions of the Cabinet, but matters of information for the Executive.

## **AGENDA – PART 1**

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members of the Cabinet are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

## **DECISION ITEMS**

### **3. URGENT ITEMS**

The Chair will consider the admission of any reports (listed on the agenda but circulated late) which have not 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.

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

### **4. DEPUTATIONS**

To note, that no requests for deputations have been received for presentation to this Cabinet meeting.

### **5. ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL**

To agree that the following reports be referred to full Council:

1. Report No.156 – Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan
2. Report No.157 – ICT Capital Investment 2017-2020

### **6. APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR ENFIELD TOWN (Pages 1 - 24)**

A report from the Director of Regeneration and Environment is attached. This seeks approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield Town.  
**(Key decision – reference number 4112)**

Note: For ease of reference, the appendices to this report have been provided separately to the main agenda and are listed as a supplementary pack on the Council's website.

(Report No.151)  
(7.10 – 7.40 pm)

**7. APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 (NORTH)** (Pages 25 - 44)

A report from the Director of Regeneration and Environment is attached. This seeks approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements on the A1010 North between Southbury Road/Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/Mollison Avenue. **(Key decision – reference number 4115)**

Note: For ease of reference, the appendices to this report have been provided separately to the main agenda and are listed as a supplementary pack on the Council's website.

(Report No.152)  
(7.40 – 8.10 pm)

**8. REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2016/17: OCTOBER 2016 AND 2017/18 BUDGET UPDATE**

A report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services **will be circulated as soon as possible. (Key decision – reference number 4367)**

(Report No.153)  
(8.10 – 8.15 pm)  
**TO FOLLOW**

**9. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITOR SECOND QUARTER SEPTEMBER 2016 BUDGET YEAR 2016-17** (Pages 45 - 56)

A report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services is attached. This informs Members of the current position up to the end of September 2016. **(Key decision – reference number 4363)**

(Report No.154)  
(8.15 – 8.20 pm)

**10. PROPOSED SUBMISSION EDMONTON LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN** (Pages 57 - 64)

A report from the Director of Regeneration and Environment is attached. This seeks endorsement of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan for recommendation to Council for approval for publication. **(Key decision – reference number 4389)**

Note: For ease of reference, the appendix to this report has been provided separately to the main agenda and is listed as a supplementary pack on the Council's website.

(Report No.156)  
(8.20 – 8.25 pm)

**11. ICT CAPITAL INVESTMENT 2017-2020** (Pages 65 - 78)

A report from the Chief Executive and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services is attached. This outlines the proposed next phase of ICT investment. **(Key decision – reference number 4410)**

(Report No.157)  
(8.25 – 8.30 pm)

**12. SENIOR JOB PAY STRUCTURE AND TITLES** (Pages 79 - 88)

A report from the Chief Executive is attached. This reviews the current pay structure for senior leaders in the Council. (Non key)

(Report No.158)  
(8.30 – 8.35 pm)

**13. AWARD OF THE SUBSTANCE MISUSE RECOVERY SERVICE CONTRACT** (Pages 89 - 100)

A report from the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care is attached. This seeks approval for the award of the new contract. (Report No.162, agenda part two also refers) **(Key decision – reference number 4302)**

(Report No.160)  
(8.35 – 8.40 pm)

**14. BURY STREET WEST - DEVELOPMENT**

A report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services **will be circulated as soon as possible**. (Report No.163, agenda part two also refers) **(Key decision – reference number 4008)**

(Report No.161)  
(8.40 – 8.45 pm)

**TO FOLLOW**

**15. ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

To note that there are no items to be considered at this meeting.

**16. CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS** (Pages 101 - 104)

Attached for information is a provisional list of items scheduled for future Cabinet meetings.

**17. MINUTES** (Pages 105 - 116)

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 16 November 2016.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **18. QUARTERLY CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT (Pages 117 - 136)**

A report from the Chief Executive is attached. This provides performance information against the indicators contained in the Corporate Performance Scorecard. **(Key decision – reference number 4330)**

(Report No.155)  
(8.50 – 8.55 pm)

### **19. ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

To note that there are no written updates to be received.

### **20. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To note that the next meeting of the Cabinet is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 18 January 2017 at 8.15pm

## **CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

### **21. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for the items of business listed on part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006)  
(Members are asked to refer to the part 2 agenda)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 151****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet  
14 December 2016

|                         |                |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part: 1</b> | <b>Item: 6</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------|

**REPORT OF:**

Ian Davis  
Director - Regeneration  
and Environment

**Subject: Approval of Cycle Enfield  
Proposals for Enfield Town**

**Wards: Grange, Highlands, Southbury and  
Town**

**Key Decision No: KD4112**

Contact officer and telephone number:

Bob Griffiths: 020 8379 3676

E mail: [bob.griffiths@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:bob.griffiths@enfield.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Members consulted:**

**Cllr. Daniel Anderson and Cllr. Krystle  
Fonyonga**

**Associate Cabinet Member: Cllr. Vicki Pite**

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report seeks approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield Town. These proposals are part of the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London and will be fully funded by Transport for London (TfL). The proposals contained in this report are expected to deliver economic, health and transport benefits for local residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 To note the results of the public consultation on options 1 and 6A and the resulting changes made to the design.
- 2.2 To note the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment, the parking assessment, the traffic modelling, the equalities impact assessment and the comments of critical friends. These assessments were made in respect of the emerging design following public consultation.
- 2.3 That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield town centre
- 2.4 That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £288,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation.
- 2.5 That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to further traffic modelling, consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and make any additional changes as appropriate.

### 3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 In March 2013 the Mayor of London published his Vision for Cycling with the overarching aim to double the number of people cycling by 2023. The Vision, which is supported by funding of £913m over 10 years, set out four key elements:

- A Tube Network for the Bike – providing a network of cycle route across London
- Safer Streets for the Bike – a range of measures to improve cycle safety at junctions and to improve lorry safety
- More People Travelling by Bike – making cycling a mainstream and popular mode of transport
- Better Places for Everyone – more cycling will benefit everyone, not just people that cycle.

3.2 One of the key elements of the vision was the ‘Mini-Hollands’ programme, which allocated £100m to help boroughs deliver a step change in cycling and emulate some of the best practice seen in Holland and elsewhere. The programme was open to all outer London boroughs with funding awarded following a competitive bidding process.

3.3 Enfield’s bid, which had cross-party support, was based on the following elements:

- Providing segregated cycle lanes along the length of the A105 (Enfield Town to Palmers Green), A110 (Enfield Town to Lee Valley Road) and A1010 (Waltham Cross to Angel Edmonton);
- Revitalising Enfield Town and Edmonton Green town centres by improving the public realm and rebalancing space for traffic, pedestrians and cyclists (see para. 5.7 on Public Realm Improvements);
- Introducing ‘Quieter Neighbourhoods’ to address traffic rat-running through residential streets;
- Extending the Greenway network to promote leisure cycling;
- Addressing severance caused by the A10 and A406 North Circular Road;
- Introducing ‘Cycle Hubs’ at Enfield Town and Edmonton Green; and
- A range of supporting measures to encourage more people of all ages to take up cycling.

3.4 Enfield, Waltham Forest and Kingston were announced as the three successful bids in March 2014, each receiving in the region of £30m from the Mayor’s Mini-Hollands fund. Enfield has allocated further external funding to the project (principally significant elements of its annual LIP allocation from TfL), taking the total funding available for the project (locally branded as ‘Cycle Enfield’) to £42m.

3.5 In July 2014 the then Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety agreed to expenditure of £700,000 to commence the design and



consultation process. In September 2014 Cabinet agreed to the governance arrangements for the project, including the establishment of three Partnership Boards to allow a wide range of stakeholders to participate in the project. In April 2015 Cabinet agreed to the expenditure of an additional £1.9m to support the design and consultation process. In February 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green. In June 2016, Cabinet approved the Cycle Enfield Spending Plans for 2016/17. In July 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation on the A1010 South. In August 2016, the Cabinet Member for Environment granted approval to implement the A105 scheme and make the associated Traffic Management Orders (TMOs).

- 3.6 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help transform our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to travel safely by cycle.
- 3.7 This report sets out the consultation undertaken to date on the Enfield Town scheme and how this has helped shape the design. However, there will be further opportunities for public engagement as part of the detailed design process. In particular, many of the scheme elements, including the mandatory cycle lanes and amendments to waiting and loading arrangements etc. will require the making of traffic management orders. As part of the order making process there is a statutory requirement to consult a number of prescribed organisations and affected parties and to consider any objections or representations made.
- 3.8 Should the scheme proceed, there are also several aspects of the detailed design yet to be finalised, including the designs of the public realm improvements at Fountain Island, the area in front of Enfield Town station and the link between the Town park and the library. These will be developed in conjunction with the local community, with co-design workshops planned for Spring 2017. In addition, further detailed design will be undertaken covering issues such as bus mitigation measures; signing and lining; drainage; lighting and surfacing materials. This important stage also allows further consideration of a number of detailed concerns raised during the consultation process, including the need to minimise the risk of conflict with pedestrians at bus stop boarders and equalities.
- 3.9 The remainder of this report describes the Enfield Town consultation process; sets out the impact of the scheme on parking, town centre vitality, air quality, health and congestion; and highlights how the scheme has been amended to address other concerns raised during the consultation.

#### **4. CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 4.1 Enfield Town is the fourth of five main road cycling schemes to be delivered as part of the Cycle Enfield programme. The A110 Southbury Road

scheme is later in the programme and will be the subject of a separate report to Cabinet.

- 4.2 The purpose of the Enfield Town consultation exercise was to inform decision making and help shape the proposed scheme aimed at providing high quality, segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle. The consultation process included a series of awareness raising campaigns to encourage both debate and participation in the consultation.
- 4.3 On 17 February 2015, the Council held a public engagement event at the Dugdale Centre to enable local residents and businesses to find out about the alignment and scope of the Enfield Town scheme and make comments using post-it notes. This event was attended by more than 200 people.
- 4.4 On 26 June 2015, the original proposals for Enfield Town underwent a TfL sponsor review. This meeting was attended by Jacobs (the Council's designers), LBE officers and representatives from different parts of TfL. As a result of this review, various amendments were made to the designs to improve alignment with the London Cycle Design Standards.

### **12-week Consultation**

- 4.5 In early September 2015, we wrote to approximately 53,000 properties within a 1 Km radius of the centre of Enfield Town, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the 12 weeks consultation. We also consulted residents associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Police and the other emergency services, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/major-projects/enfield-town-road-scheme-consultation/>. We also provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy.
- 4.6 On 24 September 2015, the Council held a business event at the Dugdale Centre Centre for business owners/managers to find out about the proposals and to let us know how and when goods are delivered and where their customers park etc. This event was attended by 40 people.
- 4.7 On 25 & 26 September July 2015, the Council held a public exhibition at the Dugdale Centre to launch the public consultation. This event provided an opportunity for local residents to peruse the detailed proposals and discuss any concerns with officers and the designers. Over the two days, a total of 367 people attended the exhibition.
- 4.8 Towards the end of November 2015, booklets were delivered to approximately 53,000 properties within a 1 Km radius of Enfield Town to remind people to have their say.
- 4.9 The public consultation started on 25 September 2015 and ran until 18 December 2015.

- 4.10 Enfield Council received a total of 2,707 responses to the online consultation. Option 1 was fully supported by 29.8% (806) of respondents and partially supported by 3.8% (103) of respondents. 64.6% (1749) of respondents did not support this option, whilst 1.8% (49) either had no opinion or were unsure. Option 6A was fully supported by 13.7% (370) of respondents and partially supported by 14.7% (398) of respondents. 69.2% (1872) of respondents did not support this option, whilst 2.4% (67) either had no opinion or were unsure. The results of the consultation and resulting changes to design can be found at Appendix B1.
- 4.11 Throughout 2016, the Council's designers have continued to amend the initial proposals to take account of the extensive consultation feedback, which favoured the Cecil Road remaining one-way with two-way cycle lanes, and Church Street remaining open for all vehicular access, and the new Mayoral priority of "walking and cycling". The amended proposal may be less transformational than that shown in the bid, but still delivers significant cycling and town centre improvements. It also enables future enhancements to be delivered in the longer-term as part of the ongoing Master Plan for Enfield Town.
- 4.12 On 12 October 2016, the amended proposals were reviewed at a design surgery by Urban Design London. The notes/ recommendations from that meeting can be found in Appendix F.
- 4.13 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, presentations were made to the Enfield Town Partnership Board on 15 November 2016 and Project Board on 24 November 2016. A pack containing comments received from both boards was provided to Members in advance of the meeting to enable Cabinet to consider them as part of the decision-making process.

### **Youth Engagement**

- 4.14 Over the summer of 2016, Council Officers delivered a programme of engagement to better understand the views of younger people on the Cycle Enfield programme. This group has consistently been under represented in previous consultations. The combined number of responses to the A105, Enfield Town, Southbury Road and A1010 South consultation totalled 5065 responses. Of these, 32% (1622 responses) were from people aged over 60 and just 3% from people aged under 20.
- 4.15 During August and September 2016, 16 mini exhibitions were held across the borough (at leisure centres, festivals and other young people community events), displaying details of the Cycle Enfield programme. Young people at these events (aged between 8 – 24 years old) were surveyed about how they would like to travel around the Borough and whether they support Enfield Council's proposals to invest in cycle lanes across the Borough. There were 1,112 responses to the survey, which found that 79% (884) supported the investment in cycle lanes, 7% (82) did

not support and 13% (146) were not sure. Further details about youth engagement can be found at Appendix B2.

### **Impact Assessments**

- 4.16 On 28 October 2015, we commissioned Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants to undertake an air quality assessment for five main road cycling schemes, including Enfield Town.
- 4.17 On 19 November 2015, we commissioned Regeneris Consultants to assess the economic impacts of the Enfield Town scheme on Enfield town centre.
- 4.18 In November 2016 a predictive equalities impact assessment was undertaken. This assessment confirms that the scheme will have a generally positive effect in tackling inequality and can be found at Appendix E.

### **Impact on Blue Light Services**

- 4.19 The Metropolitan Police Neighbourhood Partnerships Support & Operations Unit stated:

“In principle, the Metropolitan Police support and encourage greener forms of transportation such as cycling and this must fit into a modern world with all other forms of vehicular traffic. Our own officers on cycles will also benefit from the introduction of designated cycle lanes.

We would be keen to be given more time in advance of the design workshops to consult with colleagues within boroughs such as Westminster, where cycle schemes not dissimilar to this one are already in place. This will enable us to benefit from lessons learned and feed these into the designs for Enfield.

We have considered the risks associated with the scheme as it currently stands, and our initial points are summarised below:

- Communication strategy for project to link in with TFL to prevent congestion with buses timetable
- Cecil Road blind spots for two-way traffic for cycle lane but one way vehicular traffic.
- Cecil Road - potential collisions with large scale deliveries to rear of shopping chains
- Cecil Road is a poorly lit area design should incorporate this factor to make the cycle lanes safe.
- Emergency vehicles travelling at speed to be aware of blind spots and two way cycle lane traffic conflicting one way vehicular access.
- To ensure Safer Transport police are invited to the co-design workshops in 2017 to provide safety advice.”

4.20 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit stated:

“It's a little difficult for me to give a detailed response from the limited contact I've had with the scheme. In addition, the Traffic Management Unit would tend to only comment/object on a safety and casualty reduction basis. That said, the scheme itself has merit. The plan is to rejuvenate the area and create a more welcoming and safer place for all road users. Your design proposal lists a couple of additions I am supportive of (countdown timers, better designed crossings, traffic calming) as these look to improve collision and casualty rates. And taken as a whole, upon initial examination, the proposals look to fairly balance the needs of all roads users, whilst still offering additional safeguards for the more vulnerable road user.”

4.21 The London Fire Brigade Station Manager for Southgate fire station stated:

“London Fire Brigade in Enfield have reviewed the proposed cycle route revision for Enfield Town and supports the change with the following observations.

The ‘Moritz 1996 study’ into cycle lanes provides strong evidence that cars pass closer to cyclists on roads without cycle lanes due to the absence of a physical barrier. Further analysis of the impact of cycle lanes introduced in European towns and cities also indicate a reduction in the number of accidents taking place involving cyclists.

London Fire Brigade welcomes programmes which enhance the safety of all road users which in turn reduce incidents attended by fire crews. This being said, it has also been identified that significant changes to road layouts have occasionally resulted in road traffic collisions due mostly to individual drivers failing to either understand the change or apply sufficient attention.

We welcome steps that are taken which provide extensive information to drivers and pedestrians regarding road changes via a variety of methods prior to and during the initial stage of the implementation.

#### Operational response

Our review of the planned physical changes have not identified that they will have a negative impact to the response times of fire appliances in Enfield. Whilst this is our position presently, fire crews are required to report their observations of their actual experiences travelling under emergency conditions and whilst performing their general duties.

#### Traffic separators

I have noted the proposed introduction of traffic separators and further note the physical makeup of these separators will allow fire appliances and other emergency vehicles to drive over them in emergency situations without hindrance.

### Raised tables

A particular observation made by emergency crews centre on the impact to response time following the introduction of speed humps and raised tables. The Mercedes fire appliance used in London carries 3000 litres of water. When full the impact to the physical attributes of the appliance when travelling at speed over uneven or raised surfaces is a factor taken into account by our drivers.

Our assessment of the proposed raised tables would be that their design incorporates a gentle incline at either end thus reducing the impact to the appliance when travelling at speed. It is also preferable that the length of the tables are consistent with the length of the Mercedes fire appliance and are of greater length whenever possible.

### Widened crossings

It is felt that the widened controlled crossings will increase the number of pedestrians able to cross roads safely in what is predominantly a busy commercial area. However, to eliminate any concerns over the increased number of pedestrians being physically on the road at the approach of a fire appliance responding to an emergency. Local planning must ensure authorised parking sites, street furniture and other structures that are placed near crossings do not affect the line of sight of an approaching emergency service vehicle thus hindering the drivers entire view of the crossing.

### Traffic/congestion

We are unable to provide a fact based position regarding the impact of the introduction of the proposed changes and will once, and if introduced, comment further upon receipt of reports from fire crews.

Needless to say in our last safety plan London Fire Brigade stated that we will endeavour to provide a fire appliance anywhere in London within 6 minutes of being called and the second in 8 minutes.”

#### 4.22 The Stakeholder Engagement Manager for London Ambulance Service stated:

“My concerns remain the same as detailed in other correspondence around such schemes. Such as:

- The LAS has unhindered 24/7 access to all road networks.
- Traffic should be able to move out of the path of LAS vehicles engaged on emergency calls safely.
- Producing bottlenecks in flow should be avoided.
- The manufacture of such a scheme shouldn't produce increased traffic flow or rat runs/heavy traffic in surrounding streets.”

## **5. SCHEME DESIGN PROPOSALS**

- 5.1 The Enfield Town scheme helps address three key themes: transforming our high streets and town centres; delivering long-term health benefits; and enabling people to travel safely by cycle.
- 5.2 This scheme involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of Cecil Road; additional traffic signals to reduce conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions; widened pedestrian crossings on Church Street; public realm improvements at Fountain Island and the plaza in front of Enfield Town station; a new link between the Town Park and the library; the installation of bus stop boarders, side road entry treatments and raised tables; remodelling of key junctions. The scheme drawings can be found at Appendix A.
- 5.3 Light segregation is defined in the London Cycle Design Standards (2014) as “the use of physical objects intermittently placed alongside a cycle lane marking to give additional protection from motorised traffic”.
- 5.4 To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to make changes to parking and loading as outlined in section 5.8 below.
- 5.5 Subject to Cabinet approval, the detailed design and statutory consultation will be undertaken by Ringway Jacobs via the London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC).

### **5.6 Bus Lanes and Bus Stops**

- 5.6.1 Detailed discussions have taken place with TfL about the impact of the scheme on bus services and their views have been taken into account in developing the current designs and mitigation measures.
- 5.6.2 In the proposed design, the bus stops on Church Street will remain in their current locations. On Cecil Road, Bus Stop S, east of Raleigh Road, will be merged with bus stops W and X to the east. The Bus stand located west of Raleigh Road will be relocated to the Little Park Gardens bus station. The northbound stop on London Road (Stop V) has been relocated south and the Genotin Road stop has remained in its current location.
- 5.6.3 Bus stop by-passes are proposed on Cecil Road, with shared bus boarders at the stops on London Road and Genotin Road, with a 0.5m ‘buffer’ strip between the kerb and the cycle lane.

5.6.4 To accommodate the cycle lane on London Road south of Genotin Road, it will be necessary to remove the northbound bus lane. This section of bus lane was originally due to be removed as part of the A105 scheme, but was left in place for logistical reasons.

## 5.7 Public Realm Improvements

5.7.1 Public realm improvements will be incorporated through the town centre area with key locations being:

- Fountain Island at the eastern end of Church Street
- Improved crossings on Church Street
- The plaza in front of Enfield Town station
- New link created between the Town Park and the library

5.7.2 To inform the detailed plans for Enfield Town and ensure community buy-in, a co-design event will be organised where local resident and business owners can help shape the final design of some of the key public spaces. This is expected to take place in early Spring 2017 and will provide further opportunity for engagement.

## 5.8 Parking Implications

5.8.1 The proposed changes to parking and loading in the town centre are summarised below.

| Location/Type of facility | Existing Spaces | Proposed Spaces                      |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Church Street West</b> |                 |                                      |
| Disabled Parking          | 0               | 2                                    |
| Pay and Display bay       | 14              | 0                                    |
| Loading                   | 11              | 8                                    |
| <b>The Town</b>           |                 |                                      |
| Disabled Parking          | 1               | 1                                    |
| Loading                   | 8               | 6                                    |
| Motorcycles               | 12 metre bay    | Relocated to New River Loop Car Park |
| Taxi                      | 0               | 3                                    |
| <b>London Road</b>        |                 |                                      |
| Loading                   | 6               | 5                                    |
| <b>Cecil Road</b>         |                 |                                      |
| Pay & Display Bay         | 5               | 0                                    |



5.8.2 Furthermore, two additional disabled bays also introduced on Little Park Gardens, replacing existing pay and display bays.

## 5.9 Economic Impact Assessment

5.9.1 Regeneris Consulting were commissioned to undertake an economic impact assessment of the Cycle Enfield Scheme on the economic vitality of Enfield Town centre. The assessment focuses on the current turnover of the town centre and assesses how this may be affected by Cycle Enfield both during the construction phase and the operational phase, once the scheme has been implemented. It also recognises that the potential transformational effect of the proposals could, if achieved, lead to a 10-15% uplift in spend. Indeed, in section 3.134 of their report they document 3 case studies, which show increased footfall of up to 30% after public realm improvements. However, this potential uplift has not been factored into the assessment as it is not guaranteed.

5.9.2 The Economic Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix D, but the overall conclusions are summarised in the table below:

|              | Construction Phase |                |                 | Operational Phase |            |                 |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------|
|              | Better Case        | Base Case      | Worst Case      | Better Case       | Base Case  | Worst Case      |
| Enfield Town | Negligible         | Minor Negative | Medium Negative | Medium Positive   | Negligible | Medium Negative |

5.9.3 The following measures have been identified by the consultants and will be implemented to ensure that impact of construction and operation is minimised and to enable the operational phase to reach either a neutral or positive level:

### Construction Phase Mitigation

5.9.4 The ongoing design and planning process provides an opportunity to develop and refine a number of important pre-construction mitigation approaches.

- **Design of construction works** – engineers should bear town centre vitality in mind and do as much as possible to limit disruption to businesses and users;
- **Traffic management plan** – could help to scope out congestion issues and ensure that alternative provisions are put in place where possible; and
- **Publicity and business liaison** – widely publish delivery plans to ensure that town centre businesses and users are aware of what the work entails, how they might be impacted and when.

5.9.5 Once the construction work is underway, a range of additional mitigation measures can be developed to help reduce disruption:

- **Approach to construction** – ensure that construction is undertaken in a way which is considerate to local businesses and town centre users;
- **Ongoing business liaison** – explore the potential for the contractors to employ a specific business liaison officer for the duration of the construction period; and
- **Proactive efforts to maintain footfall flows** to local shops during construction e.g. develop a coherent town centre parking strategy for both the construction and operational phases of Cycle Enfield and local way-finding to guide pedestrians if necessary.

### **Operational Phase Mitigation**

5.9.6 Once the scheme is operational, there is potential to deploy additional measures to mitigate negative impacts or maximise positive impacts of the scheme on town centre vitality as follows:

- **Traffic flow** – introduce traffic management measures and add new junctions to SCOOT cells to minimise congestion delays;
- **Loading/unloading** - offer to work with individual businesses to explore alternative loading and unloading solutions to minimise cost impacts for businesses;
- **Town centre management** – e.g. through town teams to enhance overall economic vitality, helping to develop stakeholder relationships, identify and respond to issues and offer opportunities for proactive work to enhance town centre vitality; and
- **Employment and training** – explore the potential to engage local residents, particularly young people in the delivery process.

## **5.10 Air Quality Impact and Health**

5.10.1 Without any of the Cycle Enfield proposals, the air quality objective for annual average NO<sub>2</sub> is predicted to be exceeded in Enfield town centre.

5.10.2 With the introduction of the proposals and assuming a 2.5% reduction in traffic, there are predicted to be both increases and decreases in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations near junctions. At the junction of Church Street with Windmill Hill, concentrations are predicted to increase by more than 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> where queuing traffic is introduced. At the other junctions the NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations show both increases and decreases, for instance, where the road is proposed to be narrowed from two lanes to one lane, concentrations decrease at the start of the queue, but increase where the queue extends further from the junction. An example of this is the junction of Cecil Road with Sydney Road where the average delay per vehicle is predicted to increase from 9 seconds per vehicle to 19 seconds per vehicle whilst the queue length increases from 4 vehicles long to 22 vehicles long. Away from the junctions, the reduction in traffic results in small decreases in NO<sub>2</sub>

concentrations close to the major roads. It is, however, important to note that increases in NO<sub>2</sub> will also be found in the vicinity of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings caused by queuing traffic.

- 5.10.3 With greater reductions in traffic flows, the increases in concentrations at queues become smaller and the decreases in concentrations along the rest of the road become greater.
- 5.10.4 The changes to the traffic flows are predicted to bring about only small decreases in particulate matter PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
- 5.10.5 The scenarios were run through an air pollution computer simulation modelling programme to make predictions of their effects on air pollution levels. The results of this work showed that none of the scenarios tested made a significant reduction in the distance from the edge of the road that air pollution levels exceed air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide and particulates. The Air Quality Standards Regulations set emissions standards levels for various pollutants, these include nitrogen dioxide and particulates which are emitted from road traffic. If these standards are breached it is referred to as an 'exceedance' of the standard.
- 5.10.6 On balance, taking into account both air quality impacts and the potential for more people to engage in active travel, the proposed scheme can play a significant part in supporting the council's objective to improve the health of residents in the borough and to address health inequality.
- 5.10.7 The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) consultation on air quality (Air Pollution – outdoor air quality and health) recognises its profound impact on both health and health inequalities. This includes the 52,630 life-years lost per year due to PM<sub>2.5</sub> particulates and the further loss of 88,113 life-years from NO<sub>2</sub> exposure in London alone. Implementing many of their recommendations will lead to improved health and quality of life. These include those aimed towards input into Supplementary Planning Documents, urban planning, providing infrastructure to support low and zero emission travel, travel planning, vehicle idling and congestion zones.
- 5.10.8 The Council is working with its NHS colleagues to improve health in the borough. The Chair of Enfield CCG is very supportive of our Cycle Enfield programme both because it will make Enfield better and more pleasant but also because of the huge costs of physical inactivity to the NHS. This includes an increased risk of 20 – 30% in conditions such as diabetes, cancer, obesity and dementia. Diabetes alone costs the NHS some £25,000 per minute. It is unfortunate therefore that some of the draft recommendations that contradict NICE's own guidance and are likely to actually increase pollution. For example, NICE guidance Physical Activity and the Environment recommends that 'pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of transport that involve physical activity are given the highest priority when developing or maintaining streets and roads'. Recommending off-road or quiet streets for cycle routes will inevitably take a circuitous route to destinations thereby encouraging car-use and pollution. Similarly,

Enfield has followed NICE guidance to introduce traffic calming schemes to make streets more attractive for walking, cycling and children to play thereby increasing health and stopping pollution at source.

