

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON THURSDAY, 7 JULY 2016**

COUNCILLORS

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

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

ABSENT Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader/Public Service Delivery)

OFFICERS: Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ian Davis (Director - Regeneration & Environment), Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services), Bindi Nagra (Assistant Director - Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director Legal & Governance), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Planning, Highways & Transportation), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Mohammed Lais (Senior Asset Management Surveyor), Nicholas Bowater (Programme Manager - Policy and Performance), Rocco Labellarte (Interim Assistant Director of ICT), Glenn Stewart (Assistant Director - Public Health), Shnow Chory (Legal Services), Richard Eason (Cycle Enfield) and Laura Berryman (Press Officer) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillor Peter Fallart
Abhijit Chatterjee (Representative of Jacobs – Cycle Enfield Consultant)

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader).

CABINET - 7.7.2016

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

Councillor Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture) apologised that she would need to leave the meeting at 7.30pm.

2

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Ahmet Oykener (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) declared non-pecuniary interests in Report Nos. 34 and 39 – Contracting with Lee Valley Heat Network for the Provision of Heat on Enfield's Housing Estates (Minute Nos.12 and 21 below refer) in their capacity as Board Members of the Lee Valley Heat Network. The Members remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion of the reports.

3

URGENT ITEMS

NOTED, that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012. These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear working days in advance of meetings.

4

DEPUTATIONS

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

5

ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

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

6

APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 (SOUTH)

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment (No.27) seeking approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South (Lincoln Road to Fairfield Road).

NOTED

CABINET - 7.7.2016

1. Councillor Anderson advised Members that the report set out in detail the results of the consultation which had taken place to date and presented a series of recommendations for Members' consideration and approval. Subject to approval of this report, detailed design work and statutory consultation would then be undertaken as explained in the report.
2. A number of particular issues were highlighted for Members' consideration including the options for the future configuration of the roundabout at Edmonton Green and location of the war memorial. Councillor Anderson outlined the results of the consultation on these particular issues and the potential cost implications for the alternative options. In conclusion it was explained that the recommended option was for a signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green (Option 2) subject to statutory consultation, as set out in recommendation 2.2 of the report. This option would also enable the war memorial to remain in its existing location. Members noted the intention to enhance the look and feel of the area with appropriate environmental improvements being made as part of the final scheme design.
3. Councillor Anderson highlighted the extensive consultation which had been undertaken as set out in the report. The difficulties in engaging with local communities were recognised and extensive consultation work had been carried out in a variety of ways. There had been direct contact with local businesses; a significant number of properties had been leafleted; and, public exhibitions had been held. Members' attention was drawn to section 4 of the report which highlighted the detail of the consultation process. Section 4.10 of the report set out a number of the specific events which had occurred. The responses received were detailed in paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the report. Appendix B to the report provided the consultation summary in detail.
4. Councillor Anderson outlined the concerns which had been raised regarding congestion and safety issues which would be addressed further during the design work and statutory consultation. The responses that had been received from the emergency services were also highlighted to Members, as set out in the report.
5. Members' attention was drawn to the scheme design proposals in section 5 of the report. The potential impact on parking provision was highlighted for consideration. Parking would be reviewed as part of the detailed design process, as set out in the report, and mitigating measures considered where possible.
6. The Air Quality Assessment and Economic Impact Assessment provided as Appendices C and D to the report. The key issues arising from the assessments were highlighted for Members' consideration, as provided in section 5 of the report. Members noted the potential health benefits arising from increased levels of physical activity and improvements in air quality. The conclusions with regard to the impact

CABINET - 7.7.2016

on congestion and journey times, as set out in section 5.17 of the report were also noted. The Predictive Equalities Impact Assessment was provided in Appendix E to the report. The issues raised throughout the report would be considered further during the detailed design stage and statutory consultation.

7. Councillor Taylor invited comments from Officers present. Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director – Planning, Highways and Transportation) reported that during the preliminary design phase, the Cycle Enfield Partnership Board (Enfield South East) had met on four occasions to enable stakeholders to influence the designs and share information with the organisations that they represented. Following the meeting on 1 June 2016, comments had been received from Councillor Lee Chamberlain and the Enfield Cycling Campaign. All comments had been circulated to Cabinet Members to be considered as part of the decision making process.
8. Councillor Peter Fallart was invited to address the Cabinet. Councillor Fallart highlighted his concerns regarding the level of responses received during the consultation and, therefore the potential opposition to the scheme from local people who had not formally responded. He also noted with concern the potential impact on blue light services set out in section 4 of the report and questioned whether emergency vehicles could have appropriate exemptions as referred to in the report. The issues with regard to congestion in the area and implications for journey times were highlighted.
9. Councillor Fallart drew attention to a number of concerns recognised in the report including: the provision of central refuges to assist those who had difficulty in crossing roads; the proposals for the Edmonton Green roundabout; the potential safety issues for bus stop boarders; the outcome of the Economic Impact Assessment and the need to protect local businesses from any negative impact arising from the scheme; and, the potential increase in congestion and journey times. Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Fallart for his comments and acknowledged the issues which he had raised.
10. Councillor Taylor invited comments and questions from Cabinet Members.
11. Councillor Cazimoglu thanked Officers for their engagement with local ward Councillors and requested feedback on the ward specific issues which had been raised during the consultation period. This would enable responses to be provided to local residents highlighting the actions that were being taken in response to issues of concern.
12. Councillor Pite felt that a signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green was the best option for cyclists. The traffic congestion in the area was recognised and, noted her personal experience that cycling in

CABINET - 7.7.2016

the area was a quicker option and one that the scheme would encourage and support.

