

COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS: 27 March 2013

Question 1 from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Goddard cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration

Enfield Council will be awarded in the region of £2.2 million from the New Homes Bonus as a consequence of the development at Cat Hill.

(The New Homes Bonus is a grant paid by central government to local councils for increasing the number of homes and their use. The New Homes Bonus is paid each year for 6 years. It's based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new-build homes, conversions and long-term empty homes brought back into use. There is also an extra payment for providing [affordable homes](#).)

Given:

- (i) the planning report in relation to Cat Hill acknowledged that because of viability issues, it was recommended to levy a s.106 requirement of only £1m to help provide health and educational facilities, when according to planning policies, the development justified a £2.8m contribution, and
- (ii) the Oakwood area is one of the most deprived in the west of the Borough;

Will Councillor Goddard provide an assurance that the New Homes Bonus monies will be set aside to provide such services in the Oakwood area, which ought properly to have been paid for by the developer?

Reply from Councillor Goddard

My response to your question and to the others raised on this topic cover the same points that I made to you at the meeting. I trust that you will now have a full understanding of how regeneration is undertaken and the place of s.106, New Homes Bonus and the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in that process.

The key point that has been discussed with Members, officers, Planning Committee and MPs is that the Council has to have due regard to the financial viability of any scheme. This point has been explained to developers who sought that assurance, and their agents at various meetings including one convened with officers and myself by David Burrowes MP. The Government's National Policy Planning Policy Statement (2012) is clear that plan led development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. The Council carries out its own independent assessment of the viability of a scheme to confirm what level of obligation would be appropriate.

To address the specific matters in the sequence of the development.

The original application started under the old formula for calculating s106.

This had lower calculations that were enhanced when the SPD formula came into effect in 2011. This explains the change in the situation.

The process of assessing financial viability explains how the amounts were arrived at.

s.106 negotiations concerning the Cat Hill application were informed by the Council s.106 Supplementary Planning Document adopted in 2011. This sets out the circumstances in which an S106 agreement is likely to be required and details of the type and level of contribution necessary. The Council aims to facilitate development to deliver sustainable growth in the borough, including necessary infrastructure such as education and health. Where applicants for planning permission consider that a particular S106 requirement cannot be met, a viability assessment will be required to demonstrate what level of contribution is viable.

In terms of the most recent planning application, a financial viability assessment was undertaken to establish the level of contribution that the development of the mix and numbers proposed could support. This was assessed by the Council's independent consultant to confirm that the scheme could support contribution of £1.7 m. From this, the Mayor's CiL will amount to £500,000 leaving £1.2 m for everything else. We therefore approached the division of the financial contribution as above and set it out in the report for member consideration. If we did not have to meet the Mayor's CiL, then we would have had more money available.

New Homes Bonus (NHB) is a grant paid by Central Government to local councils for increasing the number of homes and their use. It must be remembered that NHB is calculated on new net additions to the borough's overall housing stock. The Cat Hill development therefore has the potential to raise £2.2m in NHB but this will be subject to the criteria for assessing the overall level of housing growth in the borough.

NHB is met by a reduction in Formula Grant from the Government and is therefore not new funding. It is not ring-fenced to particular areas of the borough but instead contributes to delivering the Council's corporate objectives and meeting need in those areas of greatest need, as determined by Members. NHB is not a S106 mechanism but there in relation to meeting the need for new houses, thus while Oakwood may have relative needs in the west of the Borough, Education and health needs have been assessed as part of the process and were reported to Planning Committee and are set out in answers to other questions.

Question 2 from Councillor Levy to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property

Can you confirm that there are currently no proposals to sell off Council owned golf courses.

Reply from Councillor Stafford

The Council always seeks to get the best possible value for money from all its resources, including property and are constantly reviewing options. However, there are no plans to dispose of golf courses at the present time. Unlike the Opposition party who suggested at the last Council meeting that some golf courses were superfluous to requirements and should be sold off.

Question 3 from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Stafford Cabinet Member for Finance and Property

At the last council meeting you set a budget. Within weeks of that budget the Planning Committee granted planning permission for 231 homes at Cat Hill and agreed to waive a £1.8m s.106 levy, which ought to have financed consequential education and health needs, this sum is equivalent to nearly 2% on council tax. The reason for this waiver was to preserve the viability of the scheme.

Will Councillor Stafford confirm:

- (i) whether the New Homes Bonus and/or the s.106 shortfall were forecast in the budget,
- (ii) if not, how this shortfall of £1.8m is to be met, and
- (iii) whether there was any communication between the planning officers and the Finance and any other Departments and/or any Cabinet Member about the proposal not to levy the full £2.8m before the planners made that recommendation.

Does he support the fact that as a consequence of this almost the entirety of the £2.2 m New Homes Bonus has effectively gone into the back pocket of a developer, which paid too much for the site in the first place?

What steps is Councillor Stafford putting in place to prevent Councillor Goddard promoting the development (at the Council's expense) of other non-viable sites (such as Middlesex University site at Ponders End) the consequence of which would be to throw his budget and his so-called medium term plan into even further chaos?

Reply from Councillor Stafford

- (i) Section 106 monies are one-off contributions generally used to support capital investment or one off revenue expenditure in infrastructure. These contributions are not used to support existing on-going revenue service costs and therefore not included in the budget setting process.

The 2013/14 budget includes assumptions for the New Homes Bonus in 2013/14. In future years, there are no NHB assumptions as it would be imprudent to assume growth that far into the future.

It should also be noted that NHB is a grant financed by a reduction in Formula

Grant and is therefore not additional funding. This was explained on pages 26 & 27 of the Council budget report.

- (ii) There is no budget shortfall.
- (iii) The Planning Committee report discussed on the 4th March 2013 included the proposed s.106 contributions. The decision regarding this contribution is made by those members who sit on the Planning Committee.