5.10.9 The Council is also disappointed that NICE's draft guidance does not seem to recognise recent evidence from Cambridge University that the health benefits of physical activity through cycling far outweigh any dis-benefits of air pollution<sup>1</sup> or that trees and the natural environment encourage people to walk and cycle.

1. *Tainio et al. [Can air pollution negate the health benefits of cycling and walking?](#) Preventive Medicine; 5 May 2016; DOI: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.02.002*

## 5.11 Congestion and Journey Times

5.11.1 Modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of scheme on congestion for buses and general traffic. Modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of scheme on congestion for buses and general traffic. Modelling shows that the proposed network can accommodate existing traffic levels in the AM and PM peak but in the Saturday Peak 10% of through trips will need to reassign to alternative routes. Further details of the results of the modelling can be found in Appendix G.

5.11.2 The modelling results show the following estimated impact on buses as a result of the proposed scheme. The results are shown in minutes for both directions of each route.

| Route                     | Estimated Change in Journey Time Per Route (Mins) |              |             |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|
|                           | AM  | PM           | Sat         |
| W9 Eastbound              | 0.5 to 1.5  | -1 to 0      | 0.5 to 1.5  |
| W9 Westbound              | 2.5 to 3.5  | 1 to 2       | 0.5 to 1.5  |
| 231/121/191/307 Eastbound | -0.5 to 0.5                                       | -1.5 to -0.5 | 0 to 1      |
| 231/121/191/307 Westbound | 3 to 4  | 2 to 3       | 0.5 to 1.5  |
| 192/317 Eastbound         | -1 to 0   | -1.5 to -0.5 | 1 to 2      |
| 192/317 Westbound         | 3.5 to 4.5  | 3 to 4       | 1 to 2      |
| 377 Southbound            | 0.5 to 1.5  | -0.5 to 0.5  | -0.5 to 0.5 |
| 377 Westbound             | 1 to 2  | 2 to 3       | 1 to 2      |
| 329 Southbound            | 0 to 1  | 0.5 to 1.5   | 0 to 1      |
| 329 Northbound            | 1.5 to 2.5  | 2 to 3       | 1.5 to 2.5  |
| W8 Southbound             | 0.5 to 1.5  | -1 to 0      | -1 to 0     |
| W8 Northbound             | -0.5 to 0.5                                       | 0.5 to 1.5   | 0 to 1      |

5.11.3 The above estimated journey times equate to an average delay per bus of approximately 1 to 2 mins in the AM, and 0.5 to 1.5 mins in the PM and

Saturday peak. To mitigate the impact of these delays, LB Enfield are investigating bus priority measures on sections of the routes outside the Enfield Town study area, to improve the impact on overall bus journey times.

5.11.4 The table below shows the impact on vehicle journey times as a result of the scheme based on no reduction in traffic volumes in the AM and PM Peak hours and 10% of through-traffic in the Saturday Peak. The table compares through-routes and also key routes into the town centre from the west to the Palace Gardens car park and from the south to Palace Exchange car park.

| Route          |                          | Additional Delay Per Movement (Secs) |            |            |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                |                          | AM                                   | PM         | Sat        |
| Through Trips  | West to East             | 0 to 1                               | 0.5 to 1.5 | 0.5 to 1.5 |
|                | East to West             | 3.5 to 4.5                           | 2.5 to 3.5 | 1 to 2     |
|                | South to North           | 0 to 1                               | 0.5 to 1.5 | 0.5 to 1.5 |
|                | North to South           | 0.5 to 1.5                           | -1 to 0    | -1 to 0    |
| Car Park Trips | West to Palace Gdns      | 0.5 to 1.5                           | 0 to 1     | 0.5 to 1.5 |
|                | Palace Gdns to West      | 0 to 1                               | 1 to 2     | 0.5 to 1.5 |
|                | South to Palace Exchange | 0.5 to 1.5                           | 0.5 to 1.5 | 0 to 1     |
|                | Palace Exchange to South | 0.5 to 1.5                           | 2.5 to 3.5 | 2 to 3     |

5.11.5 The results show that the east to west route is most heavily affected by the scheme for through-routes and the two-way trip between the South and Palace Exchange, for the key routes into the town centre.

5.11.6 Based on the number of vehicles travelling along the through-routes shown in the above table, the average increase in journey per through- movement is approximately 0.5 to 1.5 mins.

5.11.7 When considering the wider impact of the traffic reduction in the Saturday Peak, a worst case scenario has been assumed, with no reduction related to cycling mode shift and all traffic re-assigns onto local alternative routes. The results of these calculations are based on origin and destination survey calculations and are summarised in the table below, indicating that the most significant reassignment is assumed to occur on the Willow Road, with 91 Passenger Car Units (PCUs) in total (approximately 45 each way) transferring to the alternative route in the peak hour.

| Local Diversion Route               | Two-way Hourly Increase (PCUs) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Chase Side/Parsonage Lane           | 45                             |
| Willow Road                         | 91                             |
| A10/ Trinity Avenue/Park Avenue     | 75                             |
| Green Dragon Lane/ Old Park Ridings | 29                             |

5.11.8 These journey times are based on the proposed junctions and bus stops. More details of the impact of the scheme on congestion and journey times are set out in Appendix G.

5.11.9 In considering these additional delays, it should be noted that congestion is likely to increase at Enfield Town (and on other routes) in the light of forecast population and employment growth. Providing the infrastructure to enable more people to cycle forms part of the strategy to maintain accessibility and reduce congestion in the medium to long term.

## 5.12 Enfield Town Masterplan

5.12.1 The Council is advancing a regeneration strategy for Enfield Town, through an Enfield Town Centre Master Plan. This will unlock identified development sites and guide new investment. The Master Plan will progress as a Supplementary Planning Document and will form part of Enfield's Local Plan in due course.

5.12.2 With highway capacity in the town centre constrained, public transport, walking and cycling will need to play a critical role in supporting future growth. The significant improvement in cycle facilities delivered by Cycle Enfield is therefore consistent with aims of the emerging Master Plan.

5.12.3 The Master Plan will focus on opportunities at the eastern end of the town centre, adjacent to Enfield Town station and the key adjoining sites. At this stage the form of development for the various sites is not known. However, the Council is aware that there has been interest to develop this area, including Genotin Road Car Park, which has been identified as a key opportunity site. Consequently, some sensitivity testing has been carried out to look at the implications of a more efficient use of Genotin road Car Park. One test therefore considers the possibility of an intensified use of Genotin Road Car Park, with an assumed employment use and a reconfigured car park. This test highlights that the network can continue to perform at an acceptable level, but emphasises the need for the Master Plan to promote highly sustainable forms of development.

5.12.4 Regeneris were asked to assess the impact of such development and loss of parking to Enfield Town Centre. They conclude that there is sufficient capacity at other car parks parking during the daytime on weekdays, with

the occupancy rate only reaching 95% at peak times of the year. Loss of parking would have no additional impact on Enfield Town. However, retention of 75% of existing capacity at Genotin Road Car Park during evenings and weekends would be required to ensure limited impact on the overall number of spaces available in Enfield Town. This report is attached at appendix D2

## **6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.7million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £37.6million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

## **7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- To create better, healthier communities;
- To make cycling a safe & enjoyable choice for local travel;
- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone;
- To provide better travel choices for the 34% of Enfield households who have no access to a car and an alternative travel choice for the 66% that do;
- To transform cycling in Enfield;
- To encourage more people to cycle;
- To enable people to make short journeys by bike instead of by car;
- To increase physical activity and therefore the health of cyclists;
- To reduce overcrowding on public transport;
- To enable transformational change to our town centres

## **8. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **8.1 Financial Implications**

8.1.1 The total estimated cost of detailed design and statutory consultation is £288,000, which will be fully funded by Transport for London. This is all Mini Holland funding, which can only be spent on delivering the Mayor's Cycle Vision.

8.1.2 Expenditure once approved by TfL will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TfL. The funding arrangements are governed through the TfL Borough Portal and no costs will fall on the Council. The release of funds by TfL is based on a process that records the progress of the works against approved spending profiles. TfL makes payments against certified claims as soon as costs are incurred, ensuring the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement.

8.1.3 Use of the funding for purposes other than those for which it is provided may result in TfL requiring repayment of any funding already provided and/or withholding provision of further funding. TfL also retains the right to carry out random or specific audits in respect of the financial assistance provided.

## **8.2 Legal Implications**

8.2.1 Under the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999, the Mayor is empowered, through TfL, to provide grants to London Boroughs to assist with the implementation of the Transport Strategy. TfL is charged with responsibility of ensuring that the key rationale for allocating grants is the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

8.2.2 The generic matters to which TfL will have regard in allocating financial assistance and the generic conditions that will apply to any such assistance are:

- Under section 159 of the GLA Act, financial assistance provided by TfL must be for a purpose which in TfL's opinion is conducive to the provision of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities or services to, from or within Greater London.
- In order to ensure this purpose is met, TfL may have regard to the following matters when exercising its functions under section 159:
  - Any financial assistance previously given
  - The use made by the authority of such assistance
- Conditions – section 159(6) of the GLA Act also allows TfL to impose conditions on any financial assistance it provides and in specified circumstances to require repayment. Other more detailed conditions may be imposed that relate to particular projects.

8.2.3 Under section 65 of the Highways Act 1980, a highway authority may, in or by the side of a highway maintainable at public expense, construct a cycle track as part of the highway; and they may light any cycle track constructed by them under this section.

8.2.4 Under the Localism Act 2011, local authorities have a general power of competence.

8.2.5 In exercising powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to securing the 'expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway'. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises and the effect on



the amenities of any locality affected. Any final decision to implement any scheme needs to take account of the considerations set out above and the outcome of public consultation. Any changes to parking restrictions and the introduction of cycle lanes will be subject to the making of a Traffic Management Order pursuant to powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

- 8.2.6 Before making any decision with respect to this matter, the Cabinet must conscientiously consider the consultation responses.

### **8.3 Property Implications**

There are no corporate property implications arising from this report.

## **9. KEY RISKS**

- 9.1 The Cycle Enfield Project Delivery Team monitors and considers risk management issues at its regular meetings, and directs remedial action as necessary.
- 9.2 If the Council proceeds with these proposals there is a risk of delays due to traffic order objections, delays due to traffic signal approvals and delays due to Statutory Undertaker consents and works. If the Council does not proceed with these proposals there is a risk of increased congestion and increased pollution as the population grows and a modal shift in transport is not effected and no economic, health and transport benefits. However, the economic benefits are not guaranteed, see paragraph 5.9 above.

## **10. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **10.1 Fairness for All**

Enfield Town is part of a safe, convenient and extensive cycle route network that will make cycling a viable transport choice for all. 32.5% of households in the borough do not have access to a car or van. This scheme will improve transport for all and increase cycling amongst all age groups.

### **10.2 Growth and Sustainability**

- 10.2.1 With forecast growth in population in the borough, the Enfield Town Scheme will help to provide a safe and efficient means of accessing Enfield town centre and contributing to its long-term vitality.

10.2.2 Cycling is a sustainable mode of transport with virtually no environmental impact compared to motorised transport. GLA population projections of an additional 45,526 people in the borough by 2040 indicate that congestion will become ever more common without a modal shift towards more sustainable transport.

### **10.3 Strong Communities**

The Enfield Town scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness. It is recognised that more people on the streets will provide 'passive surveillance' making streets more accessible for communities to use for play, meeting and social activities.

## **11. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The Council has a duty when introducing new policies and making changes to services to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This includes persons of different ages, disability, race and sex (along with other protected characteristics). The content of the duty is set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (attached as part of Appendix E). The particular duties in respect of the disabled should be noted (section 149(4)).
- 11.2 With respect to the proposals for Enfield Town, Council officers have produced an Equality Impact Assessment ("EQIA") (see Appendix E). This identifies whether or not (and to what extent) the proposals have an impact (positive or negative) on a particular equality target group, or whether any adverse impacts identified have been appropriately mitigated. The Cabinet should review the EQIA when exercising their duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in considering whether to approve the proposals.
- 11.3 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, we held four Partnership Board meetings for the Enfield Town scheme on 5 January 2015, 12 May 2015, 23 July 2015 and 15 November 2016. Meeting invitations were sent to Members of Parliament; ward councillors; residents' associations; cycling groups; disabilities groups, including Enfield Disability Action, Enfield Vision, RNIB, Age UK and Enfield Over 50s Forum and interest groups. These meetings were an excellent opportunity for representatives to influence the designs and to feed information back to the groups and organisations that they represent.
- 11.4 The EQIA includes comments from the Centre for Accessible Environments, who were commissioned to undertake a design appraisal to ensure that the proposals take account of everyone in the community,

including those with protected characteristics e.g. age and disability. The concerns raised will be addressed as part of the detailed design process.

## **12. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 The Enfield Town scheme directly contributes to the Council Business Plan as follows:

### Fairness for All

- The new infrastructure delivered as part of the Enfield Town scheme will make walking and cycling safer and enable older people and people with disabilities to maintain their independence.

### Growth and Sustainability

- The inward investment in Enfield Town centre will support sustainable regeneration and growth; and
- The public realm improvements delivered as part of the Enfield Town scheme will create an environment in which businesses and community groups can grow and thrive.

### Strong Communities

- The Enfield Town scheme will transform our borough and create a place where people want to live, work, learn and visit;
- The Enfield Town scheme will enable cycling to become an alternative means of transport for short journeys and enable people to live healthier lives; and
- The Enfield Town scheme will improve safety for all road users and make the area more welcoming.

## **13. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 The preliminary design drawings were sent to TfL's Road Safety Team in November 2016 for a stage 1 Road safety Audit. This is part of an ongoing process to identify potential road safety problems that may affect any users of the highway and, where possible, to suggest measures to eliminate or mitigate those problems. Further road safety audits will be undertaken at the end of detailed design and after construction.

13.2 The Construction, Design and Management Regulations are being followed to ensure that risks are designed out/mitigated and the Enfield Town scheme can be constructed safely.

13.3 In the public consultation, some respondents raised concern about the safety of pedestrians at bus stop borders and bus stop by-passes. These

designs have been introduced successfully in other parts of London and the UK. There are a number of Councils who have implemented these designs e.g. Camden Council and Brighton & Hove Council and monitored their impact and have not reported any significant issues.

#### **14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 The Enfield Town scheme is part of Cycle Enfield, which provides a unique opportunity to improve the health of the borough's residents and address health inequality.
- 14.2 The Chair of the Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group has issued a statement, fully supporting the aims and implementation of Cycle Enfield as it will enable people to take control of their own health, improve the health of the population and make the NHS more sustainable.
- 14.3 Compared to those who are least active sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, cancer, metabolic ill-health (type 2 diabetes), mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget.
- 14.4 There is substantial evidence to suggest that a) physical activity is essential for maximal health and b) that population levels of physical activity are far below those recommended by the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) who also recommends that levels of physical activity are most likely to be increased by activities that can be integrated into everyday life.
- 14.5 Guidelines on physical activity have been published by (amongst others) the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the Chief Medical Officers of the Four Home Countries and at least 20 other countries.
- 14.6 Health Survey (HSE) 2012 self-report data indicates that 33% males and 44% of females aged 16+ report not meeting the current Chief Medical Officer (CMO) guidelines of 150 minutes of physical activity per week. Objective data indicates that in actuality some 95% of the population may not be meeting physical activity guidelines.
- 14.7 HSE data (2012) also shows that that 79% of boys and 84% of girls aged 5 – 15 do not meet physical activity guidelines.
- 14.8 10.5% of reception year pupils in Enfield (aged 4-5) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (10.1% and 9.1% respectively). 23.3% are overweight or obese, higher than in London (22.2%) and England (21.9%).
- 14.9 25.4% of Year 6 pupils in Enfield (aged 10-11) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (22.6% and 19.1% respectively). 41% are either overweight or obese compared to 37.2% in London and 33.5% in England. This is the 6th highest in London.

- 14.10 Cycling can be a very effective means of integrating physical activity into everyday life. In the Netherlands cycling accounts for some 34% of journeys up to 7.5km (4.6 miles). The population attributable fraction of mortality due to inactivity in the Netherlands is 1/3 to 1/2 that of the UK. It is estimated that 57% of Copenhagen residents cycle (e.g. undertake physical activity) everyday.
- 14.11 Whilst paragraph 5.10 acknowledges the air quality impacts of the scheme, cycling is good for health; it does not impact on air quality and those who cycle for non-sporting purposes are four times more likely to meet physical activity recommendations than people who do not cycle. The health benefits of cycling far outweigh the risks associated with air pollution and it is estimated that in London a person would need to cycle 9.15 hours before the effects of air pollution negate the positive effects of physical activity.
- 14.12 Improving cycling facilities in the borough has the potential to significantly increase the disposable income all residents in the borough. Academic studies indicate that those in the least wealthy quintile spend approximately 30% of their income on transport.
- 14.13 Other benefits to the individual could include greater access to employment, education, shops, recreation, health facilities and the countryside.
- 14.14 The greatest gain in the health of the public will be from increased physical activity. However, other benefits may accrue to the wider Enfield community that could result from a long-term modal transport shift towards cycling.

### **Background papers**

None

### **List of Appendices:**

Appendix A: Post-consultation drawings [To be available at the Cabinet meeting and in the Group offices and the Members' Library]

Technical drawing for Enfield Town revised design:

<http://cycleenfield.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Draft-Enfield-Town-Revised-Option-Design.pdf>

Appendix B1: Consultation report

Appendix B2: Youth engagement report

Appendix C: Air quality assessment

Appendix D: Economic impact assessment

Appendix D2: Cycle Enfield – Enfield Town Impacts

Appendix E: Predictive equalities impact assessment

Appendix F: Comments of critical friends

Appendix G: Preliminary traffic modelling assessment

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 152****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet  
14 December 2016

|                         |                |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part: 1</b> | <b>Item: 7</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------|

**REPORT OF:**

Ian Davis  
Director - Regeneration  
and Environment

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Subject: Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 North</b></p> <p><b>Wards: Enfield Highway, Enfield Lock, Ponders End, Southbury and Turkey Street</b></p> <p><b>Key Decision No: KD4115</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Members consulted: Cllr. Daniel Anderson and Cllr Krystle Fonyonga.</b><br/><b>Associate Cabinet Member: Cllr Vicki Pite.</b></p> |
|---|

Contact officer and telephone number:

Bob Griffiths: 020 8379 3776

E mail: bob.griffiths@enfield.gov.uk

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report seeks approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements on the A1010 North between Southbury Road/ Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/ Mollison Avenue. These proposals are part of the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London and will be fully funded by Transport for London (TfL). The proposals contained in this report are expected to deliver economic, health and transport benefits for local residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 To note the results of the public consultation.
- 2.2 To note the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment, the parking assessment, the traffic modelling, the equalities impact assessment and the comments of critical friends.
- 2.3 That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 North, between Southbury Road/ Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/ Mollison Avenue .
- 2.4 That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £368,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation, which will be fully funded by Transport for London.
- 2.5 That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and make any additional changes as appropriate.

### 3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 In March 2013 the Mayor of London published his Vision for Cycling with the overarching aim to double the number of people cycling by 2023. The Vision, which is supported by funding of £913m over 10 years, set out four key elements:

- A Tube Network for the Bike – providing a network of cycle route across London
- Safer Streets for the Bike – a range of measures to improve cycle safety at junctions and to improve lorry safety
- More People Travelling by Bike – making cycling a mainstream and popular mode of transport
- Better Places for Everyone – more cycling will benefit everyone, not just people that cycle.

3.2 One of the key elements of the vision was the ‘mini-Hollands’ programme, which allocated £100m to help boroughs deliver a step change in cycling and emulate some of the best practice seen in Holland and elsewhere. The programme was open to all outer London boroughs with funding awarded following a competitive bidding process.

3.3 Enfield’s bid, which had cross-party support, was based on the following elements:

- Providing segregated cycle lanes along the length of the A105 (Enfield Town to Palmers Green), A110 (Enfield Town to Lee Valley Road) and A1010 (Waltham Cross to Angel Edmonton);
- Revitalising Enfield Town and Edmonton Green town centres by improving the public realm and rebalancing space for traffic, pedestrians and cyclists;
- Introducing ‘Quieter Neighbourhoods’ to address traffic rat-running through residential streets;
- Extending the Greenway network to promote leisure cycling;
- Addressing severance caused by the A10 and A406 North Circular Road;
- Introducing ‘Cycle Hubs’ at Enfield Town and Edmonton Green; and
- A range of supporting measures to encourage more people of all ages to take up cycling.

3.4 Enfield, Waltham Forest and Kingston were announced as the three successful bids in March 2014, each receiving in the region of £30m from the Mayor’s Mini-Hollands fund. Enfield has allocated further external funding to the project (principally significant elements of its annual LIP allocation from TfL), taking the total funding available for the project (locally branded as ‘Cycle Enfield’) to £42m.

3.5 In July 2014 the then Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety agreed to expenditure of £700,000 to commence the design and consultation process. In September 2014 Cabinet agreed to the



governance arrangements for the project, including the establishment of three Partnership Boards to allow a wide range of stakeholders to participate in the project. In April 2015 Cabinet agreed to the expenditure of an additional £1.9m to support the design and consultation process. In February 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green. In June 2016, Cabinet approved the Cycle Enfield Spending Plans for 2016/17. In July 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation on the A1010 South. In September 2016, the Cabinet Member for Environment granted approval to implement the A105 scheme and make the associated Traffic Management Orders (TMOs).

- 3.6 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help transform our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to travel safely by cycle.
- 3.7 This report sets out the consultation undertaken to date on the A1010 North scheme and how this has helped shape the design. However, there will be further opportunities for public engagement as part of the detailed design process. In particular, many of the scheme elements, including the mandatory cycle lanes, amendments to waiting and loading arrangements, banned turns etc. will require the making of traffic management orders. As part of the order making process there is a statutory requirement to consult a number of prescribed organisations and affected parties and to consider any objections or representations made.
- 3.8 Should the scheme proceed, there are also several aspects of the detailed design yet to be finalised, including the designs of the public realm improvements. These were the subject of a co-design workshop on 22 September 2016. In addition, further detailed design will be undertaken covering issues such as bus mitigation measures; signing and lining; drainage; lighting and surfacing materials. This important stage also allows further consideration of a number of detailed concerns raised during the consultation process, including the need to minimise the risk of conflict with pedestrians at bus stop boarders and equalities.
- 3.9 The remainder of the report describes the A1010 North consultation process; sets out the impact of the scheme on parking, town centre vitality, air quality, health and congestion; and highlights how the scheme has been amended to address other concerns raised during the consultation.
- 3.10 A report about the Cycle Enfield proposals for Enfield Town is also included elsewhere on the agenda.

#### **4. CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 4.1 The A1010 North is the fourth of five main road cycling schemes to be delivered as part of the Cycle Enfield programme.
- 4.2 The purpose of the A1010 North consultation exercise was to inform decision making and help shape the proposed scheme aimed at providing high quality, segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle. The consultation process included a series of awareness raising campaigns to encourage both debate and participation in the consultation.
- 4.3 On 2 April 2015, the Council held a public engagement event at the Ordnance Unity Centre to enable local residents and businesses to find out about the alignment and scope of the A1010 North scheme and make comments using post-it notes. This event was attended by 25 people.
- 4.4 On 26 April 2016, the A1010 North scheme underwent a TfL sponsor review. This meeting was attended by Jacobs (the Council's designers), LBE officers and representatives from different parts of TfL. As a result of this review, various amendments were made to the designs to improve alignment with the London Cycle Design Standards. On 10 August 2016, TfL approved the base traffic modelling for the A1010 North scheme.

#### **12- week Consultation**

- 4.5 In June 2016, we wrote to over 17,000 properties within 400 metres of the proposed route, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the 12-week consultation. We also consulted residents associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Police and the other emergency services, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/major-projects/a1010-north-scheme-consultation/>. We also provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy.
- 4.6 On 30 June 2016, the Council held a business event at the Dharma Centre. Local business owners/managers were able to book a slot or just turn up. This was an opportunity for business owners/managers to find out about the proposals and to let us know how and when goods are delivered and where their customers park etc. On 1 & 2 July 2016, the Council held a public exhibition at the Dharma Centre to launch the public consultation. This was an opportunity for local residents to peruse the detailed proposals and discuss any concerns with officers and the designers.
- 4.7 The business event and public exhibition were attended by 101 people over the three days.
- 4.8 The public consultation started on 1 July 2016 and ran until 23 September 2016.

- 4.9 Over the period 4-6 September 2016, we delivered booklets to more than 50,000 properties in the A1010 North and A1010 south areas, reminding people that hadn't already participated in the consultation to have their say. The booklet also notified people how to apply to take part in a co-design workshop to help shape the public realm improvements for both areas.
- 4.10 Enfield Council received a total of 663 responses to the online consultation. The initial proposals were fully supported by 43.4% (288) of respondents and partially supported by 5.6% (37) of respondents. 46.3% (307) of respondents did not support the initial proposals, whilst 4.7% (31) either had no opinion or were unsure. The results of the consultation and resulting changes to design can be found at Appendix B1.
- 4.11 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, presentations were made to the Partnership Board (A1010 North) on 17 November 2016 and Project Board on 24 November 2016. A pack containing comments from both Boards was provided to Members in advance of the meeting to enable Cabinet to consider them as part of the decision-making process.

### **Interview Surveys**

- 4.12 To complement the views gained through the online consultation, we commissioned additional research to gain further insights into the improvements people in the local community would prioritise with the investment that is made available as a result of the Cycle Enfield programme. Between 13th and 20th August 2016, surveys were conducted with 1,012 people along the full length of the A1010 North route. They were shown a map illustrating the proposals to introduce cycle lanes along the A1010 North, and were asked to rate eleven different aspects in terms of importance e.g. improved air quality and safe pedestrian crossings.

### **Business Walk**

- 4.13 On Friday 9th September and Monday 12th September, Council Officers carried out a walk of the A1010 North route, entering businesses to promote the opportunity to engage in the co-design session and to encourage business owners to participate in the consultation.

### **Youth Engagement**

- 4.14 Over the summer of 2016, Council Officers delivered a programme of engagement to better understand the views of younger people on the Cycle Enfield programme. This group has consistently been under represented in previous consultations. The combined number of responses to the A105, Enfield Town, Southbury Road and A1010S consultation totalled 5,065 responses. Of these, 32% (1,622 responses) were from people aged over 60 and just 3% from people aged under 20.

- 4.15 During August and September, 16 mini-exhibitions were held across the borough (at leisure centres, festivals and other young people's community events), displaying details of the Cycle Enfield programme. Young people at these events (aged between 8 – 24 years old) were surveyed about how they would like to travel around the Borough and whether they support Enfield Council's proposals to invest in cycle lanes across the Borough. There were 1,112 responses to the survey, which found that 79% (884) supported the investment in cycle lanes, 7% (82) did not support and 13% (146) were not sure. Further information about youth engagement can be found at Appendix B2.

### **Impact Assessments**

- 4.16 On 28 October 2015, we commissioned Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants to undertake an air quality assessment for five main road cycling schemes, including A1010 North.
- 4.17 On 19 November 2015, we commissioned Regeneris Consultants to assess the economic impacts of the A1010 North scheme on Enfield Highway and Enfield Wash town centres.
- 4.18 In April 2016 a predictive equalities impact assessment was undertaken. This assessment confirms that the scheme will have a generally positive effect in tackling inequality and can be found at Appendix E.

### **Impact on Blue Light Services**

- 4.19 The Metropolitan Police state:

“Have had a look over the documentation and have no objections.”

