

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 24 AUGUST 2011**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Chris Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment), Christine Hamilton (Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing and Public Health), Donald McGowan (Cabinet Member for Adult Services and Care), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Children & Young People), Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing) and Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Property)

ABSENT Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader), Bambos Charalambous (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure) and Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration)

OFFICERS: Neil Rousell (Director of Regeneration, Leisure & Culture), Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), John Austin (Assistant Director - Corporate Governance), John Oakley (Senior Lawyer - Commercial and Contracts), Richard Tyler (Assistant Director of Finance), Gary Barnes (Assistant Director Highways and Transportation) and Ian Davis (Director of Environment) Penelope Williams (Secretary)

Also Attending: 25 members of the public

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Georgiou, Taylor, Goddard and Charalambous.

In Councillor Taylor and Georgiou's absence the meeting was chaired by Councillor Stafford.

**2
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3
URGENT ITEMS**

NOTED that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England)

Amendment Regulations 2002. These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear days in advance of meetings.

4

DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

Councillor Stafford welcomed the deputation members to the meeting.

The topic of the deputation was the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Uvedale Road, Walsingham Road, Whitethorn Gardens, Park Crescent and Amwell Close. It was sponsored by Councillor Glynis Vince.

Steve Rowe presented the deputation to Cabinet and spoke on behalf of the deputees, a summary of which follows:

- Although they had been pleased that 38 roads had been removed from the scheme, the deputees' main concern was the way that the consultation and the proposals had been handled by the Council.
- He felt that the response to the Council's consultation exercise had been poor. When he and neighbouring residents had visited door to door and explained the impact of the proposals, 80% of the residents in the five roads had signed the petition against them.
- The Council had not made clear the full impact of the proposals to residents: it had only indicated that the signing might be unsightly. He thought that the consultation papers should have been more transparent and should have included information such as the price of the parking permits, the reduction in the number of parking spaces in the roads affected, that visitor permits would be required for both morning and afternoon sessions.
- Because of the limited amount of information in the documents, he felt that the analysis was flawed and the judgements arising from the consultation weak. He saw no link between the conclusions and the preferred option. The report identified possible problems in outer zone roads on one day only and yet an all day all week solution was proposed. This was the least popular option.
- In the consultation papers, no information was available on the reasons behind the parking congestion or other possible strategies for addressing the problem.
- In response to freedom of information requests, council officers had asserted that no policy recommendations or position papers have been written to interpret the consultation findings, and that no officer reports or emails exist. He felt that there should be many reports and if not, proper scrutiny of the proposals had not been carried out.

CABINET - 24.8.2011

- In conclusion he felt that the consultation process was flawed, weak data obtained, specious conclusions made, too few options considered and the consultation options put forward were not those supported by residents. He finally suggested that the real purpose of the CPZ was to raise revenue for the Council.

Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment, responded

- The deputation had raised valid points which would be taken into consideration.
- The consultation process had been undertaken on the understanding that if residents were not in favour of CPZs, then they would not be imposed.
- Proposals had been developed following on from the outcomes of the 2009 Parking Review carried out by the previous administration.
- He felt that the Council had listened to what had been said and would be coming back with full recommendations for decision on the wider CPZ proposals for the Enfield Town Area. In the meantime 38 roads, where there had been strong opposition, had been removed from the area being considered. These roads, including the 5 roads under discussion, would not be included in the CPZ.
- Consultations of this type do tend to have a poor response rate and the rate received was in line with similar consultations.
- In other parts of the CPZ, where residents had responded expressing views opposed to the proposals, streets had been removed at an earlier stage.
- New methods of consultation would be considered in the future.

Councillor Bond thanked the deputation members for attending the meeting.

NOTED that

1. Ian Davis, Director of Environment, said that the process had been put in place to explore ways of managing parking congestion in the Enfield Town area. The problems and concerns expressed were valid; officers were open to suggestions and would be looking at ways of improving consultations; rethinking how they worked with residents in future.
2. Councillor Vince's concern that the initial information sent to residents had not explained clearly what was happening or what could happen as a result of the installation of a CPZ in those streets.
3. Councillor Neville's comment that he was aware there was a need to review CPZs on a regular basis, but that 2009 report had been a

CABINET - 24.8.2011

general report on parking, investigating possible means of resolving parking problems as a whole across the borough. He felt that the deputation had been very well researched and presented, the best he had seen, and he hoped officers and members would take note of what had been said.

4. Gary Barnes, Assistant Director Highways and Transportation, drew members attention to a paper he had circulated. This set out details of the consultation and explained that following consultation, 38 roads where residents had expressed an overwhelming rejection of the proposals, had been withdrawn from the proposals. Further analysis would take place before decisions were taken on the remaining roads and a report brought forward on the whole proposal.
5. Gary Barnes offered to meet Mr Rowe and other objectors to discuss the proposals. He added that it would be very expensive for the Council to undertake a detailed door to door/face to face consultation with every resident in an area, but that officers would seek to improve current methods.
6. A resident added that he did not feel that the Council would be justified in spending council tax money on more research.
7. Councillor Laban's view that the whole process had been flawed as residents had not understood it properly. Some residents would prefer a one hour midday restriction which had not been offered. Others wanted a reduction in all council parking charges.