Question 4 from Councillor Ibrahim to Councillor Hamilton, Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing & Public Health

Will the Cabinet Member report on a request from the Mayors Office for Policing & Crime (MOPAC) for funding for rape crisis work?

Reply from Councillor Hamilton

There are currently four Rape Crisis Centres in London.

North London RCC (NLRCC) (Solace Women's Aid) has a central coordination hub based in Islington and is one of the specialist Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) services delivered by Solace Women's Aid. Rape Crisis services are delivered in spoke locations across all north London boroughs. They offer counselling, advocacy and holistic therapies to women over 14 years of age.

Regional statistics show a 53% rise in recorded rape in London over the last four years, VAWG costs London over £5.6 billion per year and police remain unaware of 87% of serious sexual assault victims. The impact of sexual violence is profound, not only on the individual, but communities and the public purse. Addressing problems early should help prevent these long-term costs.

Enfield currently contributes just over £15,000 per annum to the NLRCC.

The requested contribution for the North Sector Boroughs has been increased from just over £15,000 to £20,000 from 13/14.

Contact was made with MOPAC to gain some assurances about the contribution from them. While we felt locally that this is an important area to support even at a higher level, it is important that as we continue to invest that MOPAC are not disinvesting.

We have had experience of this over recent years with the reduction of the Community Safety Fund by 59%, despite Enfield locally continuing to work hard to improve community safety. The success of this is borne out in the results of the recent residents' survey.

Although the Mayor of London's Contribution seems unlikely to increase, we have received assurances that it will not be reduced. (Currently £155,000 pa).

If we increase our contribution it will help to reduce the chance of delays for women wanting to access the service.

As soon as we can confirm that other boroughs involved in the NLRCC will also increase their contribution, we will write to MOPAC to confirm our increased contribution. We want to be sure that Enfield funding is not being used to cover the increased payments for other boroughs in the sub-region.

Question 5 from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

Given Councillor Orhan's view that the Council is not provided with sufficient funds to discharge its education responsibilities, will she confirm what representations either she or anyone from her department made in relation to the recommendation of the planning department to waive £582k of s.106 monies which ought properly to have been sought from the developers of Cat Hill to meet related educational needs? If representations were made, can I be provided with a copy and if not, then:

- (i) why were no representations made; and
- (ii) given the foregoing of this money does she not believe that her claims of insufficient funding now ring rather hollow?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

As part of the assessment of the Cat Hill scheme, Development Management officers consulted Education and Health colleagues to ascertain the position and pressure on existing infrastructure to enable an assessment to be made of the infrastructure necessary to support the development. Standardised formula for education and health contributions set out the s106 Supplementary Planning Document indicated that the education contribution should be £1.182m and health should be £1.682m [over five years]. There were also contributions identified for off site highway works.

These potential contributions have to be assessed in the context of the viability of the scheme; how much contribution can the development support to enable it to be both viable and to proceed. There is a clear presumption in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and the Mayor's London Plan towards supporting sustainable development especially where it meets housing need. It would not be appropriate therefore to refuse development solely on the basis that the scheme did not meet the requested level of contributions unless it could be clearly identified that the development would cause harm to infrastructure in the vicinity.

Question 6 from Councillor Cranfield to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

The Labour manifesto pledged to create a youth achievement foundation in Enfield.

Has that been done?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

I am delighted to say that our model of the foundation, specifically adapted to Enfield circumstances, is in its first year of operation. RAISE – Youth Achievement in Enfield - selects young people with behavioural or other problems and teaches them in small groups in a specially designed, newly opened facility in Edmonton. The curriculum combines conventional academic subjects with outdoor challenges and work experience, with the aim of reintegrating the young people into society as confident and responsible citizens. Youth Achievement in Enfield has already proven to be extremely successful in turning around the lives of young people and giving them skills, purpose and self-esteem.

Question 7 from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Hamilton, Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing & Public Health

Given Councillor Hamilton's view that neither the Council nor the NHS is provided with sufficient funds to discharge their public health responsibilities, will she confirm what representations either she or anyone from her department made in relation to the recommendation of the planning department to waive £1.28m of section 106 monies which ought properly to have been sought from the developers of Cat Hill to meet related health needs? If representations were made, can I be provided with a copy and if not, then:

- (i) why were no representations made; and
- (ii) given the foregoing of this money does she not believe that her claims of insufficient funding now ring rather hollow?

Reply from Councillor Hamilton

As part of the assessment of the Cat Hill scheme, Development Management officers consulted Education and Health colleagues to ascertain the position and pressure on existing infrastructure to enable an assessment to be made of the infrastructure necessary to support the development. Standardised formula for education and health contributions set out the s.106 Supplementary Planning Document indicated that the education contribution should be £1.182m and health should be £1.682m [over five years]. There were also contributions identified for off site highway works.

These potential contributions have to be assessed in the context of the viability of the scheme; how much contribution can the development support to enable it to be both viable and to proceed. There is a clear presumption in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and the Mayor's London Plan towards supporting sustainable development especially where it meets housing need. It would not be appropriate therefore to refuse development solely on the basis that the scheme did not meet the requested level of contributions unless it could be clearly identified that

the development would cause harm to infrastructure in the vicinity.

Question 8 from Councillor Constantinides to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property

The Conservative Administration in 2003 increased the Council Tax by 15%. Is this the largest single increase ever in Enfield and was it part of the Conservative manifesto commitment in the 2002 election?

Reply from Councillor Stafford

The Conservative Administration in 2003 increased the Council Tax by 15%. Is this the largest single increase ever in Enfield?

