

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25  
JANUARY 2012**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT**

Christiana During (Mayor), Kate Anolue (Deputy Mayor), Jayne Buckland, Chaudhury Anwar MBE, Alan Barker, Ali Bakir, Caitriona Bearryman, Yasemin Brett, Alev Cazimoglu, Lee Chamberlain, Bambos Charalambous, Yusuf Cicek, Christopher Cole, Andreas Constantinides, Ingrid Cranfield, Christopher Deacon, Dogan Delman, Marcus East, Patricia Ekechi, Achilleas Georgiou, Del Goddard, Jonas Hall, Christine Hamilton, Ahmet Hasan, Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward, Denise Headley, Ertan Hurer, Tahsin Ibrahim, Chris Joannides, Jon Kaye, Nneka Keazor, Joanne Laban, Henry Lamprecht, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Derek Levy, Simon Maynard, Paul McCannah, Donald McGowan, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Ahmet Oykenner, Daniel Pearce, Martin Prescott, Geoffrey Robinson, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Toby Simon, Alan Sitkin, Edward Smith, Andrew Stafford, Doug Taylor, Glynis Vince, Ozzie Uzoanya, Tom Waterhouse, Lionel Zetter and Ann Zinkin

**ABSENT**

Chris Bond, Eric Jukes, Chris Murphy, Anne-Marie Pearce and Rohini Simbodyal.

**91**

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

The Mayor apologised for the late start of the meeting, which had been delayed to 7:10pm. This had been due to the late arrival of the Mayor's Chaplain who had been held up in traffic.

The election of a Chairman/Deputy Chairman of the meeting was not required.

**92**

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

Father Emmanuel – Parish Priest of St Edmonds Church, Edmonton, gave the blessing.

**93**

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) IN CONNECTION WITH THE  
ORDINARY COUNCIL BUSINESS**

The Mayor made the following announcements:

- She thanked Father Emmanuel for offering the prayers.

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

- She reminded members about the sad death of past Mayor Patrick Cunneen, who died just before Christmas, after a long illness; she thanked the Deputy Mayor Councillor Kate Anolue and other members for attending his funeral on Monday 9 January 2012.

Councillors Doug Taylor and Mike Rye paid tribute to Patrick Cunneen. The whole Council stood and observed a minute's silence in his memory.

Further announcements followed:

- The Mayor and the Deputy had attended numerous engagements in the borough, including many Christmas Lunches, a number of concerts and recitals, showing the abundance of talent in the borough.
- The Mayor had enjoyed attending the New Years Day Parade, a spectacular occasion where it was wonderful to see so many people lining the streets, cheering and clapping the groups performing in the parade.
- She thanked the Platinum Dance Group, based at Millfield Theatre for representing Enfield. They had come ninth in the London Boroughs competition this year, as a result the Mayor's Charity appeal will receive £1500.
- She informed members that the Mayor's Charity Spring Ball would be held on Saturday 24 March 2012, at Forty Hall Banqueting Suite. Tickets would be £45 each, to include a drinks reception on arrival, 3 course meal and a half bottle of wine per person. She hoped that as many as possible would support the evening.

The Mayor announced that the Council had recently received the following awards.

### **1. London Safeguarding Children Award 2011**

The Mayor said that she was pleased to say that on 5 December 2011 Enfield Parent Engagement Panel (PEP) won the very first London Safeguarding Children Award 2011 for emerging practice.

Anne Stoker, Enfield Parent Commissioner, was joined at the award ceremony by a number of the Enfield Parent Champions; every-one was delighted when the announcement was made. There was press interest and photographs were taken of the parents receiving the award. There were 4 projects short listed with 3 being highly commended however Enfield was the winner and the judges were extremely complimentary.

Parent Engagement Panels cut across all boundaries serving the whole Borough engaging across and within communities, promoting community cohesion. The PEPs aim to keep children, young people and communities safe and strong by increasing parental involvement.

From within the Parent Engagement Panels parent champions are coming forward. These are parents willing to go that extra mile to source and support their communities by improving access and engagement to services and provisions, particularly for those who are isolated or whom do not normally engage with others outside of their communities.

It is fantastic to hear such an important initiative getting such well deserved external recognition.

Anne Stoker and members of the Parent Engagement Panel were presented with the award.