- 4.20 The London Fire Brigade stated:

“The London Fire Brigade (LFB) supports the Mayor's Vision for Cycling and recognises the benefits which the proposed changes will bring to London and Londoners. The LFB also has a corporate travel plan, which includes measures to encourage our staff to choose more sustainable forms of transport for commuting and business travel, including cycling where possible. The LFB, therefore supports measures that will provide for safer cycling conditions on the road for its staff and drivers.

LFB officers have visited the area and have no objections to the proposals as presented.”

- 4.21 The London Ambulance Service stated:

“Thanks for the information.

My reply is much the same as I have said in the past around such schemes. That being the LAS needs unhindered access 24/7 across the

capitals network of roads. By way of a little more detail on scheme like this I would also ask the following areas are considered:

Cycleways that run alongside the road don't have barriers to prevent ambulance pulling into the cycleway. This can be seen at a number of locations around London which results in terrible traffic congestion when an ambulance has to stop for a period of time.

Loading bays and bus stops are in locations which will not bottleneck the roads.

Any bus lanes/turning points are easily accessible to ambulances.

Any areas of high congestion which link to traffic light phasing can be managed/changed if the phasing is an issue for the LAS and the flow of the LAS fleet when engaged on 999 duties.

Rat runs are managed to allow vehicles to pass each other.”

- 4.22 In respect to London Ambulance Service, it is considered that the use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic will help to minimise the impact on ambulance response times, allowing broken down vehicles to pull into the cycle lane if necessary. In addition, the detailed traffic modelling demonstrates that the scheme will not have a significant impact on journey times at most times. The impact of the scheme on journey times at peak times is summarised in paragraph 5.11 below.

## **5. SCHEME DESIGN PROPOSALS**

- 5.1 The A1010 North scheme helps address three key themes: transforming our high streets and town centres; delivering long-term health benefits; and enabling people to travel safely by cycle.
- 5.2 This scheme involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A1010 between Southbury Road/ Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/ Mollison Avenue; additional traffic signals to reduce conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions; public realm improvements; the installation of bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes, new zebra crossings, side road entry treatments and raised tables; remodelling of key junctions. The scheme drawings can be found at Appendix A.
- 5.3 Light segregation is defined in the London Cycle Design Standards (2014) as “the use of physical objects intermittently placed alongside a cycle lane marking to give additional protection from motorised traffic”.
- 5.4 To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to remove 12 right-turn pockets at priority junctions and make changes to parking as outlined in paragraph 5.8 below.

- 5.5 Subject to Cabinet approval, the detailed design and statutory consultation will be undertaken by Ringway Jacobs via the London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC).

## **5.6 Bus Lanes and Bus Stops**

- 5.6.1 Detailed discussions have taken place with TfL about the impact of the scheme on bus services and their views have been taken into account in developing the current designs and mitigation measures.
- 5.6.2 In the proposed design the majority of bus stop have been retained in their existing locations. The southbound Durants Road bus stops F and N, on the approach to Southbury Road have been merged. There are five bus stops where the shelter is currently located on the island adjacent to a service road. At these locations the cycle route is diverted via the service road. At the remaining bus stops, shared bus stop boarders have been introduced to retain the cycle facilities through the bus stop. These all include 0.5m 'buffer' strips between the kerb and the cycle lane.
- 5.6.3 The northbound bus lane on the approach to Bullsmoor Lane has been retained as existing but the northbound bus lane between Broadlands Avenue and Green Street has been removed to accommodate the cycle facilities.

## **5.7 Public Realm Improvements**

- 5.7.1 Public realm improvements will be implemented along the corridor, where possible. Two key areas have been looked at in a co-design workshop, with community input into the design. These are Green Street and Enfield Wash.
- 5.7.2 The co-design workshop was held on Thursday 22nd September 2016 from 6.30pm – 9.30pm at the Enfield Business Centre on Hertford Road. It was attended by approximately 20 people and included a mixture of local residents and business owners. The session was facilitated by Living Streets with assistance from Council Officers and urban realm consultants from Jacobs.
- 5.7.3 Following some overview presentations, two groups were created to consider specific areas within each of the major A1010 schemes. For the A1010 South scheme, the group focused on the public realm area surrounding the Edmonton Green roundabout, including the front of the Station and the Green. For the A1010 North, the group focussed on two areas, the junction around Green Street and the urban realm around Longfield Avenue at Enfield Wash. Discussion covered a range of issues, exploring both areas of concern and future opportunities. The output of the session was captured in a report which will inform detailed design as each scheme progresses.

## 5.8 Parking Implications

- 5.8.1 Along the length of the corridor there are currently 185 residential parking bays, limited waiting bays, loading bays or pay & display bays, along with sections on uncontrolled parking. Under the proposal, 63% of residents bays will be retained, 89% of pay and display bays, 74% of limited waiting and all marked loading bays will be retained.
- 5.8.2 Informal parking has been reduced along the length of the corridor with the two key areas at the southern and northern extents. From A110 junction to Broadlands Avenue, during the busiest hour there is a shortfall of 3 spaces (including 100m of side road). From Holly Road to Bullsmoor Lane, during the busiest hour there is a shortfall of 1 space (including 100m of side road). For both sections there are sufficient spaces in the proposed scheme to accommodate existing overnight parking. The remaining loss of parking can be accommodated on side roads.
- 5.8.3 If properties have off-carriageway space, as part of the scheme we will offer a free crossover, subject to the planning process.
- 5.8.4 Blue badge holders (including Dial-a-Ride) will be permitted to pick up and set down passengers in lightly segregated cycle lanes.

## 5.9 Economic Impact Assessment

- 5.9.1 Regeneris Consulting were commissioned to undertake an economic impact assessment of the Cycle Enfield Scheme on the economic vitality of the A1010 North corridor town centres. The assessment focuses on the current turnover of each town centre and assesses how this may be affected by Cycle Enfield both during the construction phase and the operational phase, once the scheme has been implemented. It also recognises that the potential transformational effect of the proposals could, if achieved, lead to a 10-15% uplift in spend. Indeed, in section 4.129 of their report they document 3 case studies, which show increased footfall of up to 30% after public realm improvements. However, this potential uplift has not been factored into the assessment as it is not guaranteed.
- 5.9.2 The Economic Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix D, but the overall conclusions are summarised below:

|                 | Construction Phase |            |                | Operational Phase |            |                 |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------|
|                 | Better Case        | Base Case  | Worst Case     | Better Case       | Base Case  | Worst Case      |
| Enfield Highway | Negligible         | Negligible | Minor Negative | Minor Positive    | Negligible | Minor Negative  |
| Enfield Wash    | Minor Positive     | Negligible | Minor Negative | Minor Positive    | Negligible | Medium Negative |

5.9.3 The following measures have been identified by the consultants and will be implemented to ensure that impact of construction and operation is minimised and to enable the operational phase to reach either a neutral or positive level:

### **Construction Phase Mitigation**

5.9.4 The ongoing design and planning process provides an opportunity to develop and refine a number of important pre-construction mitigation approaches.

- **Design of construction works** – careful planning and phasing of the works to minimise access disruption to the road and pavement;
- **Traffic management plan** – could help to scope out congestion issues and ensure that alternative provisions are put in place where possible; and
- **Publicity and business liaison** – widely publish delivery plans to ensure that town centre businesses and users are aware of what the work entails, how they might be impacted and when.

5.9.5 Once the construction work is underway, a range of additional mitigation measures can be developed to help reduce disruption:

- **Approach to construction** – ensure that construction is undertaken in a way which is considerate to local businesses and town centre users;
- **Ongoing business liaison** – explore the potential for the contractors to employ a specific business liaison officer for the duration of the construction period; and
- **Proactive efforts to maintain footfall flows** to local shops during construction e.g. temporary review of town centre parking restrictions, providing local way-finding to guide pedestrians, holding town centre events to encourage stronger footfall and efforts to create a stronger brand for the town centre.

### **Operational Phase Mitigation**

5.9.6 Once the scheme is operational, there is potential to deploy additional measures to mitigate negative impacts or maximise positive impacts of the scheme on town centre economic vitality as follows:

- **Ensure clear signage** to the off-street car parks and safe and attractive routes from these car parks into the town centres;
- **Review on-street parking policy** to consider providing 30 minutes free parking where this is currently pay & display and potentially a shorter maximum stay period for on-street parking in the centre;
- **Introduce SCOOT** as part of the scheme to optimise the flow of traffic between signalised junctions and reduce congestion;



- **Town centre management** to enhance overall economic vitality, help develop stakeholder relationships, identify and respond to issues and offer opportunities for proactive work to enhance town centre vitality; and
- **Employment and training** – explore the potential to engage local residents, particularly young people in the delivery process.

## 5.10 Air Quality Impact and Health

5.10.1 Without any of the Cycle Enfield proposals, the air quality objective for annual average NO<sub>2</sub> is predicted to be exceeded along the A1010 North, although excesses are limited to roadside locations. Concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are not predicted to exceed air quality objectives.

5.10.2 With the introduction of the proposals and a 2.5% reduction in traffic, annual average NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are predicted to decrease by up to 0.5 micro grammes per cubic metre at roadside locations. The introduction of the scheme is predicted to result in some increases in queue length and delay time leading to increases in concentrations at junctions. However, the area of these increases will be much smaller than the area of air quality improvements resulting from reduced traffic flows. As a result, and providing a 2.5% reduction in traffic is achieved, the majority of frontages along this road will experience an improvement in air quality and corresponding health benefits. It is, however, important to note that increases in NO<sub>2</sub> will also be found in the vicinity of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings caused by queuing traffic.

5.10.3 On balance, taking into account both air quality impacts and the potential for more people to engage in active travel, the proposed scheme can play a significant part in supporting the council's objective to improve the health of residents in the borough and to address health inequality.

5.10.4 The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) consultation on air quality (Air Pollution – outdoor air quality and health) recognises its profound impact on both health and health inequalities. This includes the 52,630 life-years lost per year due to PM<sub>2.5</sub> particulates and the further loss of 88,113 life-years from NO<sub>2</sub> exposure in London alone. Implementing many of their recommendations will lead to improved health and quality of life. These include those aimed towards input into Supplementary Planning Documents, urban planning, providing infrastructure to support low and zero emission travel, travel planning, vehicle idling and congestion zones.

5.10.5 The Council is working with its NHS colleagues to improve health in the borough. The Chair of Enfield CCG is very supportive of our Cycle Enfield programme both because it will make Enfield better and more pleasant but also because of the huge costs of physical inactivity to the NHS. This includes an increased risk of 20 – 30% in conditions such as diabetes, cancer, obesity and dementia. Diabetes alone costs the NHS some £25,000 per minute. It is unfortunate therefore that some of the draft recommendations that contradict NICE's own guidance and are likely to actually increase pollution. For example NICE guidance Physical Activity

and the Environment recommends that ‘pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of transport that involve physical activity are given the highest priority when developing or maintaining streets and roads’. Recommending off-road or quiet streets for cycle routes will inevitably take a circuitous route to destinations thereby encouraging car-use and pollution. Similarly, Enfield has followed NICE guidance to introduce traffic calming schemes to make streets more attractive for walking, cycling and children to play thereby increasing health and stopping pollution at source.

5.10.6 The Council is also disappointed that NICE’s draft guidance does not seem to recognise recent evidence from Cambridge University that the health benefits of physical activity through cycling far outweigh any dis-benefits of air pollution<sup>1</sup> or that trees and the natural environment encourage people to walk and cycle.

1. *Tainio et al. [Can air pollution negate the health benefits of cycling and walking?](#) Preventive Medicine; 5 May 2016; DOI: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.02.002*

## 5.11 Congestion and Journey Times

5.11.1 It is accepted that the scheme will generate some level of congestion. But the designs have sought to minimise the impacts.

5.11.2 We are changing the nature of the road, to make it more town centre focused, which will naturally encourage some through traffic onto the . A10.

5.11.3 The total length of this corridor is approximately 2.3 miles. Depending on the time of day and direction of travel, the average journey time from one end of the corridor to the other is approximately 15-22 minutes.

5.11.4 Based on the modelling assessment, the estimated increase in journey time (in seconds per mile) based on the proposed junctions and bus stops are as shown below:

| <b>Additional delay per mile</b> | <b>Northbound</b> | <b>Southbound</b> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| AM peak                          | 28 to 58 secs     | -2 to 29 secs     |
| PM peak                          | 6 to 36 secs      | 16 to 46 secs     |

5.11.5 More details of the impact of the scheme on congestion and journey times are set out in Appendix G.

## 6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.7million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £37.6million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

## **7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- To create better, healthier communities;
- To make cycling a safe & enjoyable choice for local travel;
- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone;
- To provide better travel choices for the 34% of Enfield households who have no access to a car and an alternative travel choice for the 66% that do;
- To transform cycling in Enfield;
- To encourage more people to cycle;
- To enable people to make short journeys by bike instead of by car;
- To increase physical activity and therefore the health of cyclists;
- To reduce overcrowding on public transport;
- To enable transformational change to our town centres

## **8. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **8.1 Financial Implications**

8.1.1 The total estimated cost of detailed design and statutory consultation is £368,000, which will be fully funded by Transport for London. This is all Mini Holland funding, which can only be spent on delivering the Mayor's Cycle Vision.

8.1.2 Expenditure once approved by TfL will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TfL. The funding arrangements are governed through the TfL Borough Portal and no costs will fall on the Council. The release of funds by TfL is based on a process that records the progress of the works against approved spending profiles. TfL makes payments against certified claims as soon as costs are incurred, ensuring the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement.

8.1.3 Use of the funding for purposes other than those for which it is provided may result in TfL requiring repayment of any funding already provided and/or withholding provision of further funding. TfL also retains the right to carry out random or specific audits in respect of the financial assistance provided.

### **8.2 Legal Implications**

8.2.1 Under the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999, the Mayor is empowered, through TfL, to provide grants to London Boroughs to assist with the implementation of the Transport Strategy. TfL is charged with

responsibility of ensuring that the key rationale for allocating grants is the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

8.2.2 The generic matters to which TfL will have regard in allocating financial assistance and the generic conditions that will apply to any such assistance are:

- Under section 159 of the GLA Act, financial assistance provided by TfL must be for a purpose which in TfL's opinion is conducive to the provision of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities or services to, from or within Greater London.
- In order to ensure this purpose is met, TfL may have regard to the following matters when exercising its functions under section 159:
  - Any financial assistance previously given
  - The use made by the authority of such assistance
- Conditions – section 159(6) of the GLA Act also allows TfL to impose conditions on any financial assistance it provides and in specified circumstances to require repayment. Other more detailed conditions may be imposed that relate to particular projects.

8.2.3 Under section 65 of the Highways Act 1980, a highway authority may, in or by the side of a highway maintainable at public expense, construct a cycle track as part of the highway; and they may light any cycle track constructed by them under this section.

8.2.4 Under the Localism Act 2011, local authorities have a general power of competence.

8.2.5 In exercising powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to securing the 'expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway'. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises and the effect on the amenities of any locality affected. Any final decision to implement any scheme needs to take account of the considerations set out above and the outcome of public consultation. Any changes to parking restrictions and the introduction of cycle lanes will be subject to the making of a Traffic Management Order pursuant to powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

8.2.6 Before making any decision with respect to this matter, the Cabinet must conscientiously consider the consultation responses.

### **8.3 Property Implications**

8.3.1 There are no corporate property implications arising from this report.

## **9. KEY RISKS**

9.1 The Cycle Enfield Project Delivery Team monitors and considers risk management issues at its regular meetings, and directs remedial action as necessary.

9.2 If the Council proceeds with these proposals there is a risk of delays due to traffic order objections, delays due to traffic signal approvals and delays due to Statutory Undertaker consents and works. If the Council does not proceed with these proposals there is a risk of increased congestion and increased pollution as the population grows and a modal shift in transport is not effected and no economic, health and transport benefits. However, the economic benefits are not guaranteed, see paragraph 5.9 above.

## **10. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **10.1 Fairness for All**

10.1.1 The A1010 North is part of a safe, convenient and extensive cycle route network that will make cycling a viable transport choice for all. 32.5% of households in the borough do not have access to a car or van. This scheme will improve transport for all and increase cycling amongst all age groups.

### **10.2 Growth and Sustainability**

10.2.1 With forecast growth in population in the borough, the A1010 North scheme will help to provide a safe and efficient means of accessing Enfield Highway and Enfield Wash and contributing to their long-term vitality.

10.2.2 Cycling is a sustainable mode of transport with virtually no environmental impact compared to motorised transport. GLA population projections of an additional 45,526 people in the borough by 2040 indicate that congestion will become ever more common without a modal shift towards more sustainable transport.

### **10.3 Strong Communities**

10.3.1 The A1010 North scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness. It is recognised that more people on the streets will provide 'passive

surveillance' making streets more accessible for communities to use for play, meeting and social activities.

## **11. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The Council has a duty when introducing new policies and making changes to services to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This includes persons of different ages, disability, race and sex (along with other protected characteristics). The content of the duty is set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (attached as part of Appendix E). The particular duties in respect of the disabled should be noted (section 149(4)).
- 11.2 With respect to the proposals for the A1010 North, Council officers have produced an Equality Impact Assessment ("EQIA") (see Appendix E). This identifies whether or not (and to what extent) the proposals have an impact (positive or negative) on a particular equality target group, or whether any adverse impacts identified have been appropriately mitigated. The Cabinet should review the EQIA when exercising their duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in considering whether to approve the proposals.
- 11.3 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, we held three Partnership Board meetings for the A1010 North scheme on 5 January 2015, 22 June 2016 and 17 November 2016. Meeting invitations were sent to Members of Parliament; ward councillors; residents' associations; cycling groups; disabilities groups, including Enfield Disability Action, Enfield Vision, RNIB, Age UK and Enfield Over 50s Forum and interest groups. These meetings were an excellent opportunity for representatives to influence the designs and to feed information back to the groups and organisations that they represent.
- 11.4 The EQIA includes comments from the Centre for Accessible Environments, who were commissioned to undertake a design appraisal to ensure that the proposals take account of the needs of older people and people with disabilities. The concerns raised will be addressed as part of the detailed design process.

## **12. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 The A1010 North scheme will directly contribute to the Council Business Plan as follows:

Fairness for All

- The new infrastructure delivered as part of the A1010 North scheme will make walking and cycling safer and enable older people and people with disabilities to maintain their independence.

### Growth and Sustainability

- The inward investment in the A1010 North corridor will support sustainable regeneration and growth; and
- The public realm improvements delivered as part of the A1010 North scheme will create an environment in which businesses and community groups can grow and thrive.

### Strong Communities

- The A1010 North scheme will transform our borough and create a place where people want to live, work, learn and visit;
- The A1010 North scheme will enable cycling to become an alternative means of transport for short journeys and help people live healthier lives; and
- The A1010 North scheme will improve safety and make the area more welcoming.

## **13. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1 The post consultation drawings for A1010 North are due to be sent to TfL's Road Safety Team for a stage 1 Road safety Audit in December 2016.
- 13.2 The Construction, Design and Management Regulations are being followed to ensure that risks are designed out/mitigated and the A1010 North scheme can be constructed safely.
- 13.3 In the public consultation, some respondents raised concern about the safety of pedestrians at bus stop borders and bus stop by-passes. These designs have been introduced successfully in other parts of London and the UK. There are a number of Councils who have implemented these designs e.g. Camden Council and Brighton & Hove Council and monitored their impact and have not reported any significant issues.

## **14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 The A1010 North scheme is part of Cycle Enfield, which provides a unique opportunity to improve the health of the borough's residents and address health inequality.
- 14.2 The Chair of the Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group has issued a statement, fully supporting the aims and implementation of Cycle Enfield as it will enable people to take control of their own health, improve the health of the population and make the NHS more sustainable.

- 14.3 Compared to those who are least active sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, cancer, metabolic ill-health (type 2 diabetes), mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget.
- 14.4 There is substantial evidence to suggest that a) physical activity is essential for maximal health and b) that population levels of physical activity are far below those recommended by the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) who also recommends that levels of physical activity are most likely to be increased by activities that can be integrated into everyday life.
- 14.5 Guidelines on physical activity have been published by (amongst others) the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the Chief Medical Officers of the Four Home Countries and at least 20 other countries.
- 14.6 Health Survey (HSE) 2012 self-report data indicates that 33% males and 44% of females aged 16+ report not meeting the current Chief Medical Officer (CMO) guidelines of 150 minutes of physical activity per week. Objective data indicates that in actuality some 95% of the population may not be meeting physical activity guidelines.
- 14.7 HSE data (2012) also shows that that 79% of boys and 84% of girls aged 5 – 15 do not meet physical activity guidelines.
- 14.8 10.5% of reception year pupils in Enfield (aged 4-5) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (10.1% and 9.1% respectively). 23.3% are overweight or obese, higher than in London (22.2%) and England (21.9%).
- 14.9 25.4% of Year 6 pupils in Enfield (aged 10-11) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (22.6% and 19.1% respectively). 41% are either overweight or obese compared to 37.2% in London and 33.5% in England. This is the 6th highest in London.
- 14.10 Cycling can be a very effective means of integrating physical activity into everyday life. In the Netherlands cycling accounts for some 34% of journeys up to 7.5km (4.6 miles). The population attributable fraction of mortality due to inactivity in the Netherlands is 1/3 to 1/2 that of the UK. It is estimated that 57% of Copenhagen residents cycle (e.g. undertake physical activity) everyday.
- 14.11 Whilst paragraph 5.10 acknowledges the air quality impacts of the scheme, cycling is good for health; it does not impact on air quality and those who cycle for non-sporting purposes are four times more likely to meet physical activity recommendations than people who do not cycle. The health benefits of cycling far outweigh the risks associated with air pollution and it is estimated that in London a person would need to cycle 9.15 hours before the effects of air pollution negate the positive effects of physical activity.



- 14.12 Improving cycling facilities in the borough has the potential to significantly increase the disposable income all residents in the borough. Academic studies indicate that those in the least wealthy quintile spend approximately 30% of their income on transport.
- 14.13 Other benefits to the individual could include greater access to employment, education, shops, recreation, health facilities and the countryside.
- 14.14 The greatest gain in the health of the public will be from increased physical activity. However, other benefits may accrue to the wider Enfield community that could result from a long-term modal transport shift towards cycling.

**Background papers**

None

**List of Appendices:**

Appendix A: Post-consultation drawings [To be available at the Cabinet meeting and in the Group offices and the Members' Library]

A1010 North Consultation drawings (rendered drawings with changes post consultation to be developed for future public consultation):

[http://cycleenfield.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/B240G001-UD-59-A1010-North-Consultation\\_FULL\\_Package.pdf](http://cycleenfield.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/B240G001-UD-59-A1010-North-Consultation_FULL_Package.pdf)

Appendix B1: Consultation report

Appendix B2: Young people summer engagement report

Appendix C: Air quality assessment

Appendix D: Economic impact assessment

Appendix E: Predictive equalities impact assessment

Appendix F: Comments of critical friends

Appendix G: Preliminary traffic modelling assessment

This page is intentionally left blank

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **154**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet: 14th December  
2016

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Finance, Resources &  
Customer Services

Contact officer and telephone number:

Ann Freeman

Tel: 0208 379 3002

Olu Ayodele

Tel: 0208 379 6133

E mail:

[Ann.Freeman@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ann.Freeman@enfield.gov.uk)

[Olu.Ayodele@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Olu.Ayodele@enfield.gov.uk)

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>   | <b>Item: 9</b> |
| <b>Subject:</b> Capital Programme Monitor<br>Second Quarter September 2016<br>Budget Year 2016-17 |                |
| <b>Wards:</b> All   |                |
| <b>Key Decision No:</b> 4363  |                |
| <b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b> Cllr<br><b>Lemonides</b>   |                |

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the current position up to the end of September 2016 regarding the Council's Capital Programme (2016-20) taking into account the latest information for all capital schemes including the funding arrangements.

The report shows that the overall expenditure is projected to be £227.3m for the General Fund and £65.2m for the HRA for 2016/17.

The report:

- 1.1 Sets out the forecast capital programme for 2016-20
- 1.2 Confirms details of slippage, growth and reductions in the current year 2016-17 programme
- 1.3 Notes forthcoming reports seeking authorisation for inclusion in the Capital Programme

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Cabinet agrees the revised Capital Programme totalling £292.5m for 2016/17 and notes the full four-year programme as per Appendix A and indicative programme in Appendix B.
2. The additions to the programme are for information only and either require no additional borrowing as they are grant funded or have already been approved as part of the Council's democratic process as detailed in Table 3.

### 3. BACKGROUND

The Council's Capital Programme is continually reviewed and monitoring reports are submitted to Cabinet on a quarterly basis.

The Council continually strives to maximise external grants and contributions, attracting new revenue streams to fund projects wherever possible and minimising the need to borrow.

This is the second quarterly report on the 2016/17 capital budget and four-year Capital Programme 2016-20, as approved by Council in February 2016.

### 4. 2016/17 CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET

The full approved Capital programme is contained within Appendix A and is a four-year programme with the budgets shown inclusive of carry forwards from 2015/16 where there was reported project slippage.

The capital budget for the current financial year 2016/17 is summarised in Table 1 below.

| <b>TABLE 1 – Current Year Approved Capital Programme</b> | <b>2016/17 Budget as at Q1 £'000</b> | <b>Slippage to/from future years £'000</b> | <b>Additions £'000</b> | <b>Reductions £'000</b> | <b>Revised Budget as at Q2 £'000</b> | <b>Actual Spend as at Q2 £'000</b> |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Environment & Regeneration                               | 122,023                              | (23,196)                                   | 2,700                  | 0                       | 101,527                              | 23,144                             |
| Finance, Resources and Customer Services                 | 35,650                               | (14,561)                                   | 300                    | 0                       | 21,389                               | 8,225                              |
| Health, Housing and Adult Social Care                    | 41,493                               | 19,627                                     | 2,087                  | (500)                   | 62,707                               | 7,500                              |
| Schools and Children's Services                          | 48,292                               | (6,600)                                    | 0                      | 0                       | 41,692                               | 8,196                              |
| <b>Total General Fund Budget</b>                         | <b>247,458</b>                       | <b>(24,730)</b>                            | <b>5,087</b>           | <b>(500)</b>            | <b>227,315</b>                       | <b>47,065</b>                      |
| Housing Revenue Account                                  | 50,498                               | 0  | 14,727                 | 0                       | 65,225                               | 18,579                             |
| <b>Total Capital Budget</b>                              | <b>297,956</b>                       | <b>(24,730)</b>                            | <b>19,814</b>          | <b>(500)</b>            | <b>292,540</b>                       | <b>65,644</b>                      |

#### **Budget as at Q1**

Councillors approved the four-year budget including 2016-17 in February 2016 and the carry forwards from 2015-16 as part of the outturn report. The Q1 monitoring report then reported minimal other changes and the Budgets as at Q1 are a consolidation of this position as previously reported to Cabinet.

### Slippage to/from future years

These are changes regarding the forecast timing of the expenditure from the approved programme between financial years with no reported increase or decrease in budget requirement. Unless otherwise reported by responsible officers below, these movements have minimal impact on the overall delivery of the project. Where service delivery may be impacted these will be reported quarterly to members.