YES

Was it part of the Conservative manifesto commitment in the 2002 election? **NO**

Question 9 from Councillor Lavender to Councillor Constantinides, Chairman of the Planning Committee

At the Planning Committee Meeting that determined the Cat Hill Planning application, one member of the Labour Group was sat conspicuously on the stage away from and in full view of other Labour members. During the vote she appeared to gesticulate to certain Labour members to vote for the application. Would Councillor Constantinides please seek and provide to me a written account from the officers of what happened and ask for the guidance to be republished about the impropriety of group whipping and probity issues when determining planning applications.

Reply from Councillor Constantinides

Councillor Cranfield fulfilled the role of Vice Chair at this meeting in Councillor Simon's absence, it is incorrect to suggest she was sat away from other Labour Members so as to attract attention.

It is also incorrect to say that there were any signals to Members on how they should vote at the decision stage. Had there been any evidence of such this would have been addressed at the committee meeting by the legal adviser, senior officers and/or Chair.

The Chair asks Members to make their vote clear by raising their hand so the public can see and the vote can be recorded. This procedure is contained in Part 5 of the Constitution (page 5-34). The vote is recorded by the Committee Secretary and an indication is made to the Chair by officers.

All members of the Planning Committee are trained on the Code of Conduct for Planning Committee. Where appropriate refresher training is provided.

Question 10 from Councillor Levy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

What is the Council doing to help our residents in Enfield deal with their rising energy bills?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Sustainability Service is helping deliver 'The Big London Energy Switch' as a pilot along with 19 other London Boroughs, in an effort to reduce bills for vulnerable residents and people living in deprived areas. The Big London Energy Switch is a collective energy switching project, with a particular focus on deprived communities. It covers around 1.8 million households in London, of which it is estimated that 360,000 are in fuel poverty.

Collective switching enables residents to tender their energy bills to the energy companies, using bulk buying to collectively negotiate lower electricity and gas prices on their behalf.

- The more residents who register to switch the greater the likely interest from the energy companies, which in turn is likely to drive greater individual financial savings;
- There is no obligation on residents to take up the offer to switch energy provider;
- The local authority brand is generally trusted by consumers, so helps encourage residents to register to switch;
- Residents can 'register an interest' in the Collective Energy Switching initiative by going to www.biglondonenergyswitch.org.uk and leaving their name and contact details;
- When the auction is ready to go live, residents will be contacted and at that point residents will need the details of their energy supplier and their recent bills.

Led by London Councils, with input from Enfield's Sustainability Service, £686k was successfully leveraged from central government in December 2012. This grant funding is now being used to deliver the Big London Energy Switch by March 2013. It is estimated that as a result of collective energy switching, residents will save between £150 and £200 at a time when energy bills keep on rising. This will help tackle fuel poverty, improve the health of residents and go some way towards ending the circumstances where families have to choose between heating their houses in winter or buying food.

Some of the other boroughs involved in the scheme include Bexley, Brent, Camden, Croydon, Ealing, Enfield, Greenwich, Hackney, Haringey, Islington, Kingston, Lambeth, Merton, Newham, Richmond, Southwark, Sutton and Waltham Forest.

Question 11 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

Please would the Cabinet Member for Environment update the chamber on the situation at the former Brimsdown Petrol Station, Brimsdown Avenue and what action is being taken and when it will be concluded.

Reply from Councillor Bond

As you will be aware, the former Brimsdown Petrol Station in Brimsdown Avenue is privately owned and has been occupied by squatters. The landowners obtained court orders to evict the squatters and to clear the site. The Bailiffs attended the site on 7 March 2013 to evict the squatters and secure the site. The Council's Envirocrime and Planning Enforcement Officers attended to support the landowners if required in clearing the site of untaxed vehicles and to secure the site if needed. The Bailiffs agreed to permit the squatters more time to vacate and clean up the site themselves.

The site has been monitored by Council's Envirocrime and Planning Enforcement Officers, and many squatters have vacated and the visual appearance of the site so far is vastly improved.

Question 12 from Councillor Deacon to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

What is Councillor Bond doing to reduce the Council's energy use and therefore the burden on our taxpayers?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Council is leading by example to reduce its own energy use, investing now to save energy in Enfield's public buildings and schools. As a key project in the Enfield 2020 Action Plan, the initial phase of Enfield Council's RE:FIT (RE:FIT is a £3.1m 'Invest to Save' project to increase the energy performance of 6 corporate properties and 19 large schools) project is proposed to encompass 3 corporate buildings (including the Civic Centre), 7 primary schools and 7 secondary schools.

Phase 1 of RE:FIT is on track to start energy saving technology installation in June 2013. This £1.7 million capital investment is guaranteed to save at least 20% of energy consumption per annum for the technologies installed, with a pay back of just 5.8 years.

Question 13 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

Given the extensive works on highways that are being carried out by utility companies' contractors throughout the Borough will the Cabinet Member for Environment confirm what measures are being undertaken by the Council to ensure that the highways and any adjacent land affected by the works are properly reinstated. In particular Chase Green and St Michaels Green have been used by utility companies' contractors to store equipment and the junction of Carterhatch

Lane and Myddleton Avenue resembles a freshly turned allotment.

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Council has a dedicated team which is responsible for ensuring utility companies comply with their obligations and responsibilities under the New Roads and Street Works Act. In Enfield, I am pleased to advise we have one of the most proactive street works teams in London who have a track record of ensuring utility companies comply, evidenced by court action taken only recently for poor reinstatements. Works in Carterhatch Lane has involved works by National Grid Gas, on whom Fixed Penalty Charges have been issued for breach of permit conditions. In addition works have been undertaken for the Council's own footway renewal scheme, which did involve works to the verges as kerbs were realigned. Any consequential damage will be repaired. With regard to the green areas on Chase Side, National Grid have been issued a Fixed Penalty Notice and have agreed to reinstate the area.