## **2. Sword of Honour**

The Sword of Honour is a prestigious award recognising the 'best of the best' in health and safety management. It was only achievable if an organisation achieves a 'Five Star' rating in the British Safety Council health and safety audit. The audit is recognised globally as one of the toughest audits to achieve.

Only 54 organisations globally were awarded the 'Sword of Honour' in 2011. Enfield Council is the only council in the country to achieve such an award.

Being awarded the Sword of Honour brings great internal and external endorsement and heightened prestige as 'best of the best' in managing health and safety.

For the Environment Department, John Griffiths and the corporate health and safety team this has been a three year plan of hard work, commitment and dedication to bring the Council to a level that is amongst the best organisations, a wonderful achievement.

John Griffiths was presented with the Sword of Honour

## **94 MINUTES**

**AGREED** that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 9 November 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record

## **95 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Bond, Eric Jukes, Chris Murphy, Anne-Marie Pearce and Rohini Simbodyal, Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Marcus East.

96

## **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

The following interests were declared in agenda item 7 - Opposition Business: Portas Review on the Future of our High Streets:

- Councillor Tashin Ibrahim declared a personal interest as he was an employee of Enfield Retail Business Association Ltd.
- Councillor Christopher Cole declared a personal interest as an associate of the owner of a local business in a town centre within Enfield.

The Assistant Director Corporate Governance advised members that they would need to consider declaring a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 10 - Concessionary Travel Policy if they or any member of their immediate family or close associate had applied for or was in receipt of a blue badge/disabled persons Freedom Pass or Taxicard. As a result of the advice provided the following interests were declared:

- Councillor Yusuf Cicek declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a close relative held a disabled persons Freedom Pass;
- Councillor Achilleas Georgiou declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a close relative held a disabled persons Freedom Pass;
- Councillor Dino Lemonides declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a close relative held a disabled persons Freedom Pass;

Each member withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item and did not vote.

Councillor Tom Waterhouse declared a personal interest in item 14.1 (Motion in the name of Councillor Lavender) as he was employed by Nick de Bois MP, as a Senior Parliamentary Assistant.

97

## **OPPOSITION BUSINESS - PORTAS REVIEW ON THE FUTURE OF OUR HIGH STREETS**

Councillor Neville introduced the issues paper prepared by the Conservative Group, based on the Portas Review into the future of our High Streets.

In introducing the paper he highlighted the case for carrying out measures which would help improve High Streets in Enfield. The key issues raised included:

- The need to recognise High Streets and retail shopping generally as a very important contributor to the local economy.
- Whilst High Streets had been in decline for many years, both local and national governments of all political make up had not done enough to reverse this. The major factors influencing the decline included the increase in the number of large out of town stores with free parking, and the continual, exponential growth in internet shopping.

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

- The Government had commissioned Mary Portas, in the context of the current economic down turn, to come up with recommendations for improvement. The Conservative Group were now calling on the Council to consider what could be done in Enfield, in response to the main findings and recommendations from the review.
- Enfield suffered from the close proximity of large out of town shops along the A10 as well as the nearness to major shopping centres such as Brookfield Farm, Brent Cross and the recently opened Westfield Centre development at Stratford. It was difficult to compete with these large centres with combined leisure interests.
- The Conservative Group felt that the average 46% increase in parking charges and imposition of Sunday charges in Enfield would not help in addressing these issues. These measures discouraged people from shopping in their local high street, encouraged those that did come to stay for less time and therefore spend less money.
- As a result of the Opposition Business, the Conservative Group were requesting that more detailed consideration be given to those recommendations in the Portas Review which were under local authority control. This included particular action to consider immediately reversing the decision to impose Sunday parking charges in Enfield Town; to introduce a period of fifteen minutes free parking (as a measure which had worked well in neighbouring Waltham Forest & Borehamwood); and to instruct the Housing Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel to consider the findings and recommendations from the Portas Review in more detail, with a report to be provided for Cabinet & Council by July 2012.

Councillor Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration, responded on behalf of the Majority Group, highlighting that:

- The Majority Group shared the concerns of the opposition at the decline of the High Street, particularly in the light of the current Global Crisis, but felt that no single strand or issue (including the provision of free parking) would resolve the problem on its own.
- In Enfield, several of the recommendations from the Portas Review had already been implemented, including the creation of Town Centre Managers and ongoing support for the Enfield Business Retail Association (EBRA), who continued to play a significant role. Two key issues needing to be addressed remained the quality of the retail offer and the environment. An additional difficulty in Enfield Town related to the size of the retail units, with retailers increasingly wanting larger units. A key problem in many areas – particularly in the East - was the decline in disposable income which had led to major retailers moving away from local high streets.