The primary slippage this quarter has been summarised in Table 2 below:

| <b>TABLE 2 – SLIPPAGE</b>                         | <b>2016-17<br/>£'000</b> | <b>2017-18<br/>£'000</b> | <b>2018-19<br/>£'000</b> | <b>2019-20<br/>£'000</b> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Trimming & Dimming Technology (Street Lighting)   | (128)                    | 128                      | -                        | -                        |
| Edmonton Cemetery                                 | (1,890)                  | 1,890                    | -                        | -                        |
| Wheeled Bins                                      | 11                       | (11)                     | -                        | -                        |
| Waste & Recycling                                 | (421)                    | 421                      | -                        | -                        |
| CCTV Morson Road Depot                            | (419)                    | 419                      | -                        | -                        |
| Mini Holland (all funded by Transport for London) | (11,195)                 | 7,054                    | 2,427                    | 1,714                    |
| Vehicle Replacement Prog                          | (538)                    | 1,830                    | (1,190)                  | (102)                    |
| Lee Valley Heat Network                           | (630)                    | 630                      | -                        | -                        |
| Electric Qtr Project Delivery                     | (3,742)                  | 1,000                    | 1,000                    | 1,742                    |
| Ponders End High St Project Delivery              | (165)                    | 1,520                    | (1,500)                  | 145                      |
| Ponders End South Street East                     | (4,080)                  | 4,080                    | -                        | -                        |
| <b>Environment &amp; Regeneration</b>             | <b>(23,197)</b>          | <b>18,961</b>            | <b>737</b>               | <b>3,499</b>             |
| Bury Street West Depot Project                    | (13,961)                 | 13,961                   | -                        | -                        |
| Southgate Circus Library Development              | 600                      | -                        | -                        | -                        |
| Edmonton Green Library Improvements               | (1,200)                  | 1,200                    | -                        | -                        |
| <b>Finance, Resources and Customer Services</b>   | <b>(14,561)</b>          | <b>15,161</b>            | -                        | -                        |
| Mental Health and Wellbeing Centre                | (596)                    | 596                      | -                        | -                        |
| Affordable Housing                                | (2,477)                  | 2,477                    | -                        | -                        |
| Housing Gateway Ltd                               | 22,700                   | (20,000)                 | (2,700)                  | -                        |
| <b>Health, Housing and Adult Social Care</b>      | <b>19,627</b>            | <b>(16,927)</b>          | <b>(2,700)</b>           | <b>0</b>                 |
| Primary Expansion Programme Phase 2               | (6,000)                  | 1,100                    | 4,900                    | -                        |
| Minchenden budget to SGate Circus Libr            | (600)                    | -                        | -                        | -                        |
| <b>Schools and Children's Services</b>            | <b>(6,600)</b>           | <b>1,100</b>             | <b>4,900</b>             | -                        |
| <b>Total General Fund Slippage</b>                | <b>(24,730)</b>          | <b>18,295</b>            | <b>2,936</b>             | <b>3,499</b>             |

### Additions to the Programme

Additions to the programme will arise between quarterly monitoring reports with appropriate levels of authorisation obtained as required by the democratic process. Once approved these project budgets are reflected in the additions column and the financial impact built in to the Medium term financial plan where required.

Additions this quarter are detailed below in Table 3.

| <b>TABLE 3 Growth</b>                                     | <b>£'000</b>  | <b>Additional Information</b>  |
|---|---------------|--|
| <b>Environment &amp; Regeneration</b>                     | <b>2,700</b>  |  |
| London Regen Fund -Orbital Business Park (Meridian Works) | 2,700         | 100% funded - £1.35m from GLA, £1.35m from contractor contributions  |
| <b>Finance, Resources and Customer Services</b>           | <b>300</b>    |  |
| William Preye Day Centre                                  | 300           | Approved by Cabinet 07/07/16 – funded by Council borrowing   |
| <b>Health, Housing and Adult Social Care</b>              | <b>2,087</b>  |  |
| Disabled Facilities Grants                                | 663           | 100% funded from increase in DFG Grant   |
| Reprovision 2 Project- Coppice Wood Lodge                 | 925           | Approved by Cabinet 21/10/15 – funded by Council borrowing   |
| Ridge House Clinic  | 499           | Approved by Cabinet 16/03/16 – funded by Council borrowing   |
| <b>Total General Fund Growth</b>                          | <b>5,087</b>  |  |
| <b>Housing Revenue Account</b>                            |               |  |
| Estate Renewal  | 520           | Review of Right To Buy One for One Replacement Schemes.  |
| Major Works   | 13,757        | Addition of Renewable Heating Incentive Schemes to the Programme (July Cabinet) and review of other schemes. |
| Minor Works   | 450           | Review of schemes  |
| <b>Total HRA Growth</b>                                   | <b>14,727</b> |  |

### Proposed Reductions

These are the removal of budgets from the programme due to either an underspend on a completed project, the adjustment of a project budget to reflect a loss of funding or to remove the project from the programme entirely. There is only one reduction reported this quarter in Health, Housing and Adult Social Care in respect of Housing Assistance grants

of £500k. This was a carry forward from previous years which is no longer required.

## **5. Forthcoming projects**

Since the end of the quarter the following additions to the programme have been approved which will be incorporated into the capital monitor from quarter 3.

Housing Gateway Acquisition of Southbury House £21m, funded £18.5m by Housing Gateway and £2.5m from Council Borrowing.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

As the Section 151 Officer, the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services is required to keep under review the financial position of the Authority. The quarterly capital monitoring is part of this review process. If required, measures will be put in place to address risks identified through the monitoring process and to contain expenditure within approved budgets.

Cabinet on 6th September 2016 agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to decide as to whether to accept the government's multi-year settlement offer and publish an efficiency plan on its website as part of the condition of acceptance. As a result, the Council has applied to accept the multi-year settlement and published the required efficiency plan on its website. As part of the efficiency plan it is proposed to use the power provided by the Government's regulations on capital receipt flexibility to capitalise redundancy and transformation work in 2016/17. The final use of capital receipts used for this purpose will be reported to Council for final agreement in February 2017 before closing the accounts for 2016/17

The funding of the current approved programme is as follows:

|  | 2016/17<br>£'000 | 2017/18<br>£'000 | 2018/19<br>£'000 | 2019/20<br>£'000 | Total<br>£'000 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Total approved<br/>General Fund<br/>Programme (App A)</b> | <b>227,315</b>   | <b>130,993</b>   | <b>67,202</b>    | <b>32,273</b>    | <b>457,783</b> |
| Funded from:   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |
| Earmarked Resources  | -59,441          | -52,450          | -22,910          | -13,101          | <b>147,902</b> |
| Unapplied Capital<br>Receipts                                | -494             | 0                | 0                | 0                | <b>-494</b>    |
| General Fund Capital<br>Reserve                              | -73              | 0                | 0                | 0                | <b>-73</b>     |
| <b>Capital Financing<br/>Requirement</b>                     | <b>167,307</b>   | <b>78,543</b>    | <b>44,292</b>    | <b>19,172</b>    | <b>309,314</b> |
| <b>Total HRA Programme</b>                                   | <b>65,225</b>    | <b>62,720</b>    | <b>54,357</b>    | <b>43,638</b>    | <b>225,940</b> |
| Funded from:   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |
| Earmarked Resources  | -65,225          | -62,720          | -54,357          | -43,638          | <b>225,940</b> |
| <b>Capital Financing<br/>Requirement</b>                     | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>Total Increase in CFR</b>                                 | <b>167,307</b>   | <b>78,543</b>    | <b>44,292</b>    | <b>19,172</b>    | <b>309,314</b> |

### Types of Capital Funding

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Earmarked Resources             | Specific government grants or other contributions from external parties and the use of specific reserves within the Council's available resources. Funding is specific to certain schemes or certain types of capital investment e.g. provision for additional school places. There is a high level of certainty over these funding streams.  |
| Unapplied Capital Receipts      | Capital receipts from previous years' disposals, brought forward from 2015/16 and the balance in the General Fund Capital Reserve.  |
| Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) | Capital expenditure that cannot be funded immediately from grants, capital receipts or direct revenue/reserve contributions must be funded from the annual set aside from the revenue budget (MRP). MRP is determined according to statutory regulation based on the Capital Financing Requirement. There are equivalent statutory arrangements for the funding of HRA capital expenditure which do not involve an HRA Minimum Revenue Provision. |



## **6.2 Legal Implications**

The Council has a statutory duty to arrange for the proper administration of its financial affairs and a fiduciary duty to taxpayers with regards to its use of and accounting for public monies. This report assists in the discharge of those duties.

## **6.3 Property Implications**

All of the property implications are included within the main report.

## **7. KEY RISKS**

All of the key risks relating to the first quarter are included within the main report.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **8.1 Fairness for All**

The Capital Programme is designed to address the values set out within the Council's priorities. All projects are considered in the context of these priorities.

### **8.2 Growth and Sustainability**

The Capital Programme is designed to address the values set out within the Council's priorities. All projects are considered in the context of these priorities.

### **8.3 Strong Communities**

The Capital Programme is designed to address the values set out within the Council's priorities. All projects are considered in the context of these priorities.

## **9. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The report provides clear evidence of sound financial management, efficient use of resources.

## **10. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable to this Report.

## **11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

None specific to this Report

### **Background Papers**

None

## Appendix A

| 4 Year Programme:                                       | Capital Programme Budget |               |               |               |                |                      |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
|   | APPROVED PROGRAMME       | 2016/17       | 2017/18       | 2018/19       | 2019/20        | Total 16-17 to 19-20 |
|   |                          | £'000         | £'000         | £'000         | £'000          | £'000                |
| <b>Environment &amp; Regeneration</b>                   |                          |               |               |               |                |                      |
| <b>Transport for London funding:</b>                    |                          |               |               |               |                |                      |
| Major Schemes   | 3,178                    | -             | -             | -             | 3,178          |                      |
| Cycle Enfield   | 6,368                    | 16,335        | 2,970         | 1,713         | 27,386         |                      |
| <b>Highways &amp; Street scene:</b>                     |                          |               |               |               | 0              |                      |
| Main Programme  | 9,739                    | 128           | -             | -             | 9,867          |                      |
| Corridor Improvements Hertford Rd                       | 1,619                    | -             | -             | -             | 1,619          |                      |
| <b>Environmental Protection</b>                         | 122                      | -             | -             | -             | 122            |                      |
| <b>Community Safety</b>                                 | 347                      | -             | -             | -             | 347            |                      |
| <b>Waste &amp; Recycling</b>                            | -                        | 847           | -             | -             | 847            |                      |
| <b>Parks</b>  | 3,087                    | 2,943         | -             | -             | 6,030          |                      |
| <b>Vehicle Replacement Programme</b>                    | 3,869                    | 2,173         | 3,430         | 486           | 9,958          |                      |
| <b>Building Improvement Programme (BIP)</b>             | 2,056                    | -             | -             | -             | 2,056          |                      |
| <b>Civic Centre (BIP)</b>                               | 2,392                    | 1,934         | -             | -             | 4,326          |                      |
| <b>Disability Access Programme</b>                      | 313                      | -             | -             | -             | 313            |                      |
| <b>Regeneration:</b>                                    |                          |               |               |               |                |                      |
| Meridian Water  | 61,159                   | 37,070        | 28,190        | 18,370        | 144,789        |                      |
| Meridian Water Hinterland                               | 1,680                    | 1,230         | 400           | 0             | 3,310          |                      |
| Ponders End   | 500                      | 4,030         | 2,000         | 145           | 6,675          |                      |
| Electric Quarter  | 2,500                    | 5,000         | 1,000         | 1,742         | 10,242         |                      |
| Edmonton Green  | -                        | 2,000         | 2,000         | -             | 4,000          |                      |
| Enfield Town  | -                        | 1,000         | 1,000         | -             | 2,000          |                      |
| Angel Edmonton  | 72                       | -             | -             | -             | 71             |                      |
| Market Gardening  | 71                       | 1,500         | -             | -             | 1,571          |                      |
| Lea Valley Heat Network                                 | 1,349                    | -             | -             | -             | 1,349          |                      |
| Broomfield House  | 231                      | -             | -             | -             | 231            |                      |
| The Crescent Edmonton                                   | 290                      | -             | -             | -             | 290            |                      |
| <b>Business &amp; Economic Development/Regeneration</b> | 585                      | -             | -             | -             | 585            |                      |
| <b>Regen &amp; Environment Total</b>                    | <b>101,527</b>           | <b>76,190</b> | <b>40,990</b> | <b>22,456</b> | <b>241,163</b> |                      |

| 4 Year Programme:                                   | Capital Programme Budget |               |               |              |          |                      |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------------------|
|   | APPROVED PROGRAMME       | 2016/17       | 2017/18       | 2018/19      | 2019/20  | Total 16-17 to 19-20 |
|   | £'000                    | £'000         | £'000         | £'000        | £'000    | £'000                |
| <b>Corporate Schemes:</b>                           |                          |               |               |              |          |                      |
| IT Work Plan  | 10,843                   | -             | -             | -            | -        | 10,843               |
| Joint Service Centre                                | 31                       | -             | -             | -            | -        | 31                   |
| Sloemans farm                                       | 24                       | -             | -             | -            | -        | 24                   |
| Southgate Circus Library Enabling Works             | 600                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 600                  |
| William Preye Day Centre                            | 300                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 300                  |
| Bury Street Depot Redevelopment                     | 2,000                    | 29,169        | -             | -            | -        | 31,169               |
| Enfield 2017  | 4,141                    | -             | -             | -            | -        | 4,141                |
| Community Libraries                                 | 907                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 907                  |
| Edmonton Green Library                              | 1,504                    | 2,450         | -             | -            | -        | 3,954                |
| Palmers Green & Enfield Library                     | 906                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 906                  |
| Culture   | 133                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 133                  |
| <b>Corporate Total</b>                              | <b>21,389</b>            | <b>31,619</b> | <b>0</b>      | <b>0</b>     | <b>0</b> | <b>53,008</b>        |
| <b>Health, Housing &amp; Adult Social Care</b>      |                          |               |               |              |          |                      |
| Disabled Facilities Grant (£1.156m grant funded)    | 2,108                    | 1,156         | 1,156         | 1,156        | -        | 5,576                |
| Sub Regional Housing Grants                         | 190                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 190                  |
| Housing Assistance Grants                           | 998                      | 818           | 818           | 818          | -        | 3,452                |
| Housing Gateway                                     | 47,615                   | -             | -             | -            | -        | 47,615               |
| Enfield Innovations Ltd                             | -                        | -             | 7,754         | -            | -        | 7,754                |
| Residential & Social Care Provision Elizabeth House | 10,292                   | -             | -             | -            | -        | 10,292               |
| New Options   | 80                       | -             | -             | -            | -        | 80                   |
| Mental Health and Wellbeing Centre                  | -                        | 938           | 684           | -            | -        | 1,622                |
| Coppice Wood Lodge                                  | 925                      | 7,000         | 4,900         | -            | -        | 12,825               |
| Ridge Ave Clinic                                    | 499                      | -             | -             | -            | -        | 499                  |
| <b>HHASC TOTAL</b>                                  | <b>62,707</b>            | <b>9,912</b>  | <b>15,312</b> | <b>1,974</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>89,905</b>        |

| 4 Year Programme:                         | Capital Programme Budget |                |               |               |         |                      |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|
|   | APPROVED PROGRAMME       | 2016/17        | 2017/18       | 2018/19       | 2019/20 | Total 16-17 to 19-20 |
|   |                          | £'000          | £'000         | £'000         | £'000   | £'000                |
| <b>Schools &amp; Children's Services</b>  |                          |                |               |               |         |                      |
| Schools Access Initiative                 | 93                       | -              | -             | -             | -       | 93                   |
| Target Capital Special Needs              | 9,121                    | -              | -             | -             | -       | 9,121                |
| Children's Centres                        | 701                      | -              | -             | -             | -       | 701                  |
| Targeted Capital School Meals Programme   | 3,666                    | 2,872          | -             | -             | -       | 6,538                |
| Schools Condition Funding                 | 5,316                    | -              | -             | -             | -       | 5,316                |
| Basic Need Primary School Places          | 823                      | -              | -             | -             | -       | 823                  |
| Primary Expansion Plan Phase 1            | 1,953                    | -              | -             | 1,843         | -       | 3,796                |
| Primary Expansion Phase 2 Grange School   | 605                      | -              | -             | -             | -       | 605                  |
| Primary Expansion Phase 2 Garfield School | 2,825                    | -              | -             | -             | -       | 2,825                |
| Primary Expansion Plan Phase 2            | 2,072                    | -              | -             | -             | -       | 2,072                |
| Minchenden School (Upper Autism)          | 7,610                    | 4,400          | 4,900         | -             | -       | 16,910               |
| Secondary Schools                         | 93                       | -              | -             | -             | -       | 93                   |
| Fire Precaution Works                     | 713                      | -              | -             | -             | -       | 713                  |
| Non School Schemes                        | 101                      | -              | -             | -             | -       | 101                  |
| Programme before Devolved Funding         | 35,692                   | 7,272          | 4,900         | 1,843         | -       | 49,707               |
| Devolved Schools Capital Schemes          | 6,000                    | 6,000          | 6,000         | 6,000         | -       | 24,000               |
| <b>SCS TOTAL</b>                          | <b>41,692</b>            | <b>13,272</b>  | <b>10,900</b> | <b>7,843</b>  |         | <b>73,707</b>        |
|   |                          |                |               |               |         |                      |
| <b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</b>                 | <b>227,315</b>           | <b>130,993</b> | <b>67,202</b> | <b>32,273</b> |         | <b>457,783</b>       |

| Housing Revenue Account |               |               |               |               |                |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Major Works             | 42,310        | 25,194        | 28,737        | 18,121        | 114,362        |
| Minor Works             | 2,435         | 2,880         | 2,880         | 2,880         | 11,075         |
| Estate Renewals         | 20,390        | 34,646        | 22,740        | 22,637        | 100,413        |
| Grants to vacate        | 90            | -             | -             | -             | 90             |
| <b>HRA TOTAL</b>        | <b>65,225</b> | <b>62,720</b> | <b>54,357</b> | <b>43,638</b> | <b>225,940</b> |

|                                   |                |                |                |               |                |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b> | <b>292,540</b> | <b>193,713</b> | <b>121,559</b> | <b>75,911</b> | <b>683,723</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|

**Appendix B**  
Proposed Schemes not yet Funded or Approved

| 4 Year Programme:                                | Capital Programme Budget |               |               |               |                |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| INDICATIVE PROGRAMME                             | 2016/17                  | 2017/18       | 2018/19       | 2019/20       | Total          |
|  | £'000                    | £'000         | £'000         | £'000         | £'000          |
| <b>Environment &amp; Regeneration</b>            |                          |               |               |               |                |
| TFL  |                          |               |               |               |                |
| Future Years                                     | -                        | 3,178         | 4,453         | 1,903         | 9,534          |
| Highways & Street scene:                         | -                        | 7,450         | 8,450         | 8,450         | 24,350         |
| Corridor Improvements Hertford Rd                | -                        | -             | -             | -             | 0              |
| Building Improvement Programme (BIP)             | -                        | 1,500         | 1,500         | 1,500         | 4,500          |
| Disability Access Programme                      | -                        | 200           | 200           | 200           | 600            |
| Regeneration:                                    | -                        | -             | -             | -             | 0              |
| Lea Valley Heat Network                          | -                        | 23,802        | -             | -             | 23,802         |
| New Southgate                                    | -                        | 500           | 500           | -             | 1,000          |
| <b>REGENERATION &amp; ENVIRONMENT TOTAL</b>      | <b>0</b>                 | <b>36,630</b> | <b>15,103</b> | <b>12,053</b> | <b>63,786</b>  |
| <b>Health, Housing &amp; Adult Social Care</b>   |                          |               |               |               |                |
| Housing  | -                        | -             | -             | -             |                |
| Disabled Facilities Grant (£1.156m grant funded) | -                        | -             | -             | -             | 0              |
| Housing Assistance Grants                        | -                        | -             | -             | -             | 0              |
| Affordable Housing                               | -                        | 7,106         | 2,100         | 2,100         | 11,306         |
| Adult Social Care                                | -                        | -             | -             | -             | 0              |
| Welfare Adaptations                              | 100                      | 100           | 100           | 100           | 400            |
| <b>HHASC TOTAL</b>                               | <b>100</b>               | <b>7,206</b>  | <b>2,200</b>  | <b>2,200</b>  | <b>11,706</b>  |
| <b>Schools &amp; Children's Services</b>         |                          |               |               |               |                |
| Schools Access Initiative                        | -                        | 250           | 250           | 250           | 750            |
| School Expansion Plan (Phase 2 PEP)              | -                        | 10,939        | -             | 6,000         | 16,939         |
| Schools Condition Funding                        | -                        | 4,500         | 4,483         | 4,483         | 13,466         |
| Fire Precaution Works                            | -                        | 467           | 500           | 500           | 1,467          |
| <b>SCS TOTAL</b>                                 | <b>0</b>                 | <b>16,156</b> | <b>5,233</b>  | <b>11,233</b> | <b>32,622</b>  |
|  |                          |               |               |               |                |
| <b>GENERAL FUND INDICATIVE</b>                   | <b>100</b>               | <b>59,992</b> | <b>22,536</b> | <b>25,486</b> | <b>108,114</b> |

This page is intentionally left blank

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **156**

### MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Cabinet 14<sup>th</sup> December  
2016  
Council 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017

### REPORT OF:

Director of Regeneration &  
Environment

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>   | <b>Item: 10</b> |
| <b>Subject:</b> Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan   |                 |
| <b>Wards:</b> Upper Edmonton, Edmonton Green, Lower Edmonton and Jubilee  |                 |
| <b>Key Decision No:</b> 4389  |                 |
| <b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b> Cllr Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development)<br>Cllr Savva (South East Associate Cabinet Member) |                 |

Contact officer and telephone number:

James Gummery – Principal Planning Officer

Tel: 020 8379 3498

Email: james.gummery@enfield.gov.uk

Tony Pierce – Interim Head of Planning Projects

Tel: 020 8379 2275

Email: tony.pierce@enfield.gov.uk

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (AAP) (Annex 1) – previously known as the Central Leaside Area Action Plan - will form part of Enfield's Local Plan and will deliver the spatial vision and land use strategy for this part of south east Enfield which includes Meridian Water. The previous consultation draft of the Edmonton Leaside AAP was approved by Council in November 2014. Since then proposals for Meridian Water have evolved and there have been a number of contextual initiatives which the Council has been actively progressing. These include:

- securing Housing Zones status and its recognition as one of London's leading regeneration projects;
- resolving to grant permission for the first phase of development comprising 725 homes as well as a new rail station;
- selecting Barratt and Segro as preferred development partner to act as master developer to drive forward the delivery;
- setting more aspirational long term objectives to boost housing provision to 10,000 homes and 6,000 jobs;
- making great progress with site assembly having already acquired over 20ha of land;
- supporting an acquisition strategy;

- actively supporting the Crossrail 2 Growth Commission in promoting the route via the Lee Valley as a growth corridor.

1.2 All these factors have necessitated a review of the earlier draft plan. Having an up to date statutory plan for the area will ensure good coordination of strategic issues and provide greater confidence in delivery. It will support land assembly and set clear expectations for the new development. Moreover, it will add weight to the case for Crossrail 2 and enable Enfield to have a clear position when engaging with GLA and government on proposals that may affect planning policies for this area.

1.3 Following consideration by the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee at its meeting on 22 November 2016, this report seeks endorsement by Cabinet for recommendation to full Council for approval of the draft plan for consultation and subsequent submission to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in Public.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the Cabinet:

2.2 Endorse the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan and recommend to Council its approval for publication, under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and thereafter be subject to a statutory period of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State for public examination.

2.3 Agree that the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development be delegated authority to agree the publication of the supplementary documents (assessment and supporting evidence base documents) of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside AAP.

2.4 Agree that the Director of Regeneration & Environment be delegated authority to make appropriate changes to the Submission version of the Edmonton Leaside AAP and undertake any further consultation required, in the run up to and during the public examination process into the document, in response to representations received, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice. Changes of a substantive nature will be considered by the Local Plan Cabinet Sub Committee.



### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Edmonton Leaside is the largest strategic growth area identified in the Council's Core Strategy (2010) and is located in the south east of the borough. It covers the vital development site at Meridian Water, as well as a number of established employment estates, major infrastructure facilities such as the Edmonton Eco Park and Deephams Sewage Treatment Works, the Lea Valley Regional Park and its facilities at Picketts Lock. Core Strategy Policies 37 and 38 provide policy basis for preparing a more detailed area action plan.
- 3.2 Whilst a previous version of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside AAP was approved by Council on 19 November 2014 and public consultation undertaken, several key changes to circumstances - including the award of Housing Zone funding and objectives for an increase in homes, increasing population in the borough, purchase by the Council of significant land parcels in Meridian Water, Crossrail 2 proposals and the commencement of tendering for a master developer – combined to require a new evidence base for and review of the AAP. The comments received during the public consultation have informed this AAP document.
- 3.3 At the meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside AAP was taken to the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee. The Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee took the decision to change the document name from 'Central Leaside Area Action Plan' to 'Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan', to better reflect the locality. In addition a number of recommendations were suggested which have all been incorporated.
- 3.4 The Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside AAP document is attached at Annex 1.
- 3.5 The Edmonton Leaside AAP will provide the planning framework for a number of key projects:
- Regeneration of Meridian Water to provide thousands of new homes, commercial and community facilities to create thousands of new jobs, and improvements to Angel Road railway station within a sustainable environment;
  - New retail for a growing population;
  - Intensification and revitalisation of the industrial estates;
  - Supporting changes to transport infrastructure, including 3, then 4 tracking of the railway line, a better environment for pedestrians and cyclists, the provision of the Causeway, and an improved bus service;
  - Provision of Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN), a decentralised energy network, making use of heat generated at the Edmonton EcoPark waste processing facility;

- Revitalisation and intensification of the Picketts Lock site for leisure uses; and
- Major upgrade of the Deephams Sewage Treatment Works.

3.6 The Council's publication under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, is anticipated to run from February 2017 to March 2017. A minimum of a 6 week consultancy period is required. A statement of conformity with the London Plan will be sought from the Mayor of London.

3.7 Representations received from the publication stage will be formally submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) with the final submission version of the ELAAP, along with all supporting documents such as the final Sustainability Appraisal and EqIA. The SoS will appoint a Planning Inspector to conduct an Examination in Public to determine the soundness of the document. The Examination is expected to take place in August 2017.

3.8 Once the public examination process is concluded, and depending on the nature of the comments in the Inspector's report, the Council will be able to adopt the document as a statutory development plan. Adoption is scheduled for late autumn 2017.

3.9 From the Proposed Submission Stage going forward, greater weight will be afforded to the Edmonton Leaside AAP as it progresses through the plan-making process. Once adopted, the Edmonton Leaside AAP will form part of the Council's Local Plan that provides a spatial policy framework for the regeneration of the Edmonton Leaside area including the major developments of Meridian Water, Edmonton Eco Park, Picketts Lock and regeneration of industrial estates. It will build upon the policies adopted in the Council's Core Strategy, Development Management Document and Policies Map.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 None. Having an adopted and comprehensive planning framework for the area provides a basis for setting the area specific planning policies by which decisions on development can be guided. This is essential to support the Council's regeneration programme, for on-going as well as future investment opportunities.

#### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1 It is recommended that Members agree the recommendation that Edmonton Leaside AAP proceeds so it may fulfil the following aims:

- Supporting an acquisition strategy;
- Providing a planning framework against which the Council can determine planning applications in Meridian Water and the wider Edmonton Leaside area;
- Providing a tool with which the Council can measure and assess the master developer's plans; and
- Giving the Council the confidence of having a long-term planning approach to Meridian Water.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

- This report seeks endorsement by Local Plan Cabinet Sub Committee of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside AAP for consultation and subsequent submission to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in Public. Provision for the cost of preparing the Edmonton Leaside AAP is included in the Local Plan Budget. The report contains a variety of future options but does not in itself commit the Council to additional expenditure. Any future proposals with cost implications would need to be subject to separate reports and full financial appraisal

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) as amended and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the Regulations) require local authorities to prepare the local plan, which consists of the local development documents (LDDs).
- The proposed ELAAP is a LDD in accordance with Regulation 5(1) (a) of the Regulations.
- The LDDs must conform with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the London Plan and the Council's own policies.
- The form and content of the ELAAP must conform with the requirements of Part 4 of the Regulations.
- The recommendations are in accordance with the Council's powers and duties.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

- The Edmonton Leaside area includes the main opportunities for growth and change in the borough, and indeed represents one of London's key regeneration prospects. The area includes several

large areas of employment land, including Council owned estates, and this is the main property interest. The AAP includes proposals for new and revised 'strategic' and 'local' designations for some of the industrial land, together with a specific policy for improving and modernising existing Industrial areas, including Montagu and Claverings. These priorities are fully supported by the Council as landowner, and, in conjunction with occupiers, will need to be translated into specific operational management action and other practical initiatives, as also identified by the Industrial Estates Strategy.