Question 14 from Councillor Brett to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Given the concern expressed by residents about Betting Shops and their alleged increase in the Borough what action has been taken by the Labour administration?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The number of Betting Shops licensed has decreased slightly. In 2007, there were 78 licensed betting shops in the Borough, currently there are 75. The Gambling Act 2005 prohibits the Council from adopting any licensing policy to address the cumulative impact of betting shops clustering together.

Consequently, the Council's Development Management Document, which would include the detailed planning policies for the future, is being drafted and does propose a policy restricting a proliferation of betting shops in town centres. In addition, the Council is considering seeking a legislative means which would ensure that planning permission would automatically be required for new betting shops.

Question 15 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

Enfield Council has been awarded a government grant of £2.46 million to maintain residual weekly collections and provide an organic waste collection service to support its weekly bin collections. Please could the Cabinet Member for Environment confirm exactly how this service is to be extended to those residents who are not currently provided with facilities to recycle their waste?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Weekly Collection Support Scheme fund has recently been made available by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). London Borough of Enfield put in a bid to support & develop waste services to residents to the value of £2.4m.

The remit of the project is to extend the following services to householders in the borough:

- extend the estates food waste collection scheme to all properties;
- to offer an opt in garden and food waste collection for kerbside properties previously not provided with a green waste service during the main roll out due to a lack of space;

This will still be subject to the householder being able to store the bins and place them out safely for collection. This would currently exclude the A10 and red routes.

Question 16 from Councillor Murphy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Following on from the Environment Agencies Salmons Brook Flood Alleviation proposals what is the Council doing to reduce the risk of flooding to residents?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Council when determining all applications consider flood risk alleviation with every proposal and if justified requires sustainable urban drainage systems to be incorporated on new developments. The Council also follows Environment Agency guidance in opposing new residential developments on floodplains within the borough.

Enfield Council has undertaken various pieces of work to reduce the risk of flooding to residents in the borough. In addition to working with the Environment Agency to check that their design proposals for Salmons Brook properly safeguard residents, I have recently written to Richard Benyon, Parliamentary Under Secretary for Natural Environment, Water and Rural Affairs, expressing my concern over the government's delay in implementing Approval Bodies for Sustainable Drainage Systems. I am committed to improving the environment and protecting our residents from flooding and see the widespread implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems as a key measure in achieving these aims. However, the current uncertainty regarding this issue is hampering our ability to take effective action to realise this.

Nevertheless, officers are very proactive in the DrainLondon working group which enables us to work collaboratively with other boroughs in the Lea Catchment area to progress aspects of the Flood and Water Management Act and the development of our Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. In 2012 we produced our Surface Water Management Plan which we have published on Enfield's website and have used some of our funding from DEFRA to undertake studies and modelling of critical drainage areas. We have recently received funding from DEFRA to further explore

(through modelling) a number of high priority Critical Drainage Areas in Enfield, this work will be carried out in 2013/14.

Practical examples that we have taken forward have included the installation of automated flood monitoring gauges at high risk flooding locations and we have nearly finished installing CCTV cameras at two locations, namely Montagu Road and Lacy Close to enable remote monitoring. We have worked with our contractors to clear out and re-form a number of highway ditches such as along the Ridgeway and at East Lodge Lane where localised flooding was occurring. We work closely with Thames Water in order to resolve localised flooding incidents involving road gullies and their discharge into Thames Waters sewers. We will continue to invest in flood alleviation work across the borough.

Question 17 from Councillor Waterhouse to Councillor Orhan Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

At January Council, I asked Councillor Orhan (Question 40) which schools she had visited in Chase Ward, and when. Despite a three paragraph reply, Councillor Orhan did not state which schools in the ward she visited, only that she had visited a total of three schools in the ward. I would therefore like to ask again - which schools has she visited in Chase Ward, and when?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

In January I advised that I had made 56 school/educational site visits from Feb 2011 which is when I began recording them. I do not choose which schools to visit according to the Ward they are in; although I can confirm I have visited three schools in Chase Ward – detailed below:

Worcesters	September 2011
St. Ignatius	March 2012
Enfield County	March 2012

Question 18 from Councillor Lemonides to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Could Councillor Bond please update members on progress to date with the trimming and dimming of the Boroughs street lights?

Reply from Councillor Bond

Enfield Council is implementing a scheme that will reduce the energy consumption of its street lighting by over 40%, in order to help meet the dual challenge of recent cutbacks in Central Government funding and also increasing concern over energy usage and its environmental effects. This involves our Streetlighting Service provider, ETDE, installing a special piece of electronic equipment on each lighting unit and also installing a central software system which will then communicate with each unit using existing mobile phone networks, thereby allowing the lighting levels

throughout the borough to be adjusted remotely and removing the need for costly and inefficient officer scouting.

By the end of March 2013, over 35% of the borough will have been converted to this system, and we are on track to complete the whole installation across the borough by March 2014. The energy savings achieved each month will increase as the programme is implemented.

A key benefit of this scheme is that, although lighting levels will be reduced in order to meet energy saving targets, the flexibility exists to adjust them should certain areas require increased lighting for a particular event.

Question 19 from Councillor Waterhouse to Councillor Orhan Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

Further to my question to Councillor Orhan at the January full council meeting, could Councillor Orhan confirm which schools in Chase Ward she has planned to visit this year?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

My plans may well include visiting Lavender, Capel Manor and Chase Side Primary schools this year.

Question 20 from Councillor Cazimoglu to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Can Councillor Bond tell the Council of any cross Borough working that Environment Group is involved in?