5

ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

There were no items referred to Council

6

HIGHWAYS AND ENGINEERING WORKS CONTRACT 2011 - APPROVAL OF TENDER

Gary Barnes, Assistant Director Highways and Transportation, introduced the report of the Director of Environment (No: 63) seeking approval to award the Highways and Engineering Works Contract to the recommended contractor following the selection and evaluation process.

NOTED

1. That report number 63 is also referred to in minute 16 below.
2. The tender evaluation process had produced a clear outcome. Accepting the successful tender will be advantageous to the Council and is the cheapest option.

Alternative Options Considered

Contract periods of 5 and 7 years, with potential extensions of 5 and 3 years respectively, were considered however these could have restricted Enfield's ability to join one of the pan-London contracts which are currently being developed and programmed to commence in 2013.

Another option considered was to extend the existing contract beyond its current period however this would be a breach of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 ("PCR 2006") and would clearly leave the Council open to a challenge by aggrieved contractors.

Other options considered and investigated were the potential opportunities within the sub-region, regional and national areas, which found no immediate opportunity but did re-confirm the Transport for London Pan-London arrangements.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to approve contractor A, on the basis that it has provided the most economically advantageous tender.

Reasons

To ensure that the Council has the ability to fulfill its obligations under the Highways Act, in maintaining the borough's highway infrastructure by appointing a contractor from a tendering process, enabling continuity when the existing contract ends in November 2011. The contract also provides a delivery mechanism for a range of other Council projects and programmes without the need for further procurement exercises.

The recommended contractor has been assessed to provide the most economically advantageous tender to deliver a range of highway maintenance and engineering projects.

The contract duration of 4 years, with a break clause after 3, provides the potential to join the pan-London arrangements, should they be assessed to provide greater value for money.

(Key Decision Reference Number 3352)

7

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL/SCRUTINY PANELS

There were no issues arising from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the other scrutiny panels.

8

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

NOTED

1. The provisional list of items scheduled for future Cabinet Meetings.
2. Consideration of item 6 on Ordnance Road Development Brief has been deferred from 14 September to the 12 October 2011 meeting to allow for further discussion between Councillors Oyken, McGowan and Goddard on the detail of the proposal and with the NHS on funding arrangements.

9

KEY DECISIONS FOR INCLUSION ON THE COUNCIL'S FORWARD PLAN

NOTED that the next Forward Plan is due to be published on 16 September 2011 and that this will cover the period from 1 October 2011 to 31 January 2012.

10

MINUTES - ENFIELD RESIDENTS PRIORITY FUND CABINET SUB COMMITTEE

RECEIVED the minutes of the meetings of the Enfield Residents Priority Fund Cabinet Sub Committee meetings held on Thursday 7 July 2011 and Tuesday 9 August 2011.

NOTED the recommendation from the Sub Committee made on 9 August 2011 relating to the appointment of an additional member of the sub committee in order to provide greater flexibility in case of members being unable to attend future meetings.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed that Councillor Bambos Charalambous would be the fourth member of the Enfield Residents Priority Fund Sub Committee.

11

MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 13 July 2011 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

12

ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FEEDBACK

NOTED the briefing paper summarising the items discussed at the Enfield Strategic Partnership Board meeting held on 5 July 2011.

13

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that the next scheduled meeting of the Cabinet was due to take place on Wednesday 14 September 2011. (Councillor Orhan extended her apologies for absence at this meeting).

14

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude 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 confidential information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

15

HIGHWAYS AND ENGINEERING WORKS CONTRACT 2011 - APPROVAL OF TENDER

Councillor Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Environment (No: 64) seeking approval to award the Highways and Engineering Works Contract to the recommended contractor following the selection and evaluation process.

NOTED

1. That Report No 63 also referred, as detailed in Minute 6 above.
2. Tenderer A had produced the cheapest tender with a potential saving of around 25% for programmed project works delivery costs. Reactive work would be more expensive, but added together reactive and programmed works were still less than the other tenders.
3. Evaluation took account of existing service delivery programmes for services including areas such as gully cleansing and winter maintenance.
4. Contractor A (as detailed in the report) offered best financial value, as well as scoring high overall with a score of 99 out of 100.
5. The quality of work of the existing contractor was highly praised and Enfield had developed a very good relationship with the company. It was expected that a similar relationship would be developed with the new company.

CABINET - 24.8.2011

6. As the specification remains the same it was anticipated that the quality of workmanship would be maintained. Work would continue to be monitored by council officers.
7. Enfield demands a higher standard than neighbouring authorities, including a one hour response time which should ensure that quality is kept up to current standards.
8. Some concern was expressed about salt stocks for winter maintenance, but members were assured that arrangements would be made to maintain these.
9. Budgetary pressures would be managed as currently, depending on need.

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No: 63, Minute No: 6 refers.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To approve Contractor A (as detailed in the report) on the basis that it has provided the most economically advantageous tender.
2. That the identified shortfall in revenue funding be addressed through the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

Reason: As detailed in Report No: 63 Minute No 6 above refers