## **7. KEY RISKS**

- 7.1 The absence of a robust set of area specific policies would result in a policy gap which could lead to inappropriate, uncoordinated and poor quality development that fails to respond comprehensively to needs and priorities of local communities, the borough and the wider sub-region. It would also negatively impact on the success of the Meridian Water regeneration programme.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **8.1 Fairness for All**

The Edmonton Leaside AAP will be an important tool in tackling the inequalities between eastern Enfield and other parts of the borough. It will support investment and regeneration and in turn employment as well as provide a range of community facilities and physical infrastructure.

### **8.2 Growth and Sustainability**

The Area Action Plan will provide a positive statutory framework for attracting investment and managing the delivery of growth in the area.

### **8.3 Strong Communities**

The Area Action Plan will be supportive of strong communities, particularly in terms of ensuring consideration is given to addressing existing deficiencies and providing new physical, social and community infrastructure.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The policies and proposals of the AAP will have a positive impact on equalities in general. To ensure that this is the case an EqIA has been prepared by the Strategic Planning team to support the AAP submission.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 The implementation of the AAP will be subject regular assessment in annual Monitoring Report. The projects taking place in the Edmonton Leaside are will be subject to robust performance monitoring.

## **11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The AAP will have a positive impact upon the health and well-being of the public in this part of Enfield in terms of improving the environment, encouraging healthy lifestyles, reducing pollution and improving social cohesion. This will include increasing everyday physical activity through making walking and cycling part of everyday life as recommended by the Chief Medical Officer which will bring associated avoided risks / costs of motorised transport such as pollution, noise and segregation. Equally, climate change has been described as the greatest threat to the health of the public in the 21st century. There are therefore great potential public health benefits from this development. However, implementation of the plan will need to be monitored to ensure that these benefits are realised.

## **Background Papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **157**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet  
14 December 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Chief Executive and  
the Director of Finance,  
Resources and Customer  
Services  
Contact officer and telephone number:  
Paul Kearsley, AD Transformation  
E mail: [Paul.Kearsley@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Kearsley@enfield.gov.uk)  
Tel 07970 314666

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part:</b> 1  | <b>Item:</b> 11 |
| <b>Subject: ICT Capital Investment 2017 - 2020</b>                               |                 |
| <b>Wards: All</b>  |                 |
| <b>Key Decision No: 4410</b>   |                 |
| <b>Cabinet Members consulted:</b><br><b>Cllr Lemonides</b><br><b>Cllr Taylor</b> |                 |

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Historically the Council funded ongoing investment in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) through annual underspends in the revenue budget. However, through the twin pressures of unprecedented demand for statutory services and near 50% cuts in government funding, these revenue underspends have now been eradicated. On 10 February 2016 a report to Cabinet highlighted this situation and confirmed that as the Council moves forward it would need to put ongoing investment in ICT on a secure footing.

The Council has made significant progress in modernising the technology used by the workforce, partners and customers. This investment has been essential for the Council to maintain services with significantly less funding. Like any major service based organisation the Council will be required to make ongoing investment in ICT on a year on year basis. This report outlines the continued investment needed in ICT systems, infrastructure and associated processes in a proposal for a new ICT Capital Programme. The report outlines how recently introduced digital technology can be further developed to support on-going savings in line with the Medium Term Financial Plan and further improve customer experience.

However, the report clearly outlines that the proposed next phase of ICT investment will be mainly focused on essential modernisation of software systems for major council services. As well as essential updates to core ICT infrastructure and hardware required to keep the Council compliant with external legislation, maintain ICT equipment in a useable state while, keeping data secure. The report will outline the cyclical nature of ICT funding and how the investment over the next three years will significantly reduce, year on year to a level that is in line with ongoing funding in organisations that are in a steady state

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Approve for recommendation to full Council, the addition of £32m to the capital programme for ICT capital requirements over the 3 years 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20. Cabinet is asked to note that this will need to be met from Council borrowing.

## **3.0 BACKGROUND**

3.0.1 Until 2013/14 the Council funded ongoing ICT investment through annual underspends in the revenue budget. However, through the twin pressures of unprecedented demand for statutory services and near 50% cuts in government funding these revenue underspends have now been eradicated. On 10 February 2016 a report to Cabinet highlighted this situation and confirmed that as the Council moves forward it would need to put ongoing ICT investment on a secure footing.

3.0.2 Since 2014/15 the Council has utilised a significant proportion of £16m Enfield 2017 capital funding to achieve significant progress in digitally enabling its workforce, partners and customer access. This was agreed as one of a number of solutions to maintaining services with significantly less funding. Through this funding, the Council now has the foundation for on-going digital service delivery, including a new responsive website with the interactive on line Enfield Connected account. Enfield Connected includes a range of ground breaking web services that enable customers to make complex applications and account updates for services like housing and benefits, in full, on line. The Council has also harnessed digital technology in the back office to automate business processes and reduce cost of delivery. The ICT team has laid the foundations of a new cloud based ICT infrastructure that will enable greater flexibility in the way the council and its partners deliver service. This technology investment has been integral to the Council being on track to deliver £29m of savings between 2014/15 and 2019/20.

3.0.3 In early August 2016 the ICT service provided by Serco was successfully bought back into the Council. A restructure of ICT and



Transformation is now underway to enable £0.5m+ of savings and a further £1m reduction against cost pressure. This is being achieved in part by reducing permanent posts funded from the ICT revenue budget to a level that only covers business as usual ICT activity. To offset this all transformational ICT staff activity associated with changing or introducing new software and hardware will need to be capital funded as part of an ongoing capital programme. This will involve capital funding a number of fixed term posts to support services to build on the recent technology investment in the medium term but then scale back once the organisation reaches a steady state

### **3.1 Why ongoing ICT investment is required**

- 3.1.1 The Council ICT service will run out of capital to fund ongoing investment in ICT in January 2017. This capital not only covers the purchase of ICT products but the cost of internal and external staff such as developers, project managers, programme managers and business analysts. Any significant break in investment will result in delaying ongoing development in ICT and also losing a number of contractors and fixed term employees to the ICT market.
- 3.1.2 The council should seek to assure the continued quality and compatibility of the technology investments made. Both the hardware and software investments made to date are subject to the effects of time. Suppliers regularly upgrade their software and withdraw support for older versions. Hardware manufacturers similarly produce new equipment and stop providing security and maintenance.
- 3.1.3 The Council has no choice but to continue to maintain hardware and software that is compliant with the Public Service Network (PSN) regulated by Cabinet Office. The PSN enables a range of fundamental processes dependent on exchanging data with external public bodies including the DWP, The Passport Office, Home Office, DVLA, NHS and many others. This will involve upgrading major line of business applications and ongoing investment in the Council's data and communication network. Furthermore, the council has to continue to provide up to date equipment to its employees to carry out their roles efficiently and effectively every day.
- 3.1.4 Customer access and self-service through the new website and the Enfield Connected account can be continually enhanced as we move our remaining line of business software applications into the Cloud. Cloud based software can enable better integration to the Enfield Connected account and increasingly reduce the back office burden through automation of processes such as invoicing and payments, financial accounting, managing human resources, managing records even handling customer enquiries.
- 3.1.5 In response to demands in key service areas the Council is migrating major service software applications including the Adult Social Care

system, the Housing system and the telephony system to the most up to date cloud based versions. The ambition is to review our processes across our service delivery teams and the back office hubs that support them ahead of configuring these new systems. This will involve reviewing and designing processes with service teams and real customers. This will enable the most efficient deployment of this technology and build engagement to doing things differently in delivery teams from the outset. Importantly this approach will enable the council to improve customer satisfaction through improved transactional experience

- 3.1.6 By improving end to end integration we will be able to push more information to customers through the Enfield Connected account, the website and other channels automatically. This will keep customers up to date with progress of their transactions, improving their experience and reducing subsequent chasing enquiries to the customer gateway. The ambition is to also continue to automate more customer triage for services, reducing the burden on assessment teams in high volume areas like housing, adult social care and benefits. This will enable the reduced resource of the Council to be focused on those that cannot self-serve or need more intensive help.

## **3.2 What ICT Investment is required**

- 3.2.1 Section 3.1 outlines why there has been, and continues to be, the need to provide capital investment toward the continuous improvement of technology and the ICT infrastructure. A report to Cabinet on 10 February 2016 highlighted that ICT investment used to be funded from revenue underspend but the reduction in Council revenue funding means this is no longer possible and capital funding would be required to put ICT investment on a secure footing.
- 3.2.2 While not all investment can be identified “up front”, for example, equipment can fail, the fluctuation of sterling against the dollar can drive significant variations in cost, and so forth, we have profiled a best estimate three-year capital investment programme against known-knowns. Our key proposed investment projects are outlined in appendix 1.
- 3.2.3 It is recommended that the activities in appendix 1 are delivered over a three-year period from April 2017 to March 2020. The ICT products, third party developers, project managers and other support staff required should be funded from a single capital programme of £32m over three years. The investment as profiled in the table below is initially high over the first two years as the organisation has a number of large system changes to make in the short term. This is due to the ongoing cycle of ICT Disruption that organisations experience. Enfield is having to replace a large number of systems at once to release the full benefits of Digital Services and Cloud Storage, two huge technology shifts. However, the investment will bring Enfield into a

steady state for a prolonged period and ongoing investment will taper off to a level below year 3 for the medium term. This is profiled in the table below:

| 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| £14m    | £12m    | £6m     |

3.2.4 The investment breaks down into two main areas:

**Keeping the hardware up to date, compliant and data secure – £9m**

- Maintaining and updating the whole data network including communications, data transfer, storage and Wi-Fi.
- Ensuring staff desktop IT and communication devices are up to date
- Continuously improving cloud storage capacity and capability

**Upgrading and replacing software for external compliance, service integration, internal efficiencies and improved customer experience - £23m**

- Upgrading the incumbent end of life Housing Services solution to a cloud based Housing system across all housing functions and developing improved on-line access
- Upgrading the incumbent end of life Adult Social Care solution to the cloud based Adult Social Care system across all ASC functions and developing improved on line access. Developing a Shared Care Record in line with the NHS Personalised Health and Care Framework
- Replacing numerous back office systems with universal cloud based systems in performance management/data analysis, workflow and information storage.
- Improving customer experience through new telephony, website enhancements, ongoing development of the Enfield Connected account, developing Artificial Intelligence (AI) solutions for customer access and back office automation

3.2.5 This investment includes the capitalisation of 75% (approximately £800k) of the anticipated licensing costs over three years to minimise the impact on revenue budgets in the short term.

3.2.6 The investment is front loaded to enable a continued pace of delivery over the first year to move the new operating model of the Council towards a stable state, making the rapid improvements required to customer experience while maintain and growing the savings of Enfield 2017. The overall investment is in line with industry benchmarks for an organisation the size of Enfield having recently accelerated its ambition to serve customers digitally and at the end of the three years the

overall investment is closer to the lower ongoing amount required for continuous ICT investment.

- 3.2.7 This investment will ensure the Council can retain the ongoing savings of £29m delivered by Enfield 2017 in the long term and will enable the Council to deliver savings beyond these through new functions like the Procurement and Commissioning Hub and the ability to technically integrate with other public service bodies such as the National Health Service.

### **3.3 Governance**

- 3.3.1 Strategic Delivery Board (SDB) will approve the specific delivery arrangements for each individual aspect of the programme, including spend (within the confines of the approved budget and Councils overall governance arrangements).

## **4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.0.1 **Option 1: Continue to operate under the now rescinded ICT outsourced service, with a higher revenue funded proportion of transformation staff:**

This option was discounted as the mutually beneficial end to the Serco ICT contract was preferred by both the council and Serco due to significant savings identified in moving away from the Serco hosting agreement to a Microsoft Azure cloud data centre. The restructure of ICT and Transformation is underway which will reduce the revenue overspend. To offset this revenue reduction an increase in capital funded fixed term posts is required to manage the work already committed to as well as meeting further medium term challenges the council faces.

- 4.0.3 **Option 2- Do Nothing**

A significant proportion of investment is being driven externally through the ongoing need to maintain compliance with the Cabinet Office PSN and the wider public service integration agenda, as such the Council has no choice in making this investment. The remainder of the investment is required to maintain the level of efficiencies that have enabled the savings of £29m being delivered through Enfield 2017 to be secured in the long term.

## **5.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.0.1 The benefits of the next wave of investment fall under three main areas:

- 5.0.2 **Improved customer experience and wider stakeholder engagement:**

- Seamless services in better connected / increasingly integrated public services with people getting the right service from the right provider.
- Easy and clear customer access to the most appropriate support in the borough.
- Full range of Council services available online as 24/7 services with live updates back to customers through back office systems integrated into the Enfield Account.
- Quality call centre and face to face services targeted to meeting the diversity of customer needs with a quality and cost effective service
- Increased engagement in design and opportunities to shape and contribute to service delivery enabling stronger communities and truly local service provision.

**5.0.3 Ongoing external compliance and compatibility, fit for purpose internal solutions:**

- Enfield ICT infrastructure and systems continue to meet the requirements laid down by the Cabinet Office to exchange essential data across the Public Services Network (PSN)
- Enfield ICT enables exchange of data and shared development of solutions essential to the integration of key services such as health and social care or academy schools and children services
- Enfield's significantly reduced workforce has the technology and supporting equipment to allow them to effectively carry out their jobs.

**5.0.4 Securing the £29m annual revenue saving delivered by Enfield 2017 for the long term:**

- Reduction in demand created by stabilising the website, the customer gateway, service delivery teams and the hubs that support them
- Live intelligence informing better decision making by council teams with a reduced reliance on support. Fully automated statutory reporting enabling savings in staffing and remaining resources to be focused on using data to look forward and manage demand.
- Stabilisation and optimisation of the hubs through further automation of administrative processes and removal of unnecessary manual activity.
- Funding fixed term posts from capital for Transformation staff involved in technology improvement activity across the Council will allow this essential work to continue in the short term. However, this approach will also deliver an immediate reduction of £0.5m from the beginning of 2017/18 as the permanent ICT team can be scaled back to just business as usual activity.

**6.0 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

## 6.1 Financial Implications

6.1.1 Please see section 3.2 for a full explanation of the capital investment required how it should be profiled and why. This investment of £32m profiled as per 3.2.3 above is not currently included within the Council's Capital Programme. There is no identified source of funding and as such this will need to be approved by Council for its addition to the capital programme and funded from new borrowing.

6.1.2 The borrowing will be apportioned in line with forecast expenditure over the three years and will fund a combination of new IT equipment and investment into software and system with a range of asset lives. As such the budgeted repayments from revenue will be over a variety of years but the table below sets out the average revenue costs of borrowing using 3.5% interest and an annuity calculation over the asset lives.

|           | 2018/19   | 2019/20   | 2020/21   | Full Yr   |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Repayment | 2,368,420 | 4,398,494 | 4,906,013 | 5,413,531 |

## 6.2 Legal Implications

6.2.1 The Council has the power under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of its functions. The measures outlined in this Report, are incidental to the functions of the Council's departments and are intended to help maintain and ensure an effective IT service to the Council and to improve the Council's financial position to properly discharge its functions.

6.2.2 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 further empowers the Council to do anything that individuals generally may do, provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law Principles.

6.2.3 The Council must comply with its obligations regarding obtaining best value under the Local Government (Best Value Principles) Act 1999.

6.2.4 The Council must comply with its Constitution and Contract Procedure Rules; Officers should, in particular, satisfy themselves, before committing expenditure by the Council that contracts with the respective contractors, are in force and have been procured compliantly with advice and assistance from the Council's Corporate Procurement Team.

6.2.5 All legal agreements (and ancillary documentation where relevant) arising from the matters described in this Report must be approved in advance of contract commencement by the Assistant Director of Legal and Governance Services, so as to best protect the Council's commercial contracting position.

## 7.0 KEY RISKS

| Risk   | Mitigation  |
|--|---|
| Benefits and Costs are not clearly articulated   | All costs have been considered in development of the Capital programme<br>Benefits will be tracked through the programme boards and reported to SDB and the associated Member board at an agreed frequency.   |
| Minority or Vulnerable customer groups might be disadvantaged by changes in the programme  | We will continue to provide a range of access channels and promote online as the channel of choice, not must.<br>More inclusive review and design will enable a better view of the needs of the most vulnerable and will engage a broad range of customers in redesign<br>Major system will have a specific EQIA carried out and kept live throughout the programme lifecycle |
| The current business case process does not include increased revenue for support, maintenance and licensing of software products. As a result, the revenue pressure on ICT increases year on year. | All business cases moving forwards include these costs in the overall analysis and benefits proposal.   |
| The hybrid-cloud data centre solution (Azure, SunGard) may prove difficult to implement due to legacy software issues, resulting in increased operational costs and risks to disaster recovery.    | We are working closely with Microsoft, SunGard and specialist auditors to mitigate the risks.   |

## 8.0 IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

### 8.1.0 Fairness for All

8.1.1 The ICT investment programme and the recommendations in this report will ensure improved access to services for all the Borough's residents. It will do so through the increased use of digital channels, by the automisation of back office functions and workflow to support an increased focus on delivery of front line services.

8.1.2 By developing access channels and services that are fit for purpose now and into the future. This investment will ensure that our customers and residents can access all the services and support they require, as and when they need it and in a manner that suits them.

8.1.3 The ICT developed will allow the Council to increase its proactive analysis and support it identifying those who would most benefit from contact by the Council or its partners before they reach a point of crisis.

8.1.4 As well as delivering improvements for the customer, ICT investment will ensure that the Council is able to offer staff the tools, environment

and development to build fulfilling careers focused on providing the outcomes our residents require.

## **8.2.0 Growth and Sustainability**

8.2.1 Increased use of digital channels and more rapid outcome delivery for customers will reduce the cost and carbon footprint of customer access. Making it easier for customers to access services in this way will reduce the need for them to visit local offices and this will, in turn, reduce the Council's own emissions.

8.2.2 ICT investment will support staff to work in a new way, delivering services to our customers that are sustainable, efficient, cost effective, local and available when they need them.

## **9.0 EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

9.0.1 The scope and scale of the investment proposed will result in continued improvement to our organisation, staff, working practices, services to customers and the manner in which they engage with us.

9.0.2 Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out on a programme by programme basis and at a project level where appropriate.

9.0.3 Programme boards will ensure appropriate assessments are undertaken and the on-going monitoring process will take place through these boards.

## **10.0 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

### **10.0.1 Benefits monitoring**

There will be only one route for the monitoring of delivery and benefits. This will be via the Strategic Delivery Board (SDB) with six monthly reporting to Cabinet

10.0.2 All financial savings will be monitored on the Council's normal reporting system with non-cashable benefits captured by the programme and regularly reported to SDB and Cabinet.

### **10.1.1 General monitoring**

Progress against milestones and targets will be monitored by the ICT programme management office, and will include the use of the corporate performance system VERTO.

10.1.2 All aspects of the programme will be reported, monitored and managed using Enfield Council's standard approach to programme management with identified risks and issues escalated as appropriate.



## **11.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

11.0.1 The ICT programme team will work closely with HR and occupational health services to ensure that any health and safety implications are identified and addressed and that, if required by an employee, access to the employee assistance programme is readily available

## **12.0 HR IMPLICATIONS**

12.0.1 To meet the financial savings identified in this report, officers will need to design work programmes which will identify the numbers of posts required following service redesign and other improvements.

12.0.2 When the work has been completed, employment legislation requires that there should be consultation with the trade unions and staff affected on the potential numbers of redundancies, the methods of selection of staff and alternative strategies to minimise the numbers of any compulsory redundancies, such as a reduction in agency staff and staff redeployment.

12.0.3 To date the Council has been successful in minimising the number of compulsory redundancies through a range of measures including:

- Natural wastage
- Robust redeployment
- Flexible retirement
- The creation of a flexible agency workforce to minimise the future impact on job losses and redundancies

In addition to the above moving forward we will:

- Promote the voluntary reduction in hours
- Promote early retirement
- Reduce the number of agency workers
- Impose a recruitment freeze in staffing areas affected

12.0.5 All the above initiatives will allow the Council to comply with its employment legislative obligations and responsibilities

## **13.0 Public Health Implications**

13.0.1 The challenges of the increasing demand and the current and future reductions in local Government funding have severe implications for the health of the public both in relation to services provided and for the capacity for Local Government to produce environments that are conducive to health and healthy lifestyles. The ICT investment programme will seek to mitigate the effects of these cuts to funding by increasing the capacity of the Council through the use of electronic systems and by using digital channels to signpost and support residents to either self-support or to use resources that are least costly.

13.0.2 However, there is no doubt that the financial cuts to the Local Authority present a significant challenge through which maintaining and improving the health and the public will be a significant concern, particularly for our most vulnerable residents. Ongoing work will be needed to both understand how this impacts upon Enfield residents and what mitigation measures might consequently be required.

**Background Papers**

None

**Appendix 1 – overview 3-year ICT investment**

| Investment Outcome and Cost  | Main solutions and systems delivered   | Improvements /Benefits  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Up to date, compliant hardware and secure data - £9m over 3 years including all design, development and implementation plus Licensing Costs</b> | Full LBE Network Upgrade across main offices and public access buildings including up to date Wi- Fi | >LBE remains compliant with Cabinet Office rules of data security (PSN).<br>>Library network can cope with requirements of being our main customer access centres   |
|  | Replacement laptops and other equipment  | >Officers have right tools for their job and avoid duplicating activity or other ways of wasting time<br>>Reduce spend on repairing out of date equipment<br>>Improved Self service devices in customer access centres.                 |
|  | Duplicate development environments for website   | >Ability to keep the website live when releasing upgrades and limiting downtime through development errors in the live environment  |
|  | Database rationalisation migrating solutions and maintenance improvements                            | >Move into the Azure cloud reducing internal storage requirements improving capability to share, analyse and publish data across systems and organisations. >Increased automation of system maintenance reducing cost and removing risk |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Upgrading and replacing key software for improved customer experience and increased back office efficiency - £23m over 3 years including all design, development and implementation plus Licensing Costs</b> | OLM Iclipse Adult Social Care system                     | >Increased process efficiency in ASC through end to end review.<br>>Demand reduction through improved digital market place for ASC and PH provision.<br>>Ability to analyse and share data with NHS through the cloud.<br>>Ability for customers to manage their ASC needs through Enfield Connected .<br>> Increased back office automation including direct payments, invoicing and supplier payments.   |
|   | Shared Care Record with NHS                              | >Meeting the requirement of the NHS Personalised Health and Care Framework, improving experience of combined health and care customers.<br>>Ability to connect Shared Care Record into the Enfield Connected account   |
|   | Power BI Data analytics and reporting and SharePoint 365 | >Significant cost reduction through automation of all statutory reporting. Live data dashboards for daily decision making and publishing performance.<br>>Ability to manage increases in demand through forward looking live data analytics<br>>Ability to analyse data across services and with partner agencies in the cloud and automate comparison with external data also ensuring costs and savings are more effectively shared between agencies.<br>>Potential to sell our expertise in this new Microsoft technology.<br>>Improved back office efficiency and service consistency through improved workflow and a new intranet with embedded rules based on revised Scheme of Delegation   |
|   | New Telephone and Web Services                           | >Quicker customer processing over phone, face to face and website.<br>>Reduced follow up enquiries through automated status updates via Enfield Connected.<br>> Reduced process and improved experience by replacing old web forms and PDF forms.<br>>Back office efficiency and improved experience through new booking and payment solutions.<br>>Improved online access telephony and automation for Planning, Building Control, Licensing, Enforcement, Education, ASC Access, Housing and Early Help for Families.<br>>Automated customer waste and street cleansing updates through Enfield Connected .<br>> Increased 24/7 self service through Artificial Intelligence and potential to sell our digital and AI products and expertise |
|   | Civica CX Housing system                                 | >Ability to analyse and share housing data with other Registered Social Landlords through the Cloud<br>>Ability to connect all key housing processes including assessment, allocation, rents, repairs and contract management through a single database<br>>Ability for customers to manage their Housing needs through Enfield Connected<br>>Ability for landlords to access key information through the Enfield Connected account<br>> Increased back office automation including direct payments, invoicing and supplier payments.  |



This page is intentionally left blank

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **158**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet -14 December 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Assistant Director Human Resources

Contact officer and telephone number:

Tony Gilling – 020 8379 4141

Email: [tony.gilling@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:tony.gilling@enfield.gov.uk)

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>Agenda - Part: 1</b>                                | <b>Item: 12</b> |
| <b>Subject:</b><br>Senior Job Pay Structure and Titles |                 |
| <b>Wards:</b><br><b>Key Decision No:</b>               |                 |
| <b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b> Cllr Lemonides        |                 |

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report reviews the current pay structure for senior leaders in the Council and recommends changes to assist the development of an organisation structure which will deliver value for money services with fewer resources. Changes along these lines were agreed by the Remuneration Committee on 13 October 2016 and are designed to enable the Council to compete in the recruitment market to recruit and retain high calibre senior leaders and provide effective succession planning.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

With effect from 1 January 2017:

- i. The four posts of Director are renamed as Executive Directors to better reflect the organisational requirements of officers at this level.
- ii. To reintroduce an intermediate grade of Director (where it is externally validated that the job size requires this grade) to meet the need to provide additional capacity to Executive Directors with wide spans of control.
- iii. To agree an external evaluation process to determine whether any new or existing posts should be graded at the new levels and the Director level posts should be subject to ratification at the Council's Remuneration Committee.

With effect from 1 April 2017:

- iv. To reintroduce an intermediate grade of Head of Service 3, (where it is externally validated that the job size requires this grade) to recognise the increased responsibilities and demands at this level resulting from the reduction in the number of managers.

### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The pay structure for senior managers in the Council has now been in place for over 10 years and the structure was extended to include middle managers with effect from 1 April 2011. Given that the landscape in local government has changed considerably over this period of time, with significant budget reductions and the implementation of new delivery models, it is an opportune time to review whether the current pay structure is fit for purpose i.e. it succeeds in recruiting and retaining good quality staff.
- 3.2 The pay structure has seven levels as detailed in Appendix 1. The Head of Service to Chief Executive level has 26 incremental points and MM1/2 has 25. Progression is only possible if the postholder meets their objectives from the previous appraisal year. The top 10 increments are not consolidated so postholders will have to maintain or increase their performance for the next year to maintain their entitlement to their increments. This means that the top 10% of pay is 'pay at risk' which adheres to the recommendations of the Hutton report on senior pay. The pay rates are based on the national JNC rates which are nationally negotiated and posts are evaluated using the Hay evaluation scheme. The Hay scheme focuses on outcomes and more readily recognises technical expertise compared to the traditional local government job evaluation schemes. It therefore supports the culture Enfield is seeking to promote.
- 3.3 Senior and middle manager salaries are based on JNC pay rates. Between 2008 and 1 January 2015, the JNC pay rates were frozen and salaries over £100k have been frozen to 1 April 2016. The salaries for staff graded below MM1 are set in accordance with NJC rates. NJC pay rates have been increased during the reference period, 1% in 2009, 1% in 2013 and 2.2% in 2015, with a backdated lump sum. The combined effect of this is that staff on NJC pay and conditions have seen their salaries increase by 3% more than JNC staff on salaries less than £100k and 5% for staff on £100k or more. This has served to reduce differentials between managers and the staff they manage and reduce the competitiveness of Enfield managers' salaries against other London Councils who use the NJC pay rates to determine their managers' salaries.
- 3.4 London Councils conduct an annual survey of senior and middle manager salaries (2014/15 attached as Appendix 2). This survey shows that salaries at the Assistant Director and Head of Service levels (third and fourth tier management) have now fallen behind the median in London. Since 1 January 2015, the Council has lost two Assistant Directors to Camden and nine Heads of Service. This trend is particularly worrying as Enfield moves to increase spans of control and increase responsibility for managers. The Enfield 2017 organisation model is predicated on the principle of delivering 'more with less'. To make this happen, it is imperative that the Council employs the highest

quality managers and that competitive reward packages are paid to secure their employment.