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

- Before the Portas Review, the Council had been carrying out improvements to shopping areas along the Hertford Road - in Ponders End, Enfield Lock, in the South - and along Green Lanes. This had also included measures such as introduction of a business rate relief and the provision of Christmas lights. Plans were also being developed to create street markets with further investment in business and arts projects - including the Dugdale Centre in Enfield Town
- As part of the plans being developed to progress the Enfield Town Phase III development it had been recognised that there would be a need to focus on not just the retail offer, but also on improving the general environment and shopping experience. At Edmonton Green the Council was working very closely with St Modwens to encourage further investment in the shopping centre.
- Recent survey information indicated that residents rated improving the quality of the shops as the most important factor in attracting them back to the High Street; parking was fifth. Only a minority of people travelled by car to high streets in Enfield; many more travelled on foot and by public transport (with a subsequent need to include as part of any review the current level of fares). Whilst recognising the importance of parking it was felt this needed to be seen within the wider context of all the other issues identified.

Other issues highlighted as factors impacting on the decline in the High Street during the debate were as follows:

- The impact of rent and business rate levels combined with lack of choice, innovation and bureaucracy;
- The need to create a good environment where small well run businesses could thrive, including improvements to the street scene;
- The popularity of large out of town shopping centres, based partly on the fact that they offered free parking and were within close proximity in terms of travel time;
- The need to address and avoid high levels of vacant retail units.

Following a lengthy debate, Councillor Lavender summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group. He felt that the debate had been useful and recognised the need for the issues to be considered in the widest possible context. At the same time he felt there was a need for the Council to focus on those areas within its direct control as a means of addressing the issues raised, which included parking and parking charges. Of particular concern was the impact relating to the introduction of parking charges on Sunday.

In response to the debate and recommendations made within the Opposition Business paper, Councillor Goddard highlighted:

1. the need to consider the issues highlighted as part of an overall strategy and in the broadest possible context recognising the impact of issues such as the current economic climate & plummeting consumer confidence alongside the quality of the retail offer, local environment and

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

parking. There was also a need to focus on actions over the short, medium and long term.

2. the progress made in improving High Streets across the borough, including the lobbying of local MPs about the proliferation of betting shops, and attempting to tackle the problem of empty shops.
3. the need to bring forward a measured response. He therefore proposed that a report should be prepared for Cabinet looking at the issues raised in the Portas Review and during the meeting along with the Council's response in addressing these, and making recommendations for the best way forward as part of an overall strategic approach. Scrutiny would also be welcome to participate in this process.

The Leader of the Opposition requested that a vote was taken on the recommendations within the Opposition Business paper, with the following result:

- (1) To reconsider the decision to introduce parking charges on Sundays in Enfield Town and revert to allowing free off and on street parking on Sundays and Bank Holidays with immediate effect.

For: 23  
Against: 31  
Abstentions: 0

The recommendation was not therefore approved.

- (2) To introduce a 15 minute free parking period at all on street parking bays in shopping high street areas.

For: 23  
Against: 31  
Abstentions: 0

The recommendation was not therefore approved.

- (3) To instruct the Housing, Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel to consider the Portas Review in detail and to report to Cabinet and Council with recommendations by July 2012, providing reasonable and necessary resources as required.

For: 23  
Against: 31  
Abstentions: 0

The recommendation was not therefore approved.

98

**FINAL REPORT FROM THE COUNCIL COMMISSION TO EXAMINE THE AUGUST 2011 DISTURBANCES IN ENFIELD**

Councillor Hamilton (Chair of the Council Commission) moved and Councillor Rye seconded the final report setting out the findings and recommendations from the Council Commission set up to investigate the causes of the August Disturbances in Enfield during August 2011 (Report No.181A).