Reply from Councillor Bond

- Parking procured our cashless parking system with Redbridge Council
- Officers are very active in cross-borough working groups such as LoTAG (London Technical Advisors Group) and associated sub-groups for Highway Maintenance, Winter Maintenance, Bridges, Streetlighting, Drainage, Asset Management and London Councils Highway Licensing Forum.
- We work with neighbouring boroughs in our Network Management role in coordinating activities on the highway, particularly regarding works on routes affecting adjacent authorities. We are active in the cross-borough Operational Committee for the London Permit Scheme (LoPS) and also the associated task force groups.
- We have taken an active role as a Board Member for the 'Transforming London's Highways' initiative, an outcome of which is the procurement of the new London Highways Alliance Contracts, for which we will have an opportunity

to join if the rates are favourable. As part of this we seconded one of our Officers for a 12 month period to work with TfL on the contract preparation and evaluation.

- We collaborate with Barnet in our management of our Streetlighting PFI as a result of the joint procurement and both sharing the same contractor.
- Supporting the Association of London Environmental Health Managers - all 33 Borough are signed up to a consistent approach to cross borough work on a range on joint initiatives such as food safety, health and safety and pollution control.
- Traffic and Transport is engaged in a wide range of cross-borough working, at a number of different levels.

At the London-wide level, Enfield is actively involved with a number of groups, including:

- The London Technical Advisers Group (Group 1), which focuses on public transport, cycling, walking and road safety
- The Pan-London Road Safety Forum
- London Traffic Control Liaison Committee

At the sub-regional level we work with other north London boroughs (and TfL) on a wide range of transport issues, including policy formulation, development of public transport infrastructure proposals, cross- borough cycling initiatives etc. The sub-regional partnership (the North London Transport Forum) has "fuzzy" boundaries, comprising the core boroughs of Enfield, Barnet, Haringey and Waltham Forest, but also extends to include Camden, Hackney and Islington as necessary.

There are also a number of specific partnerships that we are involved with, including:

- The West Anglia Routes Group, which is an association representing public and private sector organisations along the rail routes running from Liverpool Street through north London into Cambridgeshire, Essex and Hertfordshire.
- The Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Transport Working Group, which is working with the NHS and other stakeholders to examine the transport impact of the proposed service changes at Barnet, Chase Farm and North Middlesex Hospitals.

Finally, there are several examples of joint working with other boroughs, including:

- A shared service agreement with Islington to manage our School Crossing Patrol Service
- Joint road safety activities with Haringey (including Safer Drive Stay Alive)
- Joint smarter travel initiative with Haringey

- Cross boundary traffic schemes, including the proposed Lorry Ban south of the A406

The Community Safety Unit work closely with Haringey to tackle gang activity. Members of the Gangs Action Groups attend meetings in the opposite borough to ensure that we are linking closely to reduce the risks along the border between the two.

We also take part in a Safe and Secure Scheme housing scheme in which gang members and their families may be transferred (with full agreement for all parties to another area). This involves very small numbers and gives advance warning so that risks may be mitigated.

Trading Standards Officers take a lead in the London Officers Trading Standards Association which enables best practice and collaborative work to take place and represents good value. An example of this working is a recent operation in Ealing to advise businesses and enforce on unsafe and counterfeit goods. Although this was targeted in another Borough, there is little doubt that the whole region would have been affected by the distribution of these dangerous goods.

A sum of money of around £100,000 was provided by the national Trading Standards Board to do this work as they realised the potential risks of leaving this unchecked. Because of this there was no cost implication to Enfield.

There are a number of professional associations and groups from which Enfield benefits from best practice although abstraction from Borough duties is restricted.

We have a joint Tobacco Control Alliance with Haringey Council and Public Health Team and involves other partners including the Voluntary Sector.

There is a joint strategy to enforce illegal importation and counterfeit goods, plus promote healthy lifestyles.

We have a tri-partite contract with Barnet and Redbridge which affords better value from economies of scale for abandoned and untaxed vehicles.

Enfield is currently part of the 7 borough and North London Waste Authority joint procurement for replacement waste facilities.

Enfield is also seeking to work with other boroughs to drive savings from any joint procurement opportunities and frameworks to deliver the DCLG funded waste and recycling project.

The Council is also currently exploring options of a Transport vehicle maintenance service with London Borough of Redbridge.

The Council's Sustainability Service is working closely with Haringey, Waltham Forest and GLA to develop the Lee Valley Heat Network as the strategic heat network for decentralised energy development in London. This significant

infrastructure project aims to:

- Facilitate inward investment and new jobs
- Provide affordable low carbon heat for businesses, industries, the public sector and local residents
- Tackle fuel poverty
- Reduce London's carbon footprint

Finally we are working with David Lammy MP on the proliferation of betting shops.

Question 21 from Councillor Rye to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

At an Overview and Scrutiny Call-In earlier in this Council year on Labour's policy for repairing and maintaining footpaths in the Borough, you gave an undertaking that there would be like for like replacement in maintaining footpaths unless there were exceptional circumstances. In Caterhatch Lane in my ward we have had a section of pavement from Ladysmith Road to Sinclair Close removed without any consultation with residents and Ward Councillors and replaced with black unsightly tarmac, that is completely out of keeping with the rest of the road, which is a prominent thoroughfare opposite Council Offices and part of the New River Loop Footpath.

Could he explain why there was no like for like replacement at this site and clarify if Labour's policy on footpath maintenance means tarmac instead of pavement throughout the borough?

Reply from Councillor Bond

That is not the undertaking I gave. Reactive repairs are undertaken on a like for like basis. For planned maintenance, if it is unlikely that further sections will be renewed then treatment will match existing finishes. In the case of Carterhatch Lane it is intended to continue to renew sections and therefore the policy has been applied correctly.