- 3.5 As the Council is restructured, some managerial posts will increase significantly in size and magnitude. The Enfield 2017 model provides for five levels of management above the front line, Chief Executive, Directors, Assistant Directors, Heads of Service and Middle Managers. The Hay grades and titles reflect this restructure; there are visible gaps between the Director & AD ranges and AD & HOS. The problem arises where employees' positions expand to a point where they are above the designated grade but is insufficient to be regraded to the next level. Over the last 10 years, the Council has reduced the number of management grades up to Directors from eight (SM1-5, three Assistant Directors grades) to five (MM1, MM2, HOS1, 2 and Assistant Director). The rationale behind this approach has been to assist in the delayering process and prevent grade drift, where employees constantly seek to acquire new duties to push their grades up to the next level when they are near the top of the grade. This second point has now dissipated as the Council has moved to an outcome focused culture where staff focus on the priorities for the Council and on what they need to do to deliver a service not the size of their empire. Given this, consideration should be given to whether new grades should be introduced between the levels to accommodate positions which fall between two grades. This option would not be introducing a new layer of management; it merely reflects the fact that within each management level there are differences in the scope and accountabilities for positions.
- 3.6 In 2014, the number of Directors was reduced from five to four and since that time, the number of functions the Council is responsible for have increased e.g. Council Housing has returned to the Council, the regeneration agenda has increased. In some cases this has served to significantly increase the number of reports to a Director. Where this is the case, this may inevitably draw the Director into operational areas to the detriment of their corporate, cross cutting strategic accountabilities. To address this issue, it is recommended that the pay range previously allocated to grade AD1 which fell out of use in 2009 due to the reasons outlined in paragraph 3.5 should be reactivated. This range can be used for the new position of Director.
- 3.7 The new post would report to current Directors playing a key strategic role creating capacity for the current Directors to focus on driving corporate strategic outcomes. The additional post will enable the Council to compete in an extremely competitive market and recruit and retain high calibre officers to deliver the Council's agenda. It will also provide opportunities for effective future succession planning. To complement this change, the current post of Director will be retitled Executive Director to emphasise the corporate strategic accountabilities at this level. This post title is commonly used in London with eight councils and 18 senior officers currently utilising this title. Also, this

senior pay structure is similar to the Croydon model which is a large outer London council with a comparable population and challenges.

- 3.8 As the new Director posts will be paid at a higher rate (Appendix 3) the creation of such a post will require a business case which demonstrates that it will provide value for money. To ensure that there is objectivity in the evaluation process and the Council taxpayer obtains value for money, it is recommended that any Director posts can only be put forward for evaluation with the agreement of the relevant Executive Director and the Assistant Director Human Resources. If they so agree, the posts will be evaluated by an external expert body. If it is recommended that the post is graded at the new Director level, then the case will be referred to the Remuneration Committee. The decision of the Remuneration Committee will be final.
- 3.9 There are similar organisational demand requirements at the Head of Service level. With the reduction in number of senior managers, some Heads of Service have wide ranging portfolios and there will be a need to provide additional support for Assistant Directors as decision making is pushed down the organisation. To accommodate posts which fall above the Head of Service 2 grade it is recommended that a higher HOS3 grade be created, using the former AD3 pay range which is no longer used (rates contained in Appendix 3). This grade will be used for posts where it can be demonstrated that there is a higher level of cross cutting responsibilities and there is a requirement to deputise for the Assistant Director and/or there is a higher level of expertise and/or the consequences of the outcomes delivered are significant for the Council. These newly created posts will be subject to the same evaluation controls as the new Director posts save for there will not be a requirement for Remuneration Committee ratification.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Given the retention problems identified in paragraph 3.4, maintaining the status quo in the senior leadership pay structure could hinder the Council's ability to attract high quality candidates who can lead and manage the successful delivery of services with reduced resources in the future.
- 4.2 Implementing an across the board pay uplift at the Assistant Director and Head of Service level would be extremely costly and potentially controversial in the current climate of austerity and job losses. Any pay uplifts will need to be objectively justified and targeted in areas where there is an organisational or business need.

#### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

To provide capacity in the pay structure to support the development of an organisation structure which enables the delivery of value for money services with fewer resources.



## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

As detailed in paragraph 3.8, any request to utilise the reactivated grades will require a sound business case which demonstrates value for money. The assumption will be that unless there are exceptional circumstances, there will be a budget saving accruing. This could involve the reduction of posts or the post requirements result in the Council being able to attract more income/funding or increased productivity.

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

6.2.1 S112 Local Government Act 1972 empowers the Council to appoint such officers as it thinks necessary for the proper discharge by the authority of such of their or another authority's functions as fall to be discharged by them.

6.2.2 An officer appointed under subsection (1) above shall hold office on such reasonable terms and conditions, including conditions as to remuneration, as the authority appointing him think fit. The Council therefore has the power to reactivate the grades as set out in this report.

6.2.3 In reactivating the grades and reevaluating posts, the Council should adhere to all applicable policies and procedures.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

None

## **7. KEY RISKS**

7.1 As detailed in paragraph 3.7, the reintroduction of additional grades may generate widespread demands for the re-evaluation of posts. This risk will be mitigated by the requirement for the new posts to be supported by a sound business case, implementation of an external process to evaluate posts at this level and the new Director level posts will be subject to ratification by the Remuneration Committee. Where the new post is going to be externally advertised, it will be subject to a rigorous member selection and assessment process. To ensure consistency where there is an existing internal officer for the newly created post, they will also be required to undertake an external assessment process to confirm whether they possess the necessary competencies to undertake the role.

- 7.2 There is a risk that once appointed to one of the new grades, the senior officer will not deliver to the new agenda and provide value for money. If this proves to be the case, the Council needs to ensure that appropriate performance management procedures are implemented.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **8.1 Fairness for All**

The reintroduction of additional grades will provide opportunities for career progression. The introduction of an external evaluation process will ensure objectivity and fairness.

### **8.2 Growth and Sustainability and Strong Communities**

Ensuring the Council has the appropriate pay structure for senior managers should enable the Council to recruit and retain the best managers with a view to providing services to the community which stimulate growth in the local economy and build strong communities.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

There will be a limited number of posts available at the additional grades and they will be subject to an external evaluation exercise. Prior to the implementation, a productive equality impact assessment will be undertaken.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The new grades are designed to enable the Council to attract and retain high quality leaders who can raise performance levels throughout the Council. As detailed in paragraph 7, if the performance of the postholder does not provide value for money then the appropriate performance management procedures will need to be implemented.

## **11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

The reactivation of the grades provides a tool to enable the Council to recruit and retain high calibre officers who will be able to assist in the delivery of the public health agenda.

### **Background Papers**

None

## Appendix 1

**Senior and Middle Management Pay Structure – April 2016**

|                    |                     |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Chief Executive    | £162,708 - £210,564 |
| Director           | £117,516 - £152,076 |
| Assistant Director | £81,141 - £102,945  |
| HOS2               | £55,323 - £71,592   |
| HOS1               | £48,813 - £65,085   |
| MM2                | £44,529 - £56,955   |
| MM1                | £36,072 - £46,140   |

### Comparative Pay Rates in London 2014/15

|                            | Total Package Minimum (£) | Total Package Maximum (£) |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Chief Executive</b>     |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 161,097                   | 189,528                   |
| London Median              | 171,065                   | 189,087                   |
| London Upper Quartile      | 179,380                   | 195,000                   |
|                            |                           |                           |
| PRP                        |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 0                         | 18,951                    |
| London Median              | 1,896                     | 18,550                    |
|                            |                           |                           |
| <b>Directors</b>           |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 116,352                   | 136,884                   |
| London Median              | 115,530                   | 131,757                   |
| London Upper Quartile      | 126,849                   | 144,188                   |
|                            |                           |                           |
| PRP                        |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 0                         | 13,686                    |
| London Median              | 1,365                     | 10,084                    |
|                            |                           |                           |
| <b>Assistant Directors</b> |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 80,337                    | 94,515                    |
| London Median              | 87,780                    | 102,000                   |
| London Upper Quartile      | 94,914                    | 110,451                   |
|                            |                           |                           |
| PRP                        |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 0                         | 7,410                     |
| London Median              | 924                       | 9,264                     |
|                            |                           |                           |
| <b>Heads of Service</b>    |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 48,330                    | 64,440                    |
| London Median              | 61,360                    | 71,959                    |
| London Upper Quartile      | 72,517                    | 80,673                    |
|                            |                           |                           |
| PRP                        |                           |                           |
| Enfield                    | 0                         | 6,444                     |
| London Median              | 642                       | 6,444                     |

## **Proposed New Grades**

**Director = £95,000 - £116,000**

**Head of Service 3 = £70,000 - £85,000**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 160****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet 14 December 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Health, Housing and Adult  
Social Care, Ray James, &  
Director of Public Health, Tessa Lindfield.

**Contact officer and telephone number:**

Andrew Thomson,  
Head of Drug & Alcohol Services.  
0208 379 5622

**E mail:** [andrew.thomson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.thomson@enfield.gov.uk)

**Agenda – Part 1****Item: 13**

**Subject:** Award of the Substance Misuse  
Recovery Service contract.

**Wards: ALL****Key Decision No: KD 4302**

**Cabinet Member consulted:** Cllr. Krystle  
Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for  
Community Safety and Public Health)

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 A tender process has been completed for the provision of the Substance Misuse Recovery Service. This contract expires in 2017 and the tender importantly supports the Council with mitigating for unnecessary financial risks.
- 1.2 Tenderers have been required to sustain numbers in treatment and increase quality over current performance levels to afford year on year gains for the Council. The tender is part of a wider financial strategy, which includes potential property solutions, to support planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget by £585,000 per annum.
- 1.3 Following approval from the Procurement and Commissioning Review Board (PCB) on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2016, a full tender process was implemented which adhered to Corporate Procurement Procedures and EU Procurement Regulations. The new contract includes an initial contracting period of three (3) years with options to extend on a consecutive basis of three (3) years and two (2) years, therefore, rolling up to a further five (5) years, subject to satisfactory performance.
- 1.4 A highly successful market engagement event, attended by 28 organisations, was held following the PCB's decision. Four (4) organisations submitted tender bids and service users have been active members of the tender panels.
- 1.5 The Invitation to Tender process has now been completed and, in order to finalise the procurement, agreement is now being sought from Cabinet to proceed with obtaining Approval for the award of the new contract which includes the successful relocation of the family therapy services.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes the tender process has adhered to Corporate Procurement Procedures, EU Procurement Regulations, and the new contract will afford the Council with on-going annual savings of £225,448 and performance improvements.
- 2.2 To agree the award of the new contract to the preferred bidder, as outlined in Part 2 of this Report, for an initial period of three (3) years, with options to extend on a consecutive basis of three (3) years and two (2) years, therefore, rolling up to a further five (5) years, subject to satisfactory performance.
- 2.3 That Cabinet agree to support a relocation of the family therapy service, which is a key element of this contract, to achieve £311,000 of on-going annual savings that are part of the overall planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget of £585,000, subject to an acceptable property solution being realised.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Enfield Council is committed to fulfilling the requirements of the *National Drugs Strategy (2010)*, *The Government Alcohol Strategy (2012)*, *Hidden Harm – Responding to the needs of children of problem drug users (2003)* and the *Public Health Outcome Framework: Improving Outcomes and Supporting Transparency (2013)*. Substance misuse impacts on a wide range of areas including health, crime, social care and employment. Research undertaken by Public Health England identified that for every £1 spent on substance misuse services it saves £2.50 to the public sector (2013).
- 3.2 The Council is responsible for commissioning Public Health services for residents who need health care due to substance misuse as part of its Public Health England (PHE) Grant Conditions (*Annex C, Clauses 13 – 17 apply*). These services specialise in delivering drug and alcohol treatment, crime reduction psychosocial interventions for drug and alcohol offenders, and targeted services for young people affected by substance misuse. Together these services minimise the impact that substance misuse has on individuals and the community and, ultimately, they make a positive contribution to addressing health inequalities, including the crime reduction priorities of the Safer Stronger Communities Board. The existing contract for the adult treatment service will now expire in 2017. The Council has to undertake mitigating actions to support managing the financial risks associated with the reductions made by government to the Public Health Grant in coming years.
- 3.3 The Council has merged the original substance misuse crime reduction and adult substance misuse services into one new Substance Misuse Recovery Service contract to ensure that treatment is delivered in a more seamless and



effective manner to reducing the harm associated with drug misuse. This contract supports providing treatment to those people who are less likely to cease using drugs altogether, and who primarily need access to health services to reduce the harm associated with their dependency in order that they may have a longer life expectancy. However, it equally provides highly effective treatment for those drug and alcohol users who are motivated to change and need access to high quality treatment services to enable them to achieve either abstinence, or safer alcohol use within the government's recommended sensible drinking limits. It is important to note that dependency is no indifferent to many health conditions where treatment is rightly delivered to enable an individual to have improved health and well-being and a longer life expectancy and, in this respect, treatment is not just confined to procedures aimed at curing disease, rather it encompasses much broader health intervention strategies.

- 3.4 The contract is for an initial period of three (3) years, with options to extend on a consecutive basis of three (3) years and two (2) years. Any extension will be subject to satisfactory year on year performance being achieved.
- 3.5 Service users have been involved throughout the procurement process both with their representation on the Drug and Alcohol Action Team Board and, more importantly, by being members of the tender panel where they have provided considerable direction to the commissioning staff.
- 3.6 The annual contract price is capped at a maximum fixed price level. There is no annual increase for inflation or other such health payments and the price is less than the 2016/2017 contractual commitments.
- 3.7 Full details of the preferred bidders, contract prices, and improved performances are contained within the accompanying Part 2 Report.

### **3.8 The Tender Process**

- 3.9 Following approval from the Strategic Procurement Board on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2016 a competitive tender process for the Substance Misuse Recovery Service was commenced.
- 3.10 A project board was established to work to the agreed project plan. This group received support from the Commissioning and Procurement Hub and consulted with Finance and Legal Services over the management of the tender process. An open tender procedure was chosen as it was anticipated that the final number of bidders from the market place would not be above five. The process was carried out in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and EU Procurement Regulations.
- 3.11 The market engagement event was attended by 48 people from 28 organisations. This event offered interested bidders an opportunity to gain an early understanding of the Service being commissioned. It equally supported

the Council to receive feedback from the market place before the Council produced the final tender framework.

- 3.12 The Council advertised the opportunity on the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016 through the London Tenders Portal and the Enfield Council website. Initially 17 organisations expressed an interest, with 4 of those submitting Invitation to Tender (ITT) applications on the 17<sup>th</sup> October 2016.
- 3.13 The tender included a score of up to 60% for quality and 40% for commercial pricing for each bidder's application. The evaluation of ITT responses was designed to assess bidders' ability to offer a quality Service across the full breadth of specified requirements and ensure that the Council received best value for money from the market place.
- 3.14 The commercial evaluation of the ITT responses was produced to assess bidder's ability to improve on baseline performance data, drawing on the 12 month rolling period April 2015 to March 2016, for successful treatment completions (i.e. number of people they could get drug free). A score was also given for price where bidders were awarded a percentage amount for every £10,000 they bid in below the maximum capped price available of £2,010,000 and a total of 14% of the commercial scoring was attributed towards price under this model. A further 16% was also allocated towards a unit cost for the numbers of patients successfully completing over and above the baseline performance levels. A final 10% of the commercial modelling scoring was allocated to each bidder on the basis of their Price, Staff, Performance, and Business Planning submissions. These three elements constituted the 40% total available under the commercial modelling scoring criteria.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 There were no alternative options to tendering externally as Enfield Council was unable to directly provide such a specialist treatment service in-house, without incurring serious risks from delivering health services to highly complex service users whose behaviour is often strongly correlated with social and criminal detriments such as domestic violence.
- 4.2 There was no option to enter into a negotiated procurement procedure and extend the existing contracts as this would leave Enfield Council vulnerable to a challenge as the opportunity to extend was not detailed during the last tender process and one of the contracts did not contain such provision.
- 4.3 The option to increase the planned reductions to the substance misuse budget above the £585,000 was not possible as the contract value for this provision would not have attracted interest from suppliers within the market place, especially given the number of service users needing treatment. For instance, Barnet's contract value is £2,916,206; Harrow's is £2,282,362 and Hackney's is £4,460,033.

- 4.4 The option to decommission this provision would inevitably lead to avoidable early mortalities, as well as an increase in preventable communicable diseases within the community, through the lack of clinical expertise of non-specialist services within the Borough. Local Authorities in such circumstances could be held to account for such risks if the Conditions outlined in Annex C of the Public Health Grant were not complied with through making such provisions available.

## **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 Bidders have submitted responses to the ITT as part of an open, transparent, fair and competitive procurement process in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and EU Procurement Regulations. All responses have been robustly evaluated for quality and commercial pricing.
- 5.2 Bidders have submitted applications to confirm that they have adequate experience in delivering a similar substance misuse service of an equivalent sized contract to afford the Council the assurance required. They have also demonstrated that they have a clear understanding of the substance misuse needs of Enfield and have submitted proposals that will support the Borough in achieving the vision of '*making Enfield a Safer, Healthier and More Prosperous Community by Reducing Harmful Drinking and Illicit Drug Use*'.
- 5.3 It is important that the Council sustains substance misuse provision to comply with its obligations under the Public Health Grant Agreement. Annex C of the Agreement outlines the '*Categories for Reporting Local Authority Public Health Spend*' and those that apply to substance misuse are specified in Clauses 13 – 17 as follows:-
- 5.3.1 Treatment for drug misuse in adults;
  - 5.3.2 Treatment for alcohol misuse in adults;
  - 5.3.3 Preventing and reducing harm from drug misuse in adults;
  - 5.3.4 Preventing and reducing harm from alcohol misuse in adults;
  - 5.3.5 Specialist drugs and alcohol misuse services for children and young people.
- 5.4 The tender process complied with Corporate Procurement Regulations and EU Procurement Regulations and it is now necessary to award the contract as follows:
- 5.4.1 Local Authority Public Health Services Contract for the Provision of the Enfield Substance Misuse Recovery Service.
- 5.5 This Report seeks approval from Cabinet to follow due process and award the new contract as stated in Section 5.4 above.

- 5.6 It is recommended that Cabinet endorses the award of the contract to the preferred bidder for an initial period of three (3) years, with options to extend on a consecutive basis of three (3) years and two (2) years, therefore, rolling up to a further five (5) years, subject to satisfactory performance.
- 5.7 It is recommended that Cabinet support the successful relocation of the family therapy service, which is a key element of this contract, to achieve £311,000 of on-going annual savings that are part of the overall planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget of £585,000, subject to an acceptable property solution being realised.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

- 6.1.2 Please refer to the accompanying Part 2 Report.

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

- 6.2.1 The Localism Act 2011 provides the Council power to do anything that individuals generally may do provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 inserted a new Section 2B in the National Health Service Act 2006, which requires a Local Authority to 'take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of people in its area'. This may include 'making available the services of any person or any facilities' (Section 2B(3.g) of the 2012 Act). The Recommendations within this Report are within these powers.
- 6.2.2 The procurement of this Service has been in compliance with the Councils Constitution, in particular Contract Procedure Rules and the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (and amendments thereof), there is negligible risk, if any, were the decision be made to award the new contract to the preferred bidder as set out in the accompanying Part 2 Report.
- 6.2.3 The contract for this Service must be in a form approved by the Assistant Director of Legal Services and deemed suitable for managing Public Health Services of this nature and extent.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

- 6.3.1 There are no property implications as the two properties involved with the tender are either Council properties or are rented by the Council from NHS Community Health Partnerships. The properties used by this Service are:

6.3.1.1 12 Centre Way, Claverings Industrial Estate (Council owned);

6.3.1.2 Second Floor, Forest Road Primary Care Centre (CHP rented).

6.3.2 The tender is part of a wider financial strategy to support planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget by £585,000 per annum. This includes relocating the family therapy services, which remain a key element of the contract, to more cost effective and appropriate accommodation. The family therapy services have historically been provided at Forest Road Primary Care Centre. NHS Community Health Partnerships assumed management responsibility for the Centre in 2013 and increased the rent to £383,359 per annum. The wider financial strategy includes achieving £311,000 of savings towards the £585,000 of planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget through relocating the family therapy service, subject to an acceptable property solution being realised.

#### **6.4 Procurement Implications**

6.4.1 In accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 the resulting contract which will be awarded pursuant to this tender process is deemed to be subject to the light touch procurement regime for social and other specific services in accordance with Section 7 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. The Authority has developed a procurement process which it deems appropriate to this opportunity and ensures compliance with the regulations ensuring the process is transparent, fair and treats all Providers equally.

6.4.2 The opportunity was advertised widely, using all appropriate communication mechanisms, including the London Tenders Portal and the OJEU. Providers were also invited to attend a market engagement event. Due to the specialist and complex nature of the services only 4 (four) tender submissions were received. The project team are satisfied that the four submissions received offer choice and present value for money to the Authority.

### **7. KEY RISKS**

7.1 A robust Risk Matrix was developed for the tender process and was regularly reviewed to ensure risk was mitigated for to best effect.

7.2 At this stage in the process the key risk is a possible loss in performance. This was been managed by requiring bidders to submit detailed implementation plans in their ITT applications and through requiring bidders to submit applications for performance improvements

over the baseline data. Council Officers closely monitor performance for substance misuse provision on a monthly basis and the Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) performance reports are subject to bi-monthly scrutiny by the DAAT Board and at quarterly intervals by the Safer Stronger Communities Board.

- 7.3 Risks to the Public Health England Grant or Mayors Office for Police and Crime funding can be mitigated for to most extent as the contract includes a 6 month termination clause should the Council be notified that either of these funding streams was to cease. It equally includes a 'Change Schedule' where the Authority can impose contractual alterations with reasonable and fair notice, such as 14 days, to the contract price or any other element of the contract.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **8.1 Fairness for All**

- 8.1.1 The tender process has been conducted in accordance with both the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and EU Procurement Regulations. Therefore, the tender process has adhered to the principles of transparency and fairness to encourage healthy competition within this specialist sector and bidders have accordingly been appropriately supported throughout the process.

### **8.2 Growth and Sustainability**

- 8.2.1 The increase in performance required of each successful bidder will ensure that more people in the community are supported to access substance misuse treatment to improve health and crime reduction opportunities in more appropriate and cost effective community settings. In Enfield there are an estimated 12,454 people who drink alcohol at harmful levels and 3,648 drinkers who have a physical dependency to alcohol. There are also 1,594 people who are dependent of crack or heroin in the Borough. It is, therefore, important that the Council continues to commission Service provision of this nature to maximise the health gains to substance misusers and provide effective communicable disease management strategies. It is also a requirement of the Public Health England Grant Conditions as outlined herein in Section 5.3 of this Part 1 Report.

### **8.3 Strong Communities**

- 8.3.1 There is a substantial amount of evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness that drug and alcohol treatment has on reducing crime in the community. The Home Office recently completed four (4) years of analysis that showed the important role that drug treatment has upon reducing key crimes and crime reduction remains a priority for the Safer Stronger Communities Board.

- 8.3.2 The new Substance Misuse Recovery Service contract is, therefore, also concerned with supporting drug and alcohol related offenders with changing their substance misuse and offending behaviour. The delivery of this Service requires a partnership approach between the Metropolitan Police, the London Probation Trust and the successful bidder. It is worth noting that just over 60% of all acquisitive crime is committed because of drug misuse and that PHE have found that a typical heroin user spends £1,400 per month on drugs. Furthermore, the majority of heroin users are not in employment. It is highly imperative that the Council continues to provide treatment to drug offenders to ensure Enfield remains a safe and stronger community.
- 8.3.3 Alcohol is now the third biggest risk factor for deaths and ill health; deaths from alcohol related liver disease have more than doubled over the past three decades. Almost 50% of all violent assaults are caused through alcohol misuse and 17% of road traffic fatalities involve alcohol.
- 8.3.4 Substance misuse equally has an essential role to play in safeguarding vulnerable children who are often at risk due to parental substance misuse. 58% of all referrals made to the Council's Children's Services Safeguarding Team are because of parental substance misuse. PHE found that parental drug use is a risk factor in 29% of all serious case reviews.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken to inform and support the Council's substance misuse commissioning objectives. The findings and recommendations from this Assessment have been utilised accordingly. This will, as stated above, improve the equality of access to the Service in the local area.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Substance misuse provision is subject to robust monitoring processes for service delivery and service quality. Public Health England (PHE) provides the Chief Executive, Director of Public Health, DAAT Board Chair and Head of Drug and Alcohol Services with quarterly Diagnostic Outcome Monitoring Executive Reports; detailing the milestones against all key performance measures and affording a comparison to other similar Local Authority areas, as well as the National perspective. The Reports are separated into adult and young people's and enable PHE to have the scrutiny role it requires to determine how each Local Authority is complying with the Grant Conditions. The DAAT Officers have in place appropriate and robust contract monitoring arrangements and these will be maintained under the new contract. The principal focus is on the interventions delivered to service users, as well as how

the successful bidder manages performance for the key PHE indicator of Numbers of Successful Drug Completions (PHOF 2.15). It is equally imperative that the Council reduces the Number of Alcohol Related Hospital Admissions (PHOF 2.18) which this contracts supports by ensuring that treatment is sustained in more appropriate and cost effective community settings.

10.2 Regular contract monitoring will be undertaken by the Drug and Alcohol Action Team of the successful bidder on a month on month basis.

10.3 The successful bidder is required to make monthly submissions to the National Drug Treatment Monitoring System database managed by Public Health England. They are required to improve performance over the 2015/2016 baseline levels for Numbers of Successful Treatment Completions, Numbers in Treatment and Blood Borne Virus Intervention measures.

## **11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None applicable.

## **12. HR IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 None applicable.

## **13. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 Drug and alcohol misuse impacts upon the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and communities across Enfield. It drives generational family dysfunction, damages life chances, increases criminality, harms health, spreads communicable diseases and, as a result, increases the need and demand for public sector services.

13.2 Substance misuse is common and the numbers of people affected in Enfield are significant: - more than 1,500 people are dependent on crack or heroin with 18% having children who live with them. There are an expected 3,648 people dependent on alcohol; all of whom need support from specialist Public Health Services. Alcohol misuse has considerably increased and alcohol is now the third biggest risk factor associated with death and illness. Mortality from alcohol related liver disease has more than doubled in the past 3 decades.

13.3 Substance misuse drives widespread need and demand for all public sector services, absorbing scarce resources. It is preventable and treatable. People who are intoxicated respond less well to their children's needs. UK estimates suggest 22% of children live with a parent whose hazardous drinking puts them at risk in relation to issues such as neglect. In Enfield 39% of all children



on a child protection plan have been registered because of parental substance misuse. Furthermore, 78% of young offenders who misuse alcohol were found to have grown up in homes with parental alcohol abuse and domestic abuse.