NOTED

1. Councillor Hamilton in moving the report highlighted:
  - a. The Commission had been established by Council in September to investigate the reasons behind the disturbances in Enfield and put forward recommendations to prevent them happening again. The timeframe had been very short to enable the recommendations to feed in to the review being carried out by the National Riots, Communities and Victims Panel.
  - b. The Commission had held 12 meetings, including two in public, carried out visits to areas affected and spoken to many of the individuals involved including the Borough Commander, Chief Executive and other community leaders.
  - c. The Commission had found no one single cause for the riots. There were many underlying issues with those involved from all ages and ethnicities.
  - d. Whilst there were no easy solutions, there was a need to tackle the underlying issues, build young peoples self esteem and resilience, address increasing marginalisation and improve early intervention.
  - e. The Commission would continue to review the offender survey results, and to monitor the implementation of the recommendations, a visit to Pentonville Prison was also planned. The Council would seek to take advantage of external funding to implement the recommendations.
  - f. The final report and recommendations would be submitted to the National Riots, Communities and Victims Panel to feed into their final review.
2. Councillor Rye in seconding the report highlighted:
  - a. The need to recognise that only a small minority of young people had been involved in the disturbances. A multiplicity of factors had been involved. Although the recommendations on their own could not prevent future disturbances, they would contribute to prevention.

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

- b. The Police had done the best job that they could in the circumstances and with the initial resources available but, it was felt, could have been more proactive in their initial response. Analysis should be undertaken on addressing the factors influencing young people who were known to the Education Welfare Service and who had been excluded.
- c. In addition there was a need to recognise the poor relationship between some young people and the police and to consider how representative the police were of their communities.
3. The thanks extended by the Commission Chair to all members of the Commission & Alison Trew (Head of Corporate Policy and Performance) and the other Commission Support Officers for their support in arranging and turning around the evidence and Commission meetings so quickly. These thanks were reiterated by all members of the Commission with its work felt to represent an excellent example of cross party working.
4. The concerns highlighted in relation to the impact of the criminal justice system and sentencing policy, which the Opposition Group felt had not been fully reflected as an issue within the Commission's report. In response the Commission Chair felt it was important to remind members that the review findings and recommendations had been produced following an evidence based review, with the increase in police numbers available to tackle the disturbances seen as more of an influence than the sentencing policy adopted to deal with offenders.

Following a lengthy debate the recommendations in the report were agreed unanimously without a vote.

### **AGREED**

- (1) To approve the Commission final report and recommendations for future action.
- (2) The Commission report be sent to the National Riots Communities and Victims Panel to inform their final report and recommendations.

**99**

### **NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY LEVY CHARGE & HOUSEHOLD WASTE & RECYCLING CENTRE TRANSFER**

Councillor Stafford (as Cabinet Member for Finance and Property) moved and Councillor Sitkin seconded the report of the Director of Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.162) setting out the background to the North London Waste Authority (NLWA), the current statutory default levy arrangements and the proposed changes to pending repeal of the Refuse Disposal (Amenity Act) 1978.

NOTED

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

1. The recommendations set out in the report had been endorsed by Cabinet on 14 December 2011.
2. The concerns raised by the Opposition Group at what were felt to be the insufficient level of safeguards currently in place relating to the proposed transfer of the Household Waste & Recycling Centre at Barrowell Green.
3. The final decision on transfer of the Household Waste & Recycling Centre was still to be made, pending further information regarding the proposed service provision and cost apportionment. The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance & Property highlighted the assurances that would need to be obtained from North London Waste Authority (NLWA) prior to any transfer being agreed, as detailed in section 3.20 of the report, which it was felt did provide a sufficient level of comfort.
4. The proposals to amend the levy, as detailed within section 3 of the report, would lead to a more proportional apportionment of costs.

In view of the concerns raised during the debate relating to the safeguards currently in place for the proposed transfer of the Household Waste and Recycling Centre, Councillor Neville moved and Councillor Lavender seconded a motion that the report be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration. The motion for reference back was put to the vote with the following result:

For: 22  
Against: 29  
Abstentions: 0

The motion for reference back was not approved and Council then moved on to consider the substantive recommendations, as set out in the report:

### **AGREED**

- (1) To approve the following resolution set out below, in order to vary the NLWA levy in respect of Household Waste and Recycling Centres only from the 2012/13 financial year.