The current policy is that appropriate footway treatments will be used, based on the standard palette of materials, taking into account existing treatment locally, footway category and function, location and style of frontage buildings and susceptibility to vehicle abuse. Bituminous footways will generally be used in rural locations, residential streets and footways susceptible to vehicle overrun. Paving will generally be used in high profile locations and shopping parades

Question 22 from Councillor Levy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Can the Cabinet Member update Council on the investment into the Graffiti Clean Up Team?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The Graffiti Action team remove 99% of graffiti proactively before it is reported by the public. The team generally remove offensive or racist graffiti within 4 hours and other graffiti within 24 hours of being reported. To ensure their continued high performance, we have invested in three new jet washers as the existing equipment was old and requiring greater maintenance. Removal of graffiti helps the visual amenity of the borough and street scene, and helps residents feel that their neighbourhood is cleaner and safer which is reflected in the recent residents survey.

Question 23 from Councillor Rye to Councillor Hamilton Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing & Public Health

As part of the Mayors Office for Policing & Crime (MOPAC) review of policing in London does she welcome the commitment to:

- (i) Safer Neighbourhood Teams
- (ii) Each Borough having its own Borough Commander
- (iii) An increase in police numbers in Enfield from 524 (October 2011) to 609 (by 2015) with safer Neighbourhood Teams increasing from 61 officers (October 2011) to 144 (by 2015)
- (iv) As part of the consultation process a commitment by the Deputy Mayor Policing to look again at the number and access arrangements to Police Stations?

Reply from Councillor Hamilton

There is widespread support for the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) at the moment, despite the fact that they are understaffed. This Council has provided additional support for the police teams on the Borough with the ongoing investments in the Estates and Parks Policing Teams. These are over and above the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) establishment. It is unclear however as to whether the SNTs will become more like a second tier Response service when the proposed changes through the Local Policing Model are finally implemented. We hope that the MPS will allow sufficient flexibility from the "core" model to continue to support the strong partnerships that have proved invaluable in Enfield.

We are pleased that the borough is retaining the command of a Chief Superintendent and that Jane Johnson has been successful in her bid to remain in Borough.

Many boroughs have not retained a Borough Commander at this level or have now to share a Borough Commander with a neighbouring area. We have been engaged in many conversations about how the Local Police Model might impact upon Enfield and we are pleased that our concerns have been recognised.

The increase in police numbers is of course welcomed, although the low level of

resource assigned to Enfield has been the subject of many meetings between the administration and the MPS. Our concerns are that the changes are appropriately prioritised for this borough, given that we are facing ever increasing challenges and pressures on services. We hope that the increase will happen early in the time-span suggested and that we do not have to wait until 2015, when the need for the extra police has been highlighted for years.

Some have concerns about the consultation feeding into the decision making process, in respect of public access and the Police “estates” issues, given that there are some decisions (about the use of Southgate as an SNT base for example) which seemed to have been made before the consultation could have been properly reviewed.

We hope that MOPAC and the MPS Senior Command will ensure that the access levels are sufficient in the borough and listen to the points raised by Enfield Councillors and residents at the MOPAC and MPS road-show on the 14th Feb 2013.

Question 24 from Councillor Constantinides to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Can the Cabinet Member update Council on the position of Enfield in the performance league table for Energy Efficiency.

Reply from Councillor Bond

I am pleased to report on the following position of Enfield’s continued commitment to carbon reduction

- The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) Performance League Table (PLT) for 2012 submissions was published on 26 February 2013.
- Enfield Council’s position against all 2,087 participants, from both public and private sectors nationally, is 715th, an improvement of 17 places on last year.
- Between 2010/11 and 2011/12, the Council’s emissions fell from 31,763 tCO₂ to 29,533 tCO₂, a reduction of 2,230 tCO₂. Priced at £12 per tonne, the Council avoided paying £26,760 on carbon allowances alone in this period and also made financial savings through the associated costs for the lower energy consumed for this period.
- The Council is committed to reduce its carbon emissions through its invest to save programme (e.g. funded through the Salix Recycling Fund and RE:FIT).
- Following the CRC review in autumn 2012, it was announced that the CRC Performance League Table would be abolished in 2013. The entire CRC Scheme will be reviewed again in 2016.

Question from 25 Councillor Neville to Councillor Stafford Cabinet Member for Finance and Property

Would he confirm Enfield’s position in the light of the revelation by the Enterprise Minister, Michael Fallon that only 166 out of 432 local authorities have signed up to

the Prompt Payment Code. He will doubtless recognise the importance to small businesses of large creditors making speedy payment of invoices. Could he confirm Enfield has signed up to this policy?

Reply from Councillor Stafford

Enfield Council has made a commitment to small businesses that far exceeds the Prompt Payment Code. The considerable commitment of this Administration to helping small businesses in the Borough has been matched by real investment, better procurement policies and slicker procurement practices, so that we are as easy to do business with as possible, whilst meeting our legal requirements and delivering best value for money.

The Prompt Payment Code is a payment initiative developed by Government with the Institute of Credit Management (ICM) to tackle the crucial issue of late payment to help small businesses. When an organisation signs up to the Code, it is committing to:

- Pay suppliers on time and in line with the agreed terms
- Have clear processes in place for suppliers – making sure that they know what is required to ensure they can be paid on time
- Manage and resolve disputes as quickly as possible
- Encourage its customers and suppliers to sign up to the Code

Enfield delivered all this and more when it decided to amend its payments terms. We prioritise payments to small businesses and endeavour to pay invoices within 10 days. So far this year, 81% of our invoices have been paid within 10 days and 97% are paid within 30 days. This places Enfield among the best authorities for prompt payment where the London average is 90% paid within 30 days.

Question 26 from Councillor Levy to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Can the Cabinet Member advise the Council how many Green Gyms have been put in Parks in the last three years?

Reply from Councillor Bond

We currently have nine outdoor gyms in the borough's parks and open spaces. One of these (Elsinge Golden Jubilee Park) is on our land but was actually funded by colleagues in housing.