- 13.4 Substance misuse is both a cause and effect of family dysfunction. The figures quoted above are borne out by the evidence base of children in care who commonly come from families where addiction was the main disruptive issue to their lives, particularly when this co-occurs with domestic violence or with parental mental ill-health. Lower educational attainment is heavily associated with having a parent who misuses drugs or alcohol, as is the chance of the child becoming a heavy drinker or misusing drugs when they reach adulthood.
- 13.5 People dependent on drugs and alcohol are far more likely than their peers to have mental health problems, be economically unproductive and to be homeless. Over 60% of acquisitive crime is found to be driven by drug misuse. Every year it is estimated that the impacts of drug and alcohol misuse cost society a total of £36.4 billion. Alcohol misuse alone costs the criminal justice services £11 billion; the NHS 3.5 billion and causes £7 billion of lost productivity. Enfield's local acute and primary care services have to absorb £6.57 million per year because unplanned alcohol related presentations.
- 13.6 People who drink at levels that are damaging to their health, such as drinking a bottle of wine a day, and who do not have a physical dependency are much more prevalent than people whose drinking causes withdrawal symptoms like delirium tremors (DTs) or seizures. The new Service will increase treatment levels; directly impacting on reducing the number of patients presenting to A&E for alcohol related harm, tackling the increasing burden of disease in our community from conditions relating to alcohol use such as heart disease, stroke, cancer, pancreatitis, mental health and liver disease. Stroke is the most common acquired cause of adult disability and it remains a major pressure on Local Authorities Social Care budgets.
- 13.7 Therapy services, focusing on the whole family unit, will support children affected by parental substance misuse, thereby reducing the number children at risk of being placed into care through access to support and treatment for the whole family unit. This is complimented by services for pregnant women with substance misuse issues to increase early uptake of antenatal care and post-natal care offered to families.
- 13.8 Drug and alcohol use contributes to the spread of disabling and potentially fatal infections in our community through practices such as sharing needles and risky sex. As a consequence, just over 60% of all injecting drug users are Hepatitis C positive. The new Service includes testing, treatment, needle exchange and vaccination programmes to reduce high risk communicable diseases. Needle stick injury remains a significant concern for many parents in the Enfield community and it is imperative that drug misusers have access to controlled disposal programmes, such as needle exchanges, to prevent hazardous waste being dumped in public areas.

- 13.9 Substance misuse carries a significant risk of early death. Compared to the Borough life expectancy of 80.7 for males and 84.1 for females, it is estimated that the average age of death for an alcohol misuser is 55.6 years, for a cocaine user it is 44.5 years, and for that of a heroin user it is even lower at 37.5 years. The new Service includes distribution of naloxone for the prevention of drug related deaths; substitute prescribing (e.g. methadone) aimed at significantly increasing the life expectancy of heroin users in particular; and supervised community or in-patient detoxification to support those service users who want to be drug or alcohol free.
- 13.10 The importance of drug and alcohol treatment services is recognised by their inclusion as a Condition in the Public Health Grant made to Local Authorities by the Department of Health. The Condition requires the Council to *'have regard to the need to improve the take up of, and outcomes from, its drug and alcohol misuse services'*. The full cost of the Service in Enfield is covered by the Grant and funding from the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime. Without this Service there would be significant detriments and harms to the Enfield community and unnecessary pressures on other Council budgets.

#### **14. Background Papers**

- 14.1 None.

## THE CABINET

### List of Items for Future Cabinet Meetings (NOTE: The items listed below are subject to change.)

|                                 |
|---------------------------------|
| <b>MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017</b> |
|---------------------------------|

|                     |
|---------------------|
| <b>JANUARY 2017</b> |
|---------------------|

- 1. Local Heritage Review** Ian Davis

A local heritage review and preparation of draft local list has been undertaken in conjunction with community volunteers. Following completion of public consultation the draft local list will be presented for approval. **(Key decision – reference number 4321)**
- 2. Taking Forward Enfield Council's IT Offer** James Rolfe

This will progress taking forward Enfield's Council's IT Offer following the previous Cabinet decision. **(Key decision – reference number 4378)**
- 3. Small Housing Sites Update** Ian Davis

This will provide a summary of the current position and proposed next steps to deliver the scheme. **(Key decision – reference number 4298)**
- 4. Investment Property Asset Management** James Rolfe

This will seek approval to the establishment of an investment property asset management fund. **(Key decision – reference number 4356)**
- 5. Alma Estate Regeneration – Completion of Supplemental Development Agreement and Development Phase 3** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of the completion of the supplemental development agreement and the development of phase 3. **(Key decision – reference number 4441)**
- 6. Claverings Industrial Estate** James Rolfe

**(Key decision – reference number 4381)**
- 7. The Council's Main Investment Decision in Lee Valley Heat Network Ltd.** Ian Davis

This will seek approval for referral to full Council. **(Key decision – reference number 4266)**

|                      |
|----------------------|
| <b>FEBRUARY 2017</b> |
|----------------------|

- 1. Budget Report 2017/18 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2020/21** James Rolfe

This will present the budget report 2017/18 and the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2010/21. **(Key decision – reference number 4371)**
- 2. Estate Renewal Programme Report** Ian Davis

This will provide an update on the estate renewal programme and related activity and approvals where required. **(Key decision – reference number 4272)**
- 3. Flexible Housing – Capital Programme** Ray James/Ian Davis

This will seek approval of capital funding to deliver flexible housing. **(Key decision – reference number 4333)**
- 4. Housing Supply and Delivery** Ian Davis

This will set out how the Council will increase housing supply in the short and medium terms. **(Key decision – reference number 4165)**
- 5. Small Housing Sites 2 (Phase 2b) Delivery** Ian Davis

This will set out a business case for delivering over 100 new homes across Council owned HRA sites. **(Key decision – reference number 4304)**
- 6. December 2016 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the December 2016 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4368)**
- 7. Land Acquisition at Meridian Water** Ian Davis

This will seek approval to acquire a 2.13 acre plot of land within the Meridian Water opportunity area. **(Key decision – reference number 4377)**
- 8. Construction of Relocated National Grid Infrastructure** Ian Davis

This will seek approval to the construction of relocated national grid infrastructure. **(Key decision – reference number 4439)**
- 9. Increased Budget Envelope for Housing Gateway Ltd.** James Rolfe

This will request, for recommendation to full Council, an increased budget envelope for Housing Gateway Ltd. **(Key decision – reference number 4444)**

- 10. Broomfield House** Ian Davis
- The report will refer to the Broomfield Conservation Management Plan and Options Appraisal and will set out options for the next steps. **(Key decision – reference number 4419)**
- 11. Draft Submission Version North London Waste Plan** Ian Davis
- Following consultation on the Draft North London Waste Plan in 2015, approval is required for the draft submission version of the Plan before further consultation in the summer. **(Key decision – reference number 4280)**
- 12. William Preye Redevelopment** James Rolfe
- This will seek approval of the development of the William Preye Centre. **(Key decision – reference number 4433)**
- 13. Southgate Circus Redevelopment** James Rolfe
- This will seek approval to the development of Southgate Circus Library and the Alan Pullinger Centre. **(Key decision – reference number 4432)**
- 14. Meridian Water: Land Acquisition, Budget Review and Programme Update** Ian Davis
- This will seek authorisation to, and provide an update on, a number of aspects of the Meridian Water scheme. **(Key decision – reference number 4442)**
- 15. New Avenue Development Agreement** Ian Davis
- This will update Cabinet on the Development Agreement and timescales for delivery. **(Key decision – reference number 4425)**
- 16. Ponders End Delivery Programme** Ian Davis
- This will outline for approval the Ponders End Delivery Programme. **(Key decision – reference number 4382)**

|                   |
|-------------------|
| <b>MARCH 2017</b> |
|-------------------|

- 1. Capital Programme Monitor – 3rd Quarter 2016/17** James Rolfe
- This will present the capital programme monitor third quarter 2016/17. **(Key decision – reference number 4364)**
- 2. January 2017 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe
- This will present the January 2017 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4369)**

3. **Heritage Strategy** Ian Davis

This will review the existing Heritage Strategy. **(Key decision – reference number 4428)**

4. **Broomfield House** Ian Davis

The report will refer to the Broomfield Conservation Management Plan and Options Appraisal and will set out options for the next steps. **(Key decision – reference number 4419)**

**APRIL 2017**

1. **Quarterly Corporate Performance Report** Rob Leak

This will provide performance information against the indicators contained in the Corporate Performance Scorecard, which shows the progress being made in delivering the Council's priorities. **(Key decision – reference number 4330)**

2. **February 2017 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the February 2017 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4370)**

**NEW MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018**

1. **Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A110 Southbury Road** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of Cycle Enfield proposals for the A110 for implementation. **(Key decision – reference number 4113)**

## CABINET - 16.11.2016

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 2016****COUNCILLORS****PRESENT**

Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader/Public Service Delivery), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care), Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health), Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development)

**Associate Cabinet Members (Non-Executive and Non-Voting):** Bambos Charalambous (Enfield West)

**ABSENT**

Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration), George Savva (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield South East), Vicki Pite (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield North)

**OFFICERS:**

Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration & Environment), Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Tony Theodoulou (Director of Children's Services), Jenny Tosh (Chief Education Officer), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Mohammed Lais (Senior Asset Management Surveyor), Anne Stoker (Acting Assistant Director of Children's Services), Keith Rowley (Head of Asset Management - Children's Services) and Suzanne Linsey (Press Officer) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Councillor Derek Levy (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

**1****APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration), Councillor George Savva (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield South East), and Councillor Vicki Pite (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield North).

**2****DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

NOTED, that there were no declarations of interest in respect of any items listed on the agenda.

**3  
URGENT ITEMS**

NOTED

1. 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.130 – Revenue Monitoring Report 2016/2017: September 2016 and 2017/18 Budget Update (Minute No. 7 below refers). These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear working days in advance of meetings.

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

2. **Decision Taken by the Leader of the Council under the Cabinet Urgent Action Procedure – Housing Gateway Limited – Increased Budget Envelope**

That a decision had been taken by the Leader of the Council, on behalf of the Cabinet, on 28 October 2016, under the Cabinet Urgent Action Procedure (as set out in the Council's Constitution, Chapter 4.3 – Section 12 – Rules of Procedure). The decision had recommended that the Council approve the provision of an additional loan facility to Housing Gateway Limited.

The decision had been agreed at the Council meeting held on 9 November 2016 (Report Nos. 140 and 141 – Council – 9 November 2016 – key decision – reference number 4406 referred).

**4  
DEPUTATIONS**

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

**5  
GUIDANCE FOR CABINET MEMBERS**

At this point in the meeting the Head of Legal Services advised Cabinet that any recommendations, included within the reports being considered by Cabinet this evening, that were for noting only, would not be subject to the Council's call-in procedures. Such recommendations were not deemed to be decisions of the Cabinet, but matters of information for the Executive.



**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

A statement to this effect would appear on future Cabinet agendas.

**6  
ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL**

NOTED, that there were no reports to be referred to full Council.

**7  
REVENUE MONITORING REPORT SEPTEMBER 2016 & 2017/18 BUDGET  
UPDATE**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.130) setting out the Council's revenue budget monitoring position based on information to the end of September 2016.

NOTED

1. That the wording of recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 had been amended, as reflected in noted 3 and 4 below.
2. The £7.2m overspend revenue outturn projection. This position was consistent with that which had been reported in August 2016.
3. For information, that Cabinet Members would continue to work with Directors to implement action plans to reduce the forecast overspend in 2016/17.
4. For information, that Cabinet Members would continue to work with Directors to agree and implement plans to mitigate pressures being forecast in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
5. The progress made to date in the preparation of the 2017/18 budget and requested a further report in January 2017.
6. That Cabinet would work with the Corporate Management Board (CMB) to identify further savings to bridge the budget gap and set a balanced budget.
7. That the projected revenue outturn overspend had reduced from £7.9m to £7.2m, as detailed in the report. Members noted the high level of demand for services within Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and Children's Services, as identified in the report. This was an issue that was being experienced across London and nationally.
8. In response to a question raised, clarification was provided on the projected Housing Revenue Account (HRA) underspend which was a reflection on the level of work that had been requested.

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

9. Councillor Cazimoglu reiterated the financial pressures being faced by Adult Social Care and highlighted the Learning Disabilities Service, as detailed in the report. Concerns were growing nationally regarding an underfunding of Adult Social Care services. The majority of Local Authority Adult Social Care departments were predicting a budget deficit. Councillor Cazimoglu stressed the seriousness of the funding situation and the difficulties that would be faced in sustaining future levels of service delivery.
10. James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services) reported that in response to the Government's multi-year settlement offer as set out in section 9.2 of the report, Enfield's application for a four year settlement over the period 2016/17 to 2019/20, had been accepted. Councils were now awaiting the Chancellor's Autumn Statement and draft Local Government Finance Settlement details, as outlined in the report.

**Alternative Options Considered:** Not applicable to this report.

**Reason:** To ensure that Members were aware of the projected budgetary position, including all major budget pressures and underspends which had contributed to the present monthly position and that were likely to affect the final outturn.

**(Key decision – reference number 4393)**

**8**

**LONDON REGIONAL ADOPTION AGENCY**

Councillor Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection) introduced the report of the Director of Children's Services (No.131) seeking agreement in principle, to join a London Regional Adoption Agency.

**NOTED**

1. That the DfE required all local authorities to join a regional agency by 2020 and had invited councils and Voluntary Adoption Agencies to submit expressions of interest in becoming part of new regionalised arrangements.
2. That all London Boroughs already belonged to an adoption consortium. Enfield was part of the North London consortium. These consortia allowed best practice sharing between local authorities and enabled joint working on some aspects of the service.
3. The development of regionalised adoption agencies would enable prospective adopters to be recruited more widely, improve the matching opportunities available and so potentially speed up the adoption process.

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

4. That there was still a significant amount of development work to do and a number of concerns to be addressed. It was important for Enfield to participate in the discussions taking place and influence future decision making with regard to the development of such adoption agencies. Enfield would be able to decide which regionalised adoption agency to join in the future to ensure that the needs of the Borough were best met. A further report would be brought back to a future Cabinet meeting prior to any final decision being made.
5. That a significant amount of work had been undertaken to date and would continue to take place. Enfield would participate in discussions and seek reassurances with regard to future improvements to the adoption process and adequate funding provision.
6. Councillor Fonyonga highlighted the work that had previously been undertaken by Scrutiny on the current adoption processes and expressed the hope that the development of such regionalised adoption agencies would provide increased opportunities for the matching of prospective adopters with the children available for adoption.
7. That it was anticipated that more detailed proposals would be available by September 2017. Enfield would continue to work with other local authorities in developing the proposals, as set out in the report. There were a significant number of issues to be addressed and worked through in detail before the best way forward for Enfield could be determined. This would be addressed in the future report to Cabinet.
8. In response to a question raised, Tony Theodoulou (Director of Children's Services) outlined the detailed assessment processes for prospective adoptive parents. Further detailed information would be provided to Councillor Brett as requested.

**Alternative Options Considered:** NOTED, that alternatives to the London option would be to join another developing regional agency or create a new model. Other developing regional agencies had not been developed with the involvement of London boroughs. No other regional agencies had proposed a model linked to the governance of London local authorities. The London model was being developed with the complexity of the borough and provider landscape in mind. Many of the models being developed in other regions, for example, single local authority host, would not be appropriate to meet this complexity of need.

Any new agency being developed would have the same timescale requirements and would need to access development funding independently, the Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS) identified that using existing arrangements (for example, consortia) would not remove the performance and service variation across London and most current consortia regions would not achieve the DfE aims for scale. A sub-divided

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

London would lose the benefit of the wider pool of adopters and the standardisation of service offering.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed, in principle, to join a London Regional Adoption Agency, subject to detailed financial analysis and business case and delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection and the Director of Children's Services, to progress arrangements relating to the development and implementation of the London Regional Adoption Agency model and negotiate with other Regional Adoption Agencies as appropriate. A further report would be brought back to a future Cabinet meeting.

**Reason:** The London Regional Adoption Agency had been developed to meet the needs of London Boroughs. It would operate in a similar manner to the London Admissions and London Grid for Learning Teams, with governance through ALDAS and London Councils. The DfE require all local authorities to join a regional agency by 2020, therefore "do nothing" was not an available option within the current policy and political landscape. Given the policy drive from the Government and examples of good joint working in other areas of children's services, a regionalised adoption agency (RAA) was considered to be the best viable option.

(Non key)

**9**

**STRATEGY AND APPROACH TO DELIVERING PUPIL PLACES**

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 Chief Education Officer (No.132) updating the strategy for the provision of pupil places.

**NOTED**

1. The following amendments to recommendations in the report as reflected in the decisions below:
  - Recommendation 2.2.5, bullet point two, the addition of "in accordance with the limits set out in the Council's Contract Procurement Rules";
  - Recommendation 2.3.1, the addition of "and a further report brought back to Cabinet"
  
2. That Members' attention was drawn to the information provided within the Executive Summary of the report. Councillor Orhan outlined the difficulties faced due to Central Government policy changes and the restriction on funding provision and legislation restrictions. The Council was legally prohibited from opening any new schools or purchasing sites for new schools. Any new school provision would be through the Government's Free Schools and Academies programme.

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

3. The detailed strategy and approach to the delivery of pupil places as set out in full in the report. Members supported the proposals set out in the recommendations of the report and detailed in the decisions below.

**Alternative Options Considered:** Enfield Council had a statutory responsibility to provide the necessary school places. The School Expansion Programme created a mechanism to assist with the delivery of extra capacity required. Failure to provide enough school places was not an option. The proposals which had been considered but rejected were set out in section 4 of the report.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve three additional permanent forms of primary entry (FE) in the South West from September 2017 to September 2020.
  - and the continuation of the school expansion programme, with the focus on special provision and high needs pupil places.
2. Increase capacity in special schools and establishments that provide education services for some of the most acute special need categories subject to further approval for the manner in which this was to be achieved.
3. Note that the School Expansion Programme capital budgets for 2016/17 to 2017/18 were maintained at current approved levels but updated by a separate report(s) brought forward on any necessary land acquisitions required to facilitate provision of extra places and the need to increase budgets or use Council resources.
4. Approve refinancing of the Garfield Primary project to reflect the change in legislation in respect of the sale of education land from previously approved School Expansion Programme (SEP) growth.
5. Approve the retention of the Garfield building, designated as the Key Stage 2 building, for education purposes, initially for the decant of West Lea pupils to allow building works to proceed. The long term future use of the Garfield KS2 building was to be the subject of a further report.
6. Support continued delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services, the Chief Education Officer or the Assistant Director of Strategic Property Services, to take decisions on:
  - The individual schools, sites and preferred partners for expansions, and decisions on statutory requirements, to meet the demand for extra pupil places, both mainstream and special, up to 2020/21.

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

- Conducting suitable procurement exercises and either calling off EU-compliant framework agreements or conducting suitable procurement exercises, entering into contractual arrangements with successful contractors and placing orders for any capital works required for the projects in accordance with the limits set out in the Council's Contract procurement rules; and
  - Conducting any necessary land transactions, including acquisitions by way of freehold or leasehold up to the value of £500,000, as individual schemes were developed.
7. Support continued delegated authority to the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and the Chief Education Officer to take decisions on the:
- Programme management arrangements and operational resourcing, including procurement of any required support services.
  - Commencing feasibility or initial design to inform pre-application discussions with planning and procurement of resources for this activity.
  - Cost estimates, budgets and spend for projects in advance of updates to the Capital Programme.
  - Submission of planning applications; and
  - The appropriate procurement routes for professional support services and construction for individual schemes.
8. Note that if options for schemes could not be progressed then alternative options would need to be brought forward for decision and inclusion on the Council's Capital Programme and a further report brought back to Cabinet.

**Reason:** The Council had an overriding statutory duty to provide sufficient pupil places to meet anticipated demand. The strategy and delivery arrangements would deliver the additional reception places required in the areas of highest demand up to 2020. The expanded capacity aims to provide a higher level of flexibility built in to counter sudden increases in demand.

**(Key decision – reference number 4395)**

**10**

**TRANSFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY AFTER ENFIELD 2017**

NOTED, that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**11**

**ASSET MANAGEMENT - POTENTIAL DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL OWNED PROPERTIES - TRANCHE 7**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

Services (No.134) seeking approval in principle to the sale of various Council properties.

NOTED

1. The properties listed in the Appendix to the report which were considered in the Council's overall best interests to sell, subject to satisfactory further evaluation and consultation, in order to assist in funding capital spending.
2. That the list of properties had been brought to the attention of Cabinet Members and Ward Councillors for their consideration.
3. The discussions that were currently taking place with regard to Reardon Court which would need to be concluded before moving forward with any proposals for this particular site.

**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 as 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 4413)**

**12**

**EDMONTON GREEN LEASE RESTRUCTURE**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.135) seeking approval to restructure the existing lease at Edmonton Green Shopping Centre.

NOTED

1. That Report No.137 also referred, as detailed in Minute No.19 below.

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

2. The background to the current lease arrangements as set out in section 3 of the report together with the proposals for the restructure of the existing lease.

**Alternative Options Considered:** As detailed in Report No.137, Minute No.19 below refers.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed to approve

1. The proposed terms of the restructured lease of Edmonton Green Shopping Centre as detailed in Report No.137 (Minute No.19 below refers).
2. Delegated authority to the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services in conjunction with the Assistant Director of Strategic Property Services and the Assistant Director of Legal and Governance, to agree final terms and enter into appropriate legal agreements for the proposed lease restructure.

**Reason:** To enable the Council to renegotiate the terms of the original lease, create better value for the Authority moving forwards and achieve a more effective structure to the legal relationship with St.Modwen's.

**(Key decision – reference number 4144)**

**13**

**ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

NOTED, that there were no items to be considered at this meeting.

**14**

**CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS**

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

**15**

**MINUTES**

**AGREED**, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 19 October 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**Matter Arising from the Minutes**

Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care) advised Members of a matter arising in relation to Minute Nos.17 and 26 – Refurbishment and Re-provision Work of Enfield Highway Library Building as follows:

As part of the Council's control procedures, internal audit had identified that aspects of the procurement had not been consistent with the Council's Contract Procedure rules. It was therefore considered prudent to recommend



**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

to Cabinet that no contract be awarded pursuant to this procurement. A further report would be brought back to Cabinet recommending the way forward.

**16**

**ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FEEDBACK**

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

**17**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED, that the next Cabinet meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 14 December 2016.

Councillor Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection) extended her apologies for absence for this meeting.

**18**

**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).

**19**

**EDMONTON GREEN LEASE RESTRUCTURE**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.137).

NOTED

1. That Report No.135 also referred, as detailed in Minute No.12 above.
2. The negotiations which had taken place and the proposals for the lease restructure as set out in detail in the report. Members noted the increase in the annual rent income to the Council as outlined in the report.
3. Members discussed in detail the terms of the restructured lease and the implications for both the Council and St.Modwen's. The new terms had been simplified and reassurances were provided to Members in response to questions raised on the benefits of the restructured lease for all concerned. The terms had been recommended by the Council's

**CABINET - 16.11.2016**

specialist consultant as representing best value under the Local Government Act 1972.

4. Members took this opportunity to reiterate the need for continued investment in Edmonton Green and noted that the terms of the new lease would support this.
5. The restructured lease increased flexibility and simplified the current lease arrangements. In response to questions raised, Members were advised of the Council's role and approval processes for any future development and investment opportunities brought forward for consideration.
6. In conclusion of the detailed discussion, Members expressed their support of the proposals as detailed in the decisions below.

**Alternative Options Considered:** The alternative option was to do nothing, as set out in section 4 of the report.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed

1. To a new 150 year lease being entered into between the Council and St.Modwen, for the asset known as Edmonton Green Shopping Centre on the heads of terms set out in appendix 1 to the report.
2. To note that all existing leases and variants would be terminated and replaced by the proposed new lease.

**Reason:** The detailed reasons for the recommendations were set out in section 5 of the report.

**(Key decision – reference number 4144)**

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **155**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet – 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Chief Executive

Contact officer and telephone number:

Alison Trew 020 8379 3186

E mail: [alison.trew@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:alison.trew@enfield.gov.uk)

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>                                     | <b>Item: 18</b> |
| <b>Subject: Quarterly Corporate Performance Report</b>      |                 |
| <b>Wards: All</b>   |                 |
| <b>Key Decision No: 4330</b>                                |                 |
| <b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b><br><b>Cllr A. Georgiou</b> |                 |

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 Cabinet has been receiving regular monitoring reports on the Corporate Performance Scorecard since September 2012.

1.2 In the current difficult financial circumstances, there is value in demonstrating that, in many areas, Council performance in delivering key priorities is being maintained and/or improved. It is also important that the Council understands and effectively addresses underperformance.

1.3 This is the latest quarterly report on the Corporate Performance Scorecard that reflects Council priorities and local resources, demand etc. The report attached at Appendix 1 shows the latest available performance at the end of the second quarter of 2016/17 and compares it to the Council's performance for the same period in 2015/16.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That Cabinet notes, for information only, the progress being made towards achieving the identified key priorities for Enfield.

**3. BACKGROUND**

3.1 In the continuing challenging local government financial environment, it is important that the Council continues to monitor its performance to ensure that the level and quality of service and value for money is maintained and where possible improved. It is also essential to understand and take appropriate action in areas where performance is deteriorating. This may include

delivering alternative interventions to address underperformance, or making a case to central government and other public bodies if the situation is beyond the control of the Council.

- 3.2 Following the abolition of the National Indicator Set in 2010, the Corporate Performance Scorecard was developed containing performance measures that demonstrate progress towards achieving the Council's aims and key priorities. The measures are grouped under the Council's three strategic aims, Freedom for All, Growth and Sustainability and Strong Communities. A number of financial health measures are also included. The scorecard is reviewed annually and targets are set based on local demand and available resources.
- 3.3 Performance is reported quarterly to the Corporate Management Board and Cabinet. Following the Cabinet meeting the performance tables are published on the Council's website.

#### **4. PERFORMANCE**

- 4.1 Appendix 1 shows the latest available performance at the end of the second quarter of 2016/17 and compares it to the Council's performance for the same period in 2015/16. Where appropriate, explanatory comments are provided in the column next to the performance information.

#### **4.2 Financial Indicators**

This section provides an overview of the Council's financial health. The first three indicators give the income and expenditure position, the next two provide an update on the Council's balance sheet and the final two indicators show the cash flow position.

#### **4.3 Priority Indicators**

The scorecard groups performance indicators under the Council's three strategic aims, Fairness for All, Growth and Sustainability and Strong Communities.

Where a target has been set, performance is rated at green if it is on or exceeding the target; amber where the target has been narrowly missed; and red where performance is significantly below the target set for the year.

3 of the indicators being reported do not have targets. Reasons for this include new indicators for which targets have yet to be established and indicators that have no national targets set (e.g. Domestic Violence). Performance data for Q1 is awaiting validation for 6 waste and recycling indicators.

61 performance indicators are being reported, of which 51 have targets. Of these, 26 (50.98%) are at green; 12 (23.53%) are at amber; and 13 (25.49%) are at red.

The notes cover a number of areas and may include explanation of how the indicators are calculated, commentary on progress towards achieving the targets, trends over time and national comparisons.

As part of the Enfield 2017 programme, a number of key areas in the Council have been restructured. Staffing changes and the introduction of new IT systems have resulted in a temporary drop in performance in some services. Action is being taken to bring performance back on target.

For a few indicators, questions have been raised as to whether the processes for collecting and reporting data are capturing all the activity covered by the indicators. The Data and Management Information Reporting Hub and Performance Analysis Team are working closely with departments to review and, where necessary, amend procedures.

**5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Not to report regularly on the Council's performance. This would make it difficult to assess progress made on achieving the Council's main priorities and to demonstrate the value for money being provided by Council services.

**6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

To update Cabinet on the progress made against all key priority performance indicators for the Council.

**7. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

**7.1 Financial Implications**

The cost of producing the quarterly reports will be met from existing resources.

**7.2 Legal Implications**

There is no statutory duty to report regularly to Cabinet on the Council's performance, however under the Local Government Act 1999 a best value authority has a statutory duty to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Regular reports on the Council's performance assist in demonstrating best value.

**7.3 Property Implications**

None

**8. KEY RISKS**

Robust performance management helps identify areas of risk in service delivery and ensure that Council resources are used effectively and that the Council's good reputation is maintained.

**9. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

**a. Fairness for All**

The scorecard includes indicators that measure the Council's progress in reducing inequalities across the Borough.

**b. Growth and Sustainability**

The scorecard includes indicators that aim to support business growth, increase numbers of people in employment, protect and sustain Enfield's environment and support Enfield's voluntary and community sector.

**c. Strong Communities**

The scorecard includes indicators that assess how the Council's actions are contributing to strengthening communities, improving communications, reducing crime and improving health.

**10. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate advice has been sought in regard to equalities and an agreement has been reached that an equalities impact assessment/analysis is not relevant or proportionate for the corporate performance report.

**11. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Robust performance management provides the Council with accurate data and ensures that service delivery is meeting local needs and priorities.