“The London Borough of Enfield agrees that the revisions to the Joint Waste Disposal Authorities (Levies) (England) Regulations 2006 as set out at Appendix 1 should apply to the apportionment of the North London Waste Authority levy with effect from 1st April 2012 until such time as a further resolution is agreed unanimously by this Council and the six other constituent councils of the North London Waste Authority and such further resolution becomes effective, or further statutory provisions take effect and supersede the Appendix.”

- (2) To transfer a leasehold interest in the Household Waste and Recycling Centre at Barrowell Green to the NLWA on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 following the

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

repeal of the Refuse Disposal (Amenity) Act 1978 from April 2012. This would be subject to securing assurances from the NLWA as set out in paragraph 3.20 of the report delegated to the Director Environment and Cabinet Member for Environment and (as amended by Cabinet on 14 December 2011) the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services and Cabinet Member for Finance & Property.

The above recommendations were put to the vote and approved with the following result:

For: 31  
Against: 23  
Abstentions: 0

### **100 CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL POLICY**

Councillor Taylor (as Leader of the Council) moved and Councillor Levy seconded the report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.160A) seeking approval for the Concessionary Travel Policy.

NOTED

1. The recommendations set out in the report had been endorsed by Cabinet on 14 December 2011.
2. The policy brought together existing policies and procedures, into a consistent and clear framework, in line with current legislation and guidance.

**AGREED** to approve the Concessionary Travel Policy, and to implement it with immediate effect.

Councillors Cicek, Georgiou & Lemonides all declared personal and prejudicial interests in respect of this item as they had close relatives who held a disabled persons Freedom Pass (Min.96 above refers). They left the meeting for consideration of the above item and took no part in the decision.

### **101 CORPORATE PROCUREMENT STRATEGY & SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT POLICY 2011-2015**

Councillor Stafford (as Cabinet Member for Finance & Property) moved and Councillor Goddard (as Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) seconded the report from the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.179A) seeking approval to the adoption of a new Corporate Procurement Strategy.

NOTED

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

3. The recommendations set out in the report had been endorsed by Cabinet on 14 December 2011.
4. The Strategy had been designed to provide a clear policy direction on effective and sustainable procurement across the Council and enable the Authority to be in a good position to influence partners and the supply chain when procuring goods, services and works. The Strategy was felt to represent best practice and showed the Council leading by example in promoting good social, economic and environmentally sustainable procurement.
5. In response to concerns highlighted by the Opposition Group an assurance was provided that work would continue to engage with small and medium local businesses and the Third Sector with implementation of the policy in order to enable them to compete effectively.

**AGREED** the Corporate Procurement Strategy and Sustainable Procurement Policy 2011-2015.

### 102

#### **DELEGATED AUTHORITY WITHIN THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT AND ADOPTION OF SECTION 16 LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND TRANSPORT FOR LONDON ACT 2003**

The report was withdrawn at the meeting.

### 103

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

1. **Urgent Questions** (Part 4 - Paragraph 9.2.(b) of Constitution – Page 4-9)

None received.

#### **2. Questions by Councillors**

NOTED

1. The thirty five questions, on the Council's agenda, which received a written reply by the relevant Cabinet Member.
2. In relation to Question 1:
  - a. The amended answer that had been circulated to all members in advance of the meeting. John Austin (Assistant Director Corporate Governance) advised members that the response was in the name of Councillor Savva and not Councillor Simon. The amended response is set out below:

#### **Councillor Savva's Response**

## COUNCIL - 25.1.2012

“Thank you to Cllr Lavender for pointing out an administrative error. While the details were indeed omitted, I can assure him that the items he refers to were heavily scrutinised. If he cared to ask any of his members or any member sitting on the Older People & Vulnerable Adults or Health & Well Being Scrutiny Panels he would have been informed that they did address all the issues he refers to. I would like to thank all the members from both sides who sit on these Panels and all officers and co-optees for their hard work and input.

The background to this report is that all Local Social Services Authorities were notified of the funding to be transferred by the Dept of Health through the NHS to Councils, for spend on social care activities that also benefit Health. This formed part of the 2010 government spending review commitments. The confirmed allocation is for 2011/12 & 2012/13, but with no guarantee that it will continue. The money has been treated as non recurrent and the department has sought to spread benefits from it into future years rather than restrict it to two.

Enfield is expected to agree areas of spend with the Local NHS. The Health Cabinet Sub-Committee agreed the broad areas of expenditure in April 2011. In addition areas of funding have in their own right already been the subject of decision at Cabinet and in the case of the Stroke Strategy at full Council. This report deals the allocation of the funding transfer as a whole. This decision has been on the forward plan for some time.