We have a further three which have recently received funding through the Resident Priority Fund but have not been installed yet.

Question 27 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond, Cabinet member for Environment

I understand that certain properties along the A10 and the A406 within the borough have not received wheelie bins. This is presumably because of the difficulties in stopping on a red route though I note that this does not appear to be a difficulty in other boroughs. In the light of the recent award of money from the coalition government to specifically use in connection with providing better waste and collection services, will he undertake to use some of this money to remedy what is a serious defect in the service currently being provided to such residents along these major roads.

Reply from Councillor Bond

Around 600 properties along the A406 and A10 are currently not provided with wheeled bins for refuse, recycling and organic waste. An alternative service of sacks is currently in place for refuse and recycling with compost bins being offered for garden waste.

This is being reviewed given operational practices in other boroughs. Once reviewed officers will provide a further update.

The funding from the DCLG would cover the costs of offering these households wheeled bins if the health and safety risks can be reduced, however it would not cover the significant costs of operating a buffer vehicle for the collection crews which it is currently considered is required.

Of course it was the Labour Administration that gave residents wheeled bins, which has saved taxpayers £2m per annum and cleaned up our streets. The resident satisfaction survey has demonstrated that these decisions are well supported by residents.

Question 28 from Councillor Robinson to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

Can the Cabinet Member update the Council on new investment in street cleaning kit?

Reply from Councillor Bond

As a part of the continuing Modernisation of Waste Services we have made significant investment in this key front line service. Using data gained from our surveys for street cleanliness and taking note of information from the Residents Survey we have identified areas of lower satisfaction and greater need and have made adjustments to our cleaning services to provide an improving level of service provision.

Some examples of these improvements are:-

- Orders placed for specialised third arm mechanical sweeper (£98k) for borough wide cleaning of hard surfaces and anti pedestrian paving adjoining the

highway.

- New pavement mechanical sweeper (£50k) to extend the improvements gained in Hertford Road into our eastern gateway of Nags Head Road and adjoining residential streets within Ponders End.
- Upgrade of the Mechanical Sweeper fleet to be completed by the end of March at no cost to the Council.
- Recruitment of staff completed to reduce our reliance upon agency placements.
- Two new leaf collection machines introduced (£12k).
- Pre-snow footway treatments implemented on 6 occasions using mechanical grit spreaders.
- Enhanced weed control implemented with support of five new weed removal machines.

These measures have raised standards across the borough, significantly reduced staff sickness and increased customer satisfaction to 80%, the highest it has ever been, and shows we have listened to our residents.

Question 29 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

Councillor Bond will recall that I led a call-in at the Overview and Scrutiny committee on 15th May 2012 of his attempt to rewrite policy agreed by cabinet for repairs to pavings. The upshot of that call-in was that following sympathy from members of the Overview and Scrutiny committee he agreed to revise the policy and to submit the proposed wording to me, presumably with the object of achieving some cross party consensus. That did not happen – can he please explain the failure to do so?

Will he also indicate why it is the case that there are now many instances across the borough of individual paving slabs being replaced with tarmac in areas which are wholly paved and where the resulting repair looks unsightly.

Reply from Councillor Bond

At the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 15th May 2012, it was agreed that, whilst the underlying policy changes were supported, the decision be referred back to myself for reconsideration in order to clarify the wording of the policy on use of materials for footway treatments. The Monitoring officer was also to confirm the constitutional acceptability of a Cabinet Member changing a policy that has been previously approved by Cabinet. I did reconsider my decision and agreed to amend the wording of the Highway Maintenance Plan in relation to footway treatments. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that as this is an area that falls entirely within my portfolio I could also amend the Streetscape Guidance, without referral back to Cabinet.

On 20th July 2012, I wrote a letter to Councillor Toby Simon, Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, which was copied to all Members of the Panel, to advise of the action I had taken and attached to the letter the revised wording of both the Highway Maintenance Plan and Streetscape Guidance. Unfortunately Councillor Neville, as

you are not a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, you did not receive my letter until 29th January 2013. I am sure however, that had there been any concerns over the revised wording, these would have been raised at the time.

I note that the recent residents' survey has seen strong improvements in satisfaction with our £8m capital investment programme for highways.

Question 30 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Taylor Leader of the Council

At the council on 27th February, the report on the council's pay policy was withdrawn because of the latest guidance from the Secretary of State on the issue of retirement packages. While I appreciate that another report will be forthcoming, can he explain his reluctance in the current economic climate to have pay packages in excess of £100,000 ,as recommended in the guidance, approved by full council?

Reply from Councillor Taylor

I have no reluctance to publish the information requested. You will be aware that the Government issued guidance too late to be properly considered prior to the last Council meeting.

Question 31 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Taylor Leader of the Council

Will he confirm the number of individual payments and the cumulative amount thereof of performance related pay across the council between May 2010 and to date?

Reply from Councillor Taylor

During the three year period May 2010 to date, there were 351 individual payments made in the non consolidated pay range to staff on Hay grades. These payments are at risk i.e. to retain them performance must be maintained or improved. This approach adheres to the principles contained in the Hutton Report. The additional year on cost for these payments since May 2010 totalled £181,068 which averages out at £516 per payment.

Question 32 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Bond Cabinet Member for Environment

In respect of the Morson Road depot will he confirm when the first year's rent of £650k falls due for payment and the period for which it relates?

Reply from Councillor Bond

Rent is not payable until the lease from Murphy's has been completed. Completion is due two weeks after the new premises are ready for occupation.

There is an initial rent free period of three months so if the lease is completed at the

beginning of July the first payment from the Council will be due in early October 2013 for the previous quarter.