**12. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

The scorecard includes a number of health and wellbeing indicators that aim to address the key health inequalities in Enfield.

**Background Papers**

None

# CMB Review - Financial Indicators 2016/17 (protect)

Generated on: 10 November 2016



| Area of Review  | Key Highlights  | Risk Rating - Aug'16 |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Income & Expenditure Position - Year end forecast variances | Year-end forecast variances of £7.2m overspend have been identified to date in relation to General Fund net controllable expenditure. Budget variances identified to date will need to be managed closely to ensure timely appropriate action can be taken. | ✘                    |
| Income & Expenditure Position - Budget Profiling            | Budget profiling across all departmental budgets will continue to be applied in order to better reflect predicted net spending patterns throughout the year. Budget holders now profile individual budgets based on anticipated spend across the year.      | ✔                    |
| Income & Expenditure Position - HRA                         | The HRA is projecting an underspend at year-end outturn against budget.   | ✔                    |
| Balance Sheet - Cash Investment                             | The current profile of cash investments continues to be in accordance with the Council's approved strategy for prioritising security of funds over rate of return.  | ✔                    |
| Balance Sheet - General Fund balances year end projections  | The year-end outturn projection for the General Fund balances will meet the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy target levels based on the use of uncommitted reserves to meet the one-off overspends in 2016/17.                                      | ✔                    |
| Cash Flow - Cash balances and Cashflow Forecast             | The Council's cash balances and cashflow forecast for the year (including borrowing) will ensure sufficient funds are available to cover planned capital and revenue commitments when they fall due.  | ✔                    |
| Cash Flow - Interest Receipts Forecasts                     | Interest receipts forecast for the year are on target with budget.  | ✔                    |

| Key to Status |         | 2015/16 (@ September 15) - Number of Indicators |    | Quarter 2 2016/17 (end of Sept 2016) - Number of Indicators |    |
|---------------|---------|---|----|---|----|
|               | Alert   |   | 12 |   | 13 |
|               | Warning |   | 16 |   | 12 |
|               | OK      |   | 28 |   | 26 |

### (a) Housing and Homelessness

| Indicator  | September 2015 | Jul 2016   | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|--|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|----------------|---|
| Number of households living in temporary accommodation   | 2930<br>       | 3072<br>   | 3127<br>   | 3172<br>   | Measured Monthly | 2930           | <b>Target is set as benchmark of same period last year.</b> Household in TA continues to climb. Increase of 8%/ 242 over last year. The increase in households living in temporary accommodation is due to:<br>1) Massive demand requiring temporary accommodation specifically nightly paid accommodation<br>2) Both the loss of leased units and conversion of leased units to Emergency Accommodation due to escalating prices<br>3) Housing Association Leasing Scheme (HALS) - housing associations are coming up against increased competition in the market and either withdrawing from the TA market or letting on a PRS basis.<br>Leased Properties:1200 -reduction from 1335 on same period last yr<br>Emergency Accommodation: 1851 - increase of 339 (22% increase on same period last year)<br>HALS: 116 - reduction of 15 on same period (131) last year<br>Voids(Private Sector Leased & Privately Leased Annexes): -5 |
| Overall satisfaction with repairs service provided by Council Homes                                  | 91%<br>        | 90%<br>    | 90%<br>    | 91%<br>    | Measured Monthly | 92%            | <b>Cumulative YTD:</b> 1,906 out of 2,091 surveys returned in respect of works orders issued (period April to September inc.) indicated their satisfaction with the responsive repair service.<br><b>Monthly Snapshot:</b> 95.96%   |
| Contractor monitoring by Council Homes of responsive repairs completed by agreed target date - (YTD) | 88.79%<br>     | 94.79%<br> | 95.03%<br> | 94.89%<br> | Measured Monthly | 96.00%         | Data outturns are inclusive of all term contractor repairs that were raised in April (and completed by the end of September). A total of 7,552 responsive repairs were completed in time from a total of 7,959 repairs completed. This still remains below target.<br>Following a year of mobilisation the decision was made to implement the financial penalties within the contracts from May 2016. In addition one off contract meetings were held with the AD Housing and the senior contractor representatives and action plans to address the issues are being completed. These will be monitored monthly with the aim of reaching target performance within the year.  |










| Indicator  | September 2015 | Jul 2016    | Aug 2016    | Sep 2016    | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|--|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Rent collected by Council Homes as a proportion of rent due (excluding rent arrears) | 101.53%<br>    | 100.74%<br> | 101.11%<br> | 101.14%<br> | Measured Monthly | 100.20%        | <b>Cumulative YTD:</b> A total of £31,681,404.33 of income was collected against a total of £31,322,853.58 in charges.<br><b>Monthly Snapshot:</b> 101.07% |

## (b) Adult Social Care




| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016   | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|---|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|----------------|---|
| Number of clients reviewed in the year (of clients receiving any long term service)                           | 42.1%<br>      | 26.9%<br>  | 31.8%<br>  | 38.0%<br>  | Measured Monthly | 41.0%          | At September 16 – 38% represents 1463 clients receiving a review of 3852 clients receiving a Long Term Support.   |
| Percentage of Current Social Care Clients accessing Long Term Support (LTS) who receive Self Directed Support | 100.0%<br>     | 100.0%<br> | 100.0%<br> | 100.0%<br> | Measured Monthly | 99.0%          |   |
| Percentage of current clients with LTS receiving a Direct Payment   | 57.99%<br>     | 63.95%<br> | 63.84%<br> | 62.47%<br> | Measured Monthly | 57.00%         |   |
| Delayed transfers of care (patients) per 100,000 pop  | 8.85<br>       | 10<br>     | 10.08<br>  |            | Measured Monthly | 5              | In June 2016 Q1 there were 28 patient delays of which 22 were Health Delays, 3 were attributable to Social Care and 3 were joint delays. In August 2016 there was a slight reduction to 26 patient delays. 22 of which were Health Delays, 3 were attributable to Social Care and 1 was a joint delay.<br><br>National Data (ADASS) shows that DTOC have risen nationally by 42% in four years (individual days from 119,736 to 169,928) In 2015/16 nationally 32% of DTOC were due to social care delays, however Enfield performed much better than the national position at 27%.<br><br>There are two out of hospital groups (one for North Middlesex & one for Chase Farm) attended by health, social care and commissioners from each local authority (Barnet, Enfield & Haringey). The groups meet regularly to review delays and the reasons behind them.<br><br>Examples of action recently to mitigate impact of delayed discharges include the revision and enactment of the discharge placement policy (for self-funding clients who contribute significantly to the number of delays) and a review of discharge to assess arrangements where people who are medically fit for discharge but not optimised for |

| Indicator  | September 2015 | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016  | Sep 2016  | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|--|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|----------------|--|
|  |                |           |           |           |                  |                | return home or at risk of residential/nursing admission may be discharged to a residential rehab environment to facilitate further enablement and assessment. The impact of these initiatives continues to be reviewed on a regular basis.   |
| Number of adult learning disabled clients receiving LTS in paid employment                     | 61             | 58<br>    | 58<br>    | 65<br>    | Measured Monthly | 59             |  |
| No. of adults receiving secondary mental health services in settled accommodation (percentage) | 80.5%<br>      | 77.2%<br> | 77.7%<br> | 77.2%<br> | Measured Monthly | 80.0%          | Total adults receiving secondary mental health services in settled accommodation – <b>791</b> ;<br>Total adults who have received secondary mental health services at any point during a financial year – <b>1025 (77.17%)</b>   |
| No of Adults receiving secondary mental health services in employment                          | 4.4%<br>       | 3.5%<br>  | 3.7%<br>  | 4.5%<br>  | Measured Monthly | 5.5%           | Total number of adults who have received secondary mental health services in paid employment (i.e. those recorded as ‘employed’) at the time of their most recent assessment/formal review: <b>46</b><br><br>Total number of adults who have received secondary mental health services at any point during a financial year: <b>1025 (4.49%)</b> |
| New Admissions to Residential and Nursing Care (65+) per 100,000 population over 65            | 211.9<br>      | 188.6<br> | 235.2<br> | 267.8<br> | Measured Monthly | 210.0          | This represents 115 admissions to residential care in the period from April to September 2016 compared to 85 in the same period in 2015/16   |
| New Admissions to Residential and Nursing Care 18-64   | 2.03<br>       | 2.47<br>  | 2.89<br>  | 4.12<br>  | Measured Monthly | 3.70           | This represents 10 admissions (increase from 7 to 10 from Aug and Sept) to residential care in the period from April to September 2016 compared to 4 in the same period in 2015/16   |

### (c) Safeguarding Children

| Indicator   | September 2015  | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016  | Q2 2016/17   | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|----------------|--|
| Children looked after per 10000 population age under 18   | 40.4  | 44  | 42.4   | 42.9  | 42.9   |                | 352 CLA as at the end of September. Current under 18 population figure from the DfE is 82,000.   |
| The number of Looked after children who were adopted or where an Special Guardianship Order (SGO) was granted during the year as a percentage of the number of children Looked after who had been Looked after for 6 months or more | 4%<br>   | Measured Quarterly  |  |   | 9.13%<br> | 5.5%           | Since April 2016, there have been 5 Adoptions and 16 Special Guardianship Orders granted out of a cohort of 230. This is an incremental target: Q1 = 2.75%, Q2 = 5.5%, Q3 = 8.25% and Q4 = 11%.  |
| Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time – in the past two years  | 6.0%<br> | 6.2%<br> | 5.4%<br> | 5.3%<br> | 5.3%<br>  | 8.0%           | This indicator counts children who had a previous child protection plan in the past two years. Of the 322 children who became subject to a Child Protection plan during the past 12 months, 63 (19.6%) had previously been on a Child Protection plan and 17 had been on a previous Child protection plan in the past two years. |

### (f) Sport and Culture

| Indicator   | September 2015  | Jul 2016           | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17  | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|---|---|--------------------|----------|----------|---|----------------|---|
| CYP Participation in Positive Activities (To measure and drive improved performance around the participation of young people in positive activities.) | 60,701<br> | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 60,281<br> | 60,000         | 2nd Quarter Total = 60,281<br>Dugdale Centre = 10,901<br>Festival & Events = 6,500<br>Forty Hall & Estate = 17,657<br>Millfield Arts Centre = 24,698<br>Salisbury House = 525 |
| Number of Arts activities for Children and Young people   | 4,300   | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 4,748<br>  | 4,200          | 2nd Quarter 2016-17 Total = 4748<br>Dugdale Centre – 242<br>Festivals & Events – 80   |

| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016           | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17  | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|---|----------------|--------------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------------|---|
|   |                |                    |          |          |             |                |   |
| Sports Development Sessions – Young People Attendances                              | 6,372<br>      | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 21,711<br>  | 18,000         | Summer programme has boosted numbers as more sessions are put on during this period.  |
| Sports Development Sessions – Adult Attendances                                     | 7,883<br>      | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 15,900<br>  | 15,000         | Program during summer holidays.   |
| Leisure Centre – Young People attendances   | 398,331<br>    | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 441,133<br> | 429,303        | Year End Target: 858,607  |
| Libraries self-service percentage usage – average                                   | 66.0%<br>      | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 87.3%<br>   | 60.0%          | Q2: Self Service Activity – 410,447, Total Activity – 470,301 (87.3%)   |
| Number of visits in person to libraries – All Enfield Libraries                     | 864,417<br>    | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 705,100<br> | 750,000        |   |
| Wifi usage in libraries – total number of sessions at libraries with iCAM wifi only | 18187          | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 21103<br>   | 24880          | In comparison to the same period last year there has been a 14% increase in the Wifi usage from 18,187 in Q2 2015/16 to 21,103 in 2016/17   |
| Engagement in the Arts (People taking part in all arts at local level)              | 178,196<br>    | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 156,925<br> | 155,000        | 2nd Quarter TOTAL = 156,925<br><br>Dugdale Centre = 25,041<br>Festival & Events = 27,000<br>Forty Hall & Estate = 63,561<br>Millfield Arts Centre = 37,008<br>Salisbury house = 4,315 |

**(g) Income Collection, Debt Recovery and Benefit Processing**

| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016           | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|----------------|--------------------|------------|------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Recovery of council properties fraudulently obtained, sublet or abandoned                             | 33<br>         | Measured Quarterly |            |            | 20<br>           | 37             | This is a shared target between the Internal Audit and Risk Team and the newly-established Neighbourhood Team in Council Housing. Working closely together they aim to improve performance over the remainder of the year, meeting regularly with the management team and delivering fraud awareness training to officers. |
| % of Council Tax collected (in year collection) Combined  | 54.89%<br>     | 37.56%<br>         | 46.17%<br> | 54.99%<br> | Measured Monthly | 54.90%         | End of September 2016 collection rate 54.99% (£76,176,518 collected/ £138,539,698 Net Debit).  |
| % of Business Rates collected (in year collection)  | 53.26%<br>     | 36.07%<br>         | 44.62%<br> | 53.50%<br> | Measured Monthly | 55.90%         | End of September 2016 collection rate 53.50% (£62,972,816 collected/ £117,708,359 Total Property Charge). Business rate performance would be 56.5% with internal debts paid (should be paid in October)  |
| % of Housing Benefit Overpayments recovered.  | 48.22%<br>     | Measured Quarterly |            |            | 66.75%<br>       | 52.00%         | 66.75% represents £3,149,408 recovered of £4,717,930 overpayments identified   |
| Processing Times for Benefit Change in Circumstances (average number of calendar days) Cumulative YTD | 10.9<br>       | 5.81<br>           | 5.96<br>   | 6.43<br>   | 6.43<br>         | 7              | Year to Date September 2016: 56,978 changes of circumstances / 366,118 days – average 6.43 days<br><b>September 2016 snapshot: 8,628 change of circumstances / 77,783 days – average 9.02 days.</b>  |

## (2) Growth & Sustainability

### (a) Employment & Worklessness

| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016           | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016  | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Employment rate in Enfield – working age Population   | 72.7%<br>      | Measured Quarterly |            |           | 73%<br>          | 74%            | Target set at 74% (within 1% of the London average) – As at August 2016.<br>Data extracted from August 2016 Labour Market Bulletin – Total number of JSA Claims has decreased by 2.2% on last month and young people by 3%. There has been no change in older claimants receiving JSA and long term claimants increased by 0.4% on the previous month.   |
| Percentage of 16 to 19 year olds (Academic age Y12–y14) who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) | 8.80%<br>      | 4.40%<br>          | 6.80%<br>  |           | Measured Monthly | 7.35%          | August target is reflective of the increase in leavers at this time of year. NEET figures historically start to climb from June and peaking in September. The annual target for this year is 4.25% and will be the average of November, December and January. August Actual number of NEETS is 488 and the Cohort 12367.<br>There have been changes to how NEETS and those young people with a Not Known destination will be monitored and reported post September with the requirement for Local Authorities to report on the destination of 19 year olds now being removed. In light of this change there may be adjustments to what is reported in the future |
| Young Offenders' access to suitable accommodation   | 96.3%<br>      | 100.0%<br>         | 100.0%<br> | 94.7%<br> | 94.7%<br>        | 95.0%          | 19 interventions ended 18 in suitable accommodation, 1 was left as unknown and was not updated, so counted as unsuitable.  |

### (b) Planning

| Indicator  | September 2015 | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016  | Sep 2016  | Q2 2016/17 | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|--|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------|--|
| Percentage of all valid planning applications that are registered within 5 working days of receipt | 86.9%<br>      | 76.3%<br> | 81.1%<br> | 74.2%<br> | 77.3%<br>  | 80.0%          | Monthly snapshots: July 76.3% (328/430); August 81.1% (353/435).<br>Sept 74.2% (282/380)<br>Year to Date: April to Sept: 1988 applications registered within 5 days of 2448 received (81.2%) |

| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016    | Aug 2016    | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17 | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|--|
| 2 year rolling performance of major applications determined in 13 weeks           | 73.26%<br>     | 68.82%<br>  | 70.83%<br>  | 71.72%<br> | 71.72%<br> | 73.00%         | Rolling two year performance at September 2016: 71 of 99 in time   |
| Processing of planning applications: Major applications processed within 13 weeks | 66.67%<br>     | 100.00%<br> | 100.00%<br> | 80.00%<br> | 91.67%<br> | 80.00%         | <u>Processed inside target</u><br>Q1: 4/5 – 80%<br>Q2: 11/12 – 91.7%<br>Year to Date – 15/17 – 88.2%           |
| Processing of planning applications: Minor applications processed within 8 weeks  | 83.72%<br>     | 76.56%<br>  | 78.21%<br>  | 81.67%<br> | 78.71%<br> | 75.00%         | <u>Processed inside target</u><br>Q1: 109/143 – 76.2%<br>Q2: 159/202 – 78.7%<br>Year to Date – 268/345 – 77.7% |
| Processing of planning applications: Other applications processed within 8 weeks  | 81.34%<br>     | 77.10%<br>  | 85.71%<br>  | 86.32%<br> | 82.99%<br> | 80.00%         | <u>Processed inside target</u><br>Q1: 281/354 – 79.4%<br>Q2: 322/388 – 83.0%<br>Year to Date – 603/742 – 81.3% |

### (c) Waste, Recycling & Cleanliness

| Indicator   | Q1 2015                | Jul 2016         | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Residual waste per household  | Q1<br>164.64kg/hhd<br> | 155.52kg/hhd<br> |          |          |                  | 145.00k g/hhd  | <i>These indicators are provided a quarter in arrears as per Wastedataflow deadlines, The total shown in July 2016 is the provisional figure for Quarter 1 (April to June period). This awaits validation by WasteDataFlow on 30.11.16</i> |
| Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting                      | Q1<br>38.79%<br>       | 39.38%<br>       |          |          |                  | 42.00%         | <i>These indicators are provided a quarter in arrears as per Wastedataflow deadlines, The total shown in July 2016 is the provisional figure for Quarter 1 (April to June period). This awaits validation by WasteDataFlow on 30.11.16</i> |
| Percentage of inspected land that has an unacceptable level of litter (3 surveys per annum) | 2.67%<br>              | 1.93%<br>        |          |          | Measured Monthly | 4.00%          | 2015/16 final outturn 1.94% against a target of 4%.  |





















| Indicator  | Q1 2015   | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|--|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------------|---|
| Percentage of inspected land that has an unacceptable level of detritus (3 surveys per annum)    | 3.55%<br> | 9.61%<br> |          |          | Measured Monthly | 6.00%          | 2015/16 final outturn 4.19% against a target of 6%. |
| Percentage of inspected land that has an unacceptable level of graffiti (3 surveys per annum)    | 0.00%<br> | 0.00%<br> |          |          | Measured Monthly | 2.00%          | 2015/16 final outturn 0% against a target of 2%.    |
| Percentage of inspected land that has an unacceptable level of fly-posting (3 surveys per annum) | 0.17%<br> | 0.35%<br> |          |          | Measured Monthly | 1.00%          | 2015/16 final outturn 0.17% against a target of 1%. |









### (3) Strong Communities

#### (a) Crime Rates

| Indicator | September 2015 | Jul 2016 | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016  | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|-----------|----------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Burglary  | 1,204<br>      | 777<br>  | 974<br>  | 1,170<br> | Measured Monthly | 1,417          | <p>The overall burglary figure includes burglary of domestic households (76% of total), commercial premises and businesses and domestic buildings such as sheds and garages. Currently household burglary in Enfield is at its lowest level in several years. We expect to achieve a reduction on last year's figure and are currently meeting the long term stretch target for 2016 as set by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime.</p> <p>The partnership continues to implement alley gate schemes to reduce opportunities for rear entry burglary offending across the borough and other intensive initiatives are ongoing for seasonal increases over the winter months. 12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have reduced by -4.2% compared to -4.7% across London (to 30th of September).</p> <p>The Council are supporting MetTrace, a property marking crime reduction process led by the police, through use of signage and</p> |






| Indicator                     | September 2015   | Jul 2016   | Aug 2016  | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|
| Criminal Damage               | 1,082<br> | 750<br>   | 914<br>   | 1,083<br> | Measured Monthly | 1,039          | analysis. Between March 2015 and August 2016, 13,165 MetTrace kits were deployed in Enfield.<br>Criminal Damage has reduced by -18.9% since 2011/12. 12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have decreased by -1.7% compared to +1.0% across London (to 30th of September).<br>Focused work has begun on housing areas by the estates crime group and these areas are showing improvements.   |
| Robbery                       | 458<br>   | 271<br>   | 326<br>   | 416<br>   | Measured Monthly | 449            | Robbery has reduced by -23.2% since 2011/12 and we are currently meeting the stretch target which was set by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. Rates of offending per 1,000 residents are now notably below the historic average and the proportion of offences involving young people remain lower than in previous years.<br>12-month rolling data (monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have decreased by -2.8% compared to -2.1% across London (to 30th Sept). |
| Theft from Motor Vehicle      | 1,138<br> | 599<br>   | 745<br>   | 924<br>   | Measured Monthly | 1,205          | Thefts from motor vehicle offences in Enfield have seen a significant long-term reduction over the past 5 years, with a -36.5% reduction since 2011/12.<br>12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have a -9.0% decrease compared to -0.2% across London (to 30th of September).   |
| Theft/Taking of Motor Vehicle | 308<br> | 241<br> | 298<br> | 380<br> | Measured Monthly | 433            | Thefts of motor vehicles in Enfield have declined by -34.3% since 2011/12 and we are currently exceeding the stretch target which was set by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime.<br>However, 12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have increased by +12.1% compared to +11.8% across London (to 30th of September).  |
| Theft from the Person         | 218<br> | 182<br> | 217<br> | 275<br> | Measured Monthly | 190            | Theft from the person offences are composed largely of pick-pocket type offences and snatch thefts (predominantly where mobile phones are snatched from victims in the street).<br>12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have increased by +15.3% compared to a -0.6% decrease across London (to 30th of September).   |





| Indicator                | September 2015   | Jul 2016   | Aug 2016  | Sep 2016   | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|
| Violence with Injury     | 1,205<br>   | 821<br>     | 1,033<br>   | 1,242<br>   | Measured Monthly | 670            | <p>We remain significantly off meeting the long term stretch target of -20%, as set by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, as we have seen a +12.7% increase since 2011/12. However, Theft from Person represents the lowest volume of crime amongst all MOPAC 7 crime categories and therefore any minor change in the volume represents a large percentage change.</p> <p>Reported numbers of Violence with Injury have increased across both Enfield and London in the long term. Enfield has experienced an increase of +0.7% in the past 12-months, compared to +3.3% across London (to 30th of September). This includes violent offences which may be associated with street gangs in addition to violence which takes place in the home. Of note, Knife Crime has been decreasing by -11.8% and Gun Crime has been increasing by +4.8% in the past 12-months (to 30th of September). Serious Youth Violence has increased by +4.6% in the same period.</p> <p>Approximately 40% of violence with injury offences is domestic related. Nationally it is estimated that as much as 50% of all violence goes unreported to the police particularly that which is domestic or familial, or that which occurs as part of the night time economy.</p> <p>A considerable amount of violence that is not reported to police is dealt with by the London Ambulance Service and Accident &amp; Emergency Departments. Locally we have worked to obtain this data in order to improve our knowledge on geographic locations of violence so that resources can be better coordinated and continue to work to tackle both domestic and gang related violence. Gang related violence although remaining an issue has recently reduced.</p> |
| Total Offences (MOPAC 7) | 5,615<br> | 3,641<br> | 4,507<br> | 5,490<br> | Measured Monthly | 5,401          | <p>The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime announced in 2011/12 that the Metropolitan Police would be measured against 7 neighbourhood crime targets, referred to as the MOPAC 7. An ambitious stretch target of -20% over the next four years was set for Burglary, Criminal Damage, Robbery, Theft from Motor Vehicles, Theft of Motor Vehicles, Theft from the Person and Violence with Injury.</p> <p>Enfield has noted a reduction in 'MOPAC 7' of -16.6% reduction against this baseline set by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime</p>   |

| Indicator   | September 2015 | Jul 2016           | Aug 2016 | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17       | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|---|----------------|--------------------|----------|----------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Number of Domestic Crimes                           | 1,466          | 2,927              |          | 2,931    | Measured Monthly |                | (to the 30th of September). The largest volume crime categories are Burglary and Violence with Injury, which together account for over 45% of the MOPAC 7 crimes.<br><br>12-month rolling data (which is monitored by MPS) shows Enfield to have experienced a decreased level of MOPAC 7 crimes by -1.8% compared to a +0.5% increase across London (to 30th of September). Our analysis has also shown that areas of high density housing suffer from disproportionately high levels of crime and we are working to tackle this.   |
| Number of Domestic Violence cases referred to MARAC | 347            | Measured Quarterly |          |          | 236              |                | There is no local target regarding the number of crimes of domestic violence. Domestic Violence is significantly under-reported nationally therefore we actively encourage victims to report offences to the police. Current data shows an increase in reported offences, which is believed to be down to a number of factors, including improved confidence and reporting to the police.<br><br>The Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) is a regular local meeting whereby information about high risk domestic violence victims is shared between local agencies. A co-ordinated plan is drawn up to support the victim.<br><br>There is no specific target set with regards to the number of referrals. |



**(b) Health & Well Being**

| Indicator  | September 2015   | Jul 2016 | Aug 2016  | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17   | Current Target | Latest Note  |
|--|--|----------|---|----------|--|----------------|--|
| NDTMS Partnership Successful Completion Rate (%) for all Drug users in treatment (aged 18+), excluding alcohol-only users: | 25.0%<br> |          | 21.7%<br> |          | 21.7%<br> | 21.4%          | No data from NDTMS for July as NDTMS do not publish any data during this month as they reset the baselines |




### (c) Complaints




| Indicator   | September 2015  | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016           | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17  | Current Target  | Latest Note  |
|---|---|---|--------------------|----------|---|---|--|
|   | All Departments – Complaints answered within 10 days  | 84.21%<br> | Measured Quarterly |          |   | 82.67%<br> | 92%  |
| Stage 1 Adult Social Care STATUTORY Complaints Scheme – % replied to within agreed target (individually negotiated) | 88.24%<br> | Measured Quarterly  |                    |          | 84.62%<br> | 92%   | Q2: 11 of 13 (84.6%) HHASC statutory scheme complaints closed in agreed timescales.<br>Year to Date: 26/29 (89.7%) |




### (d) Other Corporate Indicators

| Indicator | September 2015   | Jul 2016  | Aug 2016           | Sep 2016 | Q2 2016/17 | Current Target  | Latest Note |
|-----------|--|---|--------------------|----------|------------|---|-------------|
|           | Average Sick Days – Council Staff (rolling 4 quarters) | 7.99<br> | Measured Quarterly |          |            | 9.48<br> | 8.00        |

| Indicator   |
|---|
| Internal Audit Programme – % of reviews completed                                     |
| I.T. incidents resolved within SLA High Priority (severity 1) resolved within 2 hours |
| % of invoices paid within 30 days for all Departments                                 |

| September 2015  |
|---|
| 20%<br>    |
| 100%<br>   |
| 98.29%<br> |

| Jul 2016  | Aug 2016   | Sep 2016  |
|---|--|---|
| Measured Quarterly  |  |   |
| Measured Quarterly  |  |   |
| 90.97%<br> | 94.52%<br> | 95.05%<br> |

| Q2 2016/17  |
|---|
| 13%<br>    |
| 100%<br>   |
| 93.58%<br> |

| Current Target | Latest Note  |
|----------------|--|
|                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piloting Mental Health Awareness training</li> <li>Long term sickness absence is higher among blue collar workers with a high predominance of muscular-skeletal related conditions. The Public Health team have developed a programme using the health trainer service which will be piloted at the Morson Road depot.</li> </ul> |
| 26%            | The audit delivery plan has been re-profiled, and progress is being closely monitored.   |
| 95%            | 209 P1 Incidents all resolved within the 2 hour SLA.   |
| 98%            | Sep 16: 95.05% (8,105 invoices inside target of 8,527 paid).<br>April – Sep 16: 94.41% (47,253 invoices inside target of 50,050 paid)  |

This page is intentionally left blank