Both the Older People & Vulnerable Adults and the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panels want to see improved outcomes for our residents. The development of new services and improved pathways of care which reflect best practice have been outlined in the joint commissioning priorities across health and social care. These have been considered and welcomed by Scrutiny Panel members.

Draft strategies (and their implementation where applicable) covering many areas of the spending plan within the Key Decision have been scrutinised by the Panels and their working groups. These include primary care development; end of life care; re-ablement and intermediate care; stroke services; dementia services; personalisation of care (including brokerage, community equipment and adaptations); safeguarding; and telecare/assistive technology.”

3. Councillor Lavender reported that he had received an apology from Councillor Simon and officers, in response to a complaint made about the original response circulated with the agenda. He had been grateful for the apology, which had been accepted and as a result would not be pursuing his complaint any further.
4. The following supplementary questions received for the remainder of the questions indicated below:

**Question 1 (scrutiny of decision on social care joint commissioning expenditure) from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Savva, Chair of the Older People & Vulnerable Adults Scrutiny Panel.**

I remained concerned to ensure that the decision on this expenditure has followed proper corporate governance procedures and been subject to the necessary level of scrutiny by the relevant scrutiny panel. In view of this can I ask Councillor Savva to confirm whether he has read the decision and if so is he comfortable with the lack of information? If not, why has the decision not been called-in for review?"

**Reply from Councillor Savva:**

"Whilst Councillor Simon has apologised I do not intend to do so as Councillor Lavender has not attended any of my Panel meetings. This issue has been reviewed by my Panel and I would like to thank all members of my scrutiny panel for their sterling work. If he is in any doubt about the quality of scrutiny undertaken he is welcome to attend any of my Panels."

**Question 2 (Changes to Council Tax Benefit Subsidy) from Councillor Ibrahim to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

In view of the disappointing response to the consultation, can the Leader comment further on what he feels the impact in Enfield will be?

**Reply from Councillor Taylor**

"As I said in the written response, I am disappointed with the response to the consultation and have requested again that new grant is based on the relevant data. There is a need to be clear that this proposal will result in a decrease in the standard of living for our residents and I am disappointed that the minister was not prepared to reconsider the proposed reduction to ensure that the distribution of grant was fair"

**Question 3 (Resources available to the Internal Audit Department) from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Lemonides, Chairman of the Audit Committee**

Does Councillor Lemonides support the reduction in capacity of the Internal Audit Department?

**Reply from Councillor Lemonides**

"I believe in doing the right thing."

**Question 6 (Council Tax) from Councillor Levy to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

Can the Leader of the Council comment on Central Government pronouncements that Councils have a moral duty to freeze Council Tax, whilst at the same time they are doing nothing to fix the damping mechanism?

**Reply from Councillor Taylor**

“I welcome the opportunity to confirm that the Council will be proposing a 0% increase in the Council Tax, although some authorities have taken the decision not to do so. We are disappointed that the grant being offered by Central Government to offset this is only for one year. This will create difficulties in terms of longer term financial planning and may store up problems for future years, but the approach taken will be for each authority to decide.”

**Question 7 (20 Mile per hour zones) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

Given the scale and extent of the 20mph zone programme can Councillor Bond provide details of the full estimated costs for each scheme and explain why these costs can not be included as part of the public consultation process on individual schemes so the public are aware of the costs?

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 9 (Alternatives to 20mph zones as a means of achieving speed reduction) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

Can Councillor Bond explain why no reference is made to the introduction of variable speed limits as one of the alternative measures in his response, as this would be one of the less costly measures?

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 11 (20mph speed zone consultation analysis) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet member for Environment.**

In response to my question, could Councillor Bond provide a detailed breakdown of the research undertaken on each scheme, including details on recorded speed surveys in areas around each school and in the surrounding roads where each scheme is to be implemented?

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence, a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 15 (Introduction of Sunday Parking Charges) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

As I don't feel any of these points have been properly addressed could I ask Councillor Bond to provide a full and detailed answer to the questions originally asked?

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence, a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 17 (Sunday Parking Charges – Westminster City Council's parking judicial review) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

Have Councillors Bond, Taylor and Stafford taken note of what has happened in Westminster with regard to parking?