Question 33 from Councillor Kaye to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

As the Cabinet Member for Schools and Children's Services was unable to attend the Staff Forum in November and was 40 minutes late for the meeting in February, does she feel this is a 'slap in the face' to teachers and trade unionists who turned up?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

I have worked and continue to work in the trade union and have a lot of respect for those who do. I had already apologised on the evening and also reminded those who administer the meeting that the particular evening on which the meeting is held is a difficulty for me; it has not been possible to change the evening that this meeting is held and the union and staff who attend are aware of this.

Question 34 from Councillor Kaye to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

Will the Cabinet Member be able to make the next Staff Forum meeting on time?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

It's in my diary for 11th June 2013 and I have every intention of attending but see my response above.

Question 35 from Councillor Kaye to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

At the LEA Appointments Panel (appointing new school governors) in February, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Children's Services arrived nearly half an hour late. Does she consider this a 'slap in the face' to potential new school governors.

Reply from Councillor Orhan

Unfortunately the Meeting start time was entered incorrectly in both the Director's and my diaries; this was because an officer who was employed on a temporary basis and who is no longer with the Service had changed the time of the meeting and not informed us. Both the Director and I arrived at the original time in our diaries, coming straight from an earlier meeting, and we apologised profusely to the prospective governors and thanked Councillor Kaye for holding the fort.

Question 36 from Councillor Kaye to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People

At the Member Governor Forum on the 6th March, Agenda item 8 was the Primary Expansion Project, yet the council officer scheduled to talk about this failed to turn up. Was this fair on the school governors at the meeting?

Reply from Councillor Orhan

Unfortunately the officer in question misunderstood the request as he already had a commitment for the following Wednesday and confused the two. The Director for this apologised at the meeting and confirmed the officer will be at the next meeting.

Question 37 from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.

What is the expected income budgeted from Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) charges in 2013/14 for each zone?

Reply from Councillor Bond

Arnos Grove CPZ	£11,700
Bush Hill Park CPZ	£11,600
Enfield College CPZ	£7,800
Enfield Town CPZ	£147,000
Gordon Hill CPZ	£3,600
Grange Park CPZ	£5,500
North Middlesex	£46,600
Oakwood CPZ	£12,500
Palmers Green CPZ	£19,500
Southgate (all day) CPZ	£34,500
Southgate (one hour) CPZ	£3,190
Winchmore Hill CPZ	£38,400

Question 38 from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.

What is the cost of maintaining and enforcing the CPZs broken down by zone for 2013/14 ?

Reply from Councillor Bond

The anticipated maintenance costs for 2014/15 £55k and enforcement costs for all CPZs are £490k.

The costs are broken down by zones as the contractor patrols various areas in the borough and not individual CPZs.

Zone 1
Arnos Grove CPZ

Oakwood CPZ	
Palmers Green CPZ	
Southgate (all day) CPZ	
Southgate (one hour) CPZ	£110,000
Zone 2	
North Middlesex	£55,000
Zone 3	
Enfield Town CPZ (1)	
Winchmore Hill CPZ	£105,000
Grange Park CPZ	
Zone 4	
Bush Hill Park CPZ	
Enfield College CPZ	
Zone 5	£51,000
Gordon Hill CPZ	
Enfield Town CPZ (2)	£64,000
Sundays (cost for enforcing the whole borough on Sundays)	£105,000

Question 39 from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment

How much revenue does the Cabinet Member expect to generate from the CPZ scheme in 2013/14?

Reply from Councillor Bond

We expect to receive receipts for each CPZ of the same amount budgeted for in 2013/14 (question 38)

Question 40 from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Bond, Cabinet Member for Environment.

What is the total amount for fines received from enforcing the CPZs since 2010/11 in total and broken down by each CPZ for each financial year?

Reply from Councillor Bond

Due to the coding of our collection systems these figures include penalties for no Pay & Display or invalid Pay & Display tickets within these zones.

Iss. 2011	Arnos Grove CPZ	£30,199.00
	Bush Hill Park CPZ	£14,582.00
	Enfield College CPZ	£ 6,354.00

	Enfield Town CPZ	£97,841.00
	Gordon Hill CPZ	£ 2,205.00
	Grange Park CPZ	£ 6,700.00
	Oakwood CPZ	£17,652.00
	Palmers Green CPZ	£16,640.00
	Southgate (all day) CPZ	£16,518.00
	Southgate (one hour) CPZ	£11,670.00
	Winchmore Hill CPZ	£38,950.00
Iss. 2012	Arnos Grove CPZ	£25,399.00
	Bush Hill Park CPZ	£11,354.00
	Enfield College CPZ	£7,616.00
	Enfield Town CPZ	£ 83,103.00
	Gordon Hill CPZ	£ 3,119.00
	Grange Park CPZ	£6,647.00
	North Middlesex	£24,109.00
	Oakwood CPZ	£16,970.00
	Palmers Green CPZ	£22,093.00
	Southgate (all day) CPZ	£13,857.00
	Southgate (one hour) CPZ	£11,828.00

Question 41 from Councillor Chamberlain to Councillor Stafford, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property

What is the typical waiting time for appointments for residents seeking to register deaths in Enfield? Furthermore will the Cabinet member undertake to review the arrangements which seem to be unduly slow and do not offer residents an alternative to a long wait for an office hour appointment at a time of grief?

Reply from Councillor Stafford

A death registration appointment is offered within 5 days of the date of death. This is in line with the National Standard set by the General Register Office and in accordance with the Good Practice Guide. However, it is possible at certain times in the year for this figure to fall outside the normal parameters because of heavy demand for this service.

Each customer is offered a forty minute appointment which is arranged via the Customer Services Centre.

Delays are unfortunately frequently encountered in the death registration process as the need arises to liaise with the Coroner directly to ensure all information is accurately recorded.