**Reply from Councillor Taylor (in place of Councillor Bond):**

"Yes we have noted what occurred in Westminster, but this is Enfield, not Westminster."

**Question 19 Sunday Car Parking Charges and Enfield Town Economic Wellbeing from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

I don't feel the written response provided has answered my original question so will ask again if Councillor Bond could explain how he feels that the implementation of parking charges on Sunday can be reconciled with the Council's duty to promote economic well being?

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence, a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 21 (Statutory Guidance on Parking Charges) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet member for Finance and Property (in place of Councillor Bond).**

Is the administration aware of statutory rather than operational guidance that parking charges should not be used to raise revenue, and how does Councillor Stafford reconcile this with his recent statement at a public meeting?

**Reply from Councillor Stafford**

"I was misquoted"

**Question 25 (Increase in off street parking charges) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.**

I don't feel this response has answered my original question so will ask again if Councillor Bond could provide the details requested in relation to the Palace Gardens Centre

Council was informed that as Councillor Bond had submitted his apologies for absence, a written response would need to be provided to the supplementary question.

**Question 27 (Bourne Car Park Sale) from Councillor Rye to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council.**

What consultation will be undertaken in future when disposals of these types of assets, i.e. with high usage by the public, are being considered? This should not just be left to the Cabinet report.

**Reply by Councillor Taylor:**

"I will be having discussions with Councillor Stafford as to the most appropriate way of consulting in future around asset disposals."

**Question 30 (Starks Field Primary School) from Councillor Laban to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People.**

Please elaborate on what has been done since the start of January 2012 to improve results at Starks Field Primary School.

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

"I feel that the response I have already provided is appropriate, and feel we should now await confirmation of the final results. I would be happy to respond to any further queries in writing once the final results are available"

**Question 32 (Additional Provision at Bowes Primary School) from Councillor Laban to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member of Children and Young People.**

Whilst I welcome the response can Councillor Orhan comment again on why Bowes Primary School is managing extra provision when there are twenty five other schools which have achieved better results in the borough?

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

"I believe my response has made it clear why. Bowes Primary School has served the Borough well. The Headteacher has been accredited by the National College of Schools Leadership as a National Leader in Education. The current Government considers it a flagship teaching school, and it has an outstanding record in providing high quality effective support for schools in

challenging circumstances. Bowes is part of the Enfield family of schools and is an asset to the borough.”

**Question 34 (Bids to Mayor of London’s fund) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration.**

The written response does not appear to have answered my original question. Could Councillor Goddard please confirm what bids have been made to the Mayor’s fund in respect of the disturbances in Enfield Town?

**Reply from Councillor Goddard**

“We were advised by the GLA to ensure that any schemes submitted to Mayor’s Regeneration Fund needed to be fully ready in terms of acquisition costs (in the case of arson) specification costing and design. Further guidance was issued and it became obvious that Croydon and Haringey would receive the majority of funding available. Although the GLA indicated support for our borough wide proposals, it was clear that only schemes that had a track record of development progress and prior consultation with the GLA Family, alongside an established timetable for delivery, would be considered.

We were encouraged to submit longer term schemes that were not yet worked up (such as Enfield Town) to other forthcoming funding rounds. As a result it was clear that a viable scheme could not be submitted under the riot arrangements. We are working with the Enfield Town Business Association, EBRA and other key stakeholders to progress the development of economic development schemes. We are now in active discussions with developers and landowners and we will be developing the Area Action Plan for Enfield Town this year as a framework for development that will protect and preserve the vibrancy of Enfield Town.”

**104  
MOTIONS**

In view of the limited time available for the remainder of the meeting it was agreed unanimously by Council that the three motions listed on the agenda as items 14.1, 14.2 & 14.3 be withdrawn.

**105  
MEMBERSHIPS**

**AGREED**

- (1) the following changes to committee memberships
  - a. **Crime, Safety and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Panel** – Councillor Maynard to replace Councillor East
  - b. **Green Belt Forum** – Councillor Bond to fill the vacancy.

**106  
NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

None received.

**107  
CALLED IN DECISIONS**

None received.

**108  
DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED that in accordance with the decision made by Council in November 2011, the next meeting of the Council would be held on 29 February 2012 at 7.00pm at the Civic Centre.