13. Councillor Savva recognised the extensive consultation which had been undertaken and expressed his appreciation to the officers involved for their considerable work in engaging with local residents.
14. Councillor Taylor questioned the terms of required Traffic Management Orders and the potential exemptions for emergency vehicles. Clarification was sought on the procedures that had to be followed and the flexibility available to the Council in moving forward. Councillor Taylor also recognised the challenges faced with regard to adequate parking provision and that options would continue to be considered during the detailed design and statutory consultation of the scheme. He also noted the concerns expressed with regard to potential safety issues at bus stops and the need for reassurance and adequate protections for all users.
15. Councillor Orhan expressed her support of the scheme and recognised the extensive consultation which had been carried out to date. Challenges would need to be faced and in so doing consider the best use of the space available for all road users. Councillor Orhan praised the positive benefits that the scheme could have for children and young people in increasing cycling and recognising them as a primary road user for the first time. The scheme would provide positive opportunities for users of all ages. The potential health benefits were highlighted.
16. In conclusion, Councillor Anderson responded to the issues which had been raised during discussion. He expressed his thanks to Councillor Fallart for his constructive comments. Councillor Anderson acknowledged the challenges that had been faced during the consultation and encouraging responses from local residents. It was noted that local community groups had been engaged with and a range of groups and individuals had been involved in the consultation to date. In response to some of the concerns which had been raised, Members' attention was drawn to the Predictive Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix E of the report), it was not the intention to disadvantage any users and all issues of concern would continue to be addressed through the detailed design and statutory consultation.
17. Councillor Anderson also highlighted the Economic Impact Assessment (Appendix D to the report) and gave assurances that every effort would be made to ensure that local businesses were not negatively affected by the scheme. The parking challenges would continue to be looked at as would the issues around bus stops and any potential impact on the emergency blue light services.
18. Councillor Anderson expressed his thanks and appreciation to Members and Officers for their support and hard work and continued to

CABINET - 7.7.2016

welcome all feedback as the scheme progressed. The Council wanted to implement the best possible scheme for all concerned.

19. David Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation) outlined the conditions of implementing traffic orders and the exemptions which existed for emergency vehicles. It was also the intention to introduce a local condition relating to blue badge holders. There were steps that could be taken for temporary changes to traffic orders if the need arose in the future. In response to questions raised he also outlined the responsibilities for enforcing traffic orders.

Alternative Options Considered: The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.2 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £38.1 million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health, and transport benefits.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed

1. To note the results of the public consultation.
2. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South, between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road.
3. That approval be granted to proceed with the signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green (Option 2), subject to statutory consultation.
4. That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £350,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation.
5. That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and make any additional changes as appropriate.

Reasons: As listed below and in section 7 of the report:

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

- To enable transformational change to our town centres.
(Key decision – reference number 4114)

7

REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2015/16

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.28) setting out the overall 2015/16 revenue and capital outturn position for the Council's General Fund and Housing Revenue Account, along with the Council's current financial state including reserves and financial risks.

NOTED

1. That the report also provided an overview of the budget process for 2017/18 together with the latest information on public expenditure and progress on the Government's plans to replace Revenue Support Grant with 100% retention of local business rates.
2. That the final outturn position was set out in table 1 of the report. The outturn position for 2015/16 was within budget. The pressures faced by Children's Services and Adult Social Care were highlighted to Members, as set out in the report.
3. The Housing Revenue Account remained strong, as detailed in section 5 of the report. The impact of the provision for the Southwark water billing judgement was noted, as set out in section 5.1 of the report.
4. The capital outturn position detailed in section 6 of the report was noted, as was the significant capital programme expenditure shown in table 7 of the report.
5. The finances of the Council remained strong and appreciation was expressed to both Cabinet Members and Officers for their considerable efforts. Members recognised the difficult decisions that they would continue to face in the future within the limited resources available to the Council.

Alternative Options Considered: None.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Noted the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and capital outturn for 2015/16.
2. Agreed specific changes to reserves as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report and detailed in the service appendices attached to the report.

CABINET - 7.7.2016

3. Noted the capital outturn and agreed the funding of the Council's capital expenditure for 2015/16 as set out in paragraph 6.3 of the report.
4. Noted the budget process set out in paragraph 8.5 of the report.

Reason: To ensure that Members were aware of the outturn position for the authority including all major variances which had contributed to the outturn position. To manage the 2016/17 financial planning process with particular regard to continuing reductions in public spending.

(Key decision – reference numbers 4323/4324)

8

ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2015/16

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.29) reviewing the activities of the Council's Treasury Management function over the financial year ended 31 March 2016.

NOTED, the key points of the report as set out in section 1.2 of the report.

Alternative Options Considered: None. The report was required in order to comply with the Council's Treasury Management policy statement, agreed by Council in February 2014.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to accept the Treasury Outturn report.

Reason: To Inform the Council of Treasury Management performance in the financial year 2015/16.

(Key decision – reference number 4325)

9

QUARTERLY CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) introduced the report of the Chief Executive (No.30) presenting the latest quarterly report on the Corporate Performance Scorecard.

NOTED, the progress made towards delivering the identified key priority indicators for Enfield as set out in the report.

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

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

(Key decision – reference number 4331)

10

HOUSING CAPITAL WORKS AND DECENT HOMES FUNDING PROGRAMME 2016/17

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment (No.31) seeking approval to re-profile part of the planned HRA funding for major works, to bring forward a number of heating renewal schemes.

NOTED

1. That the proposed re-profiling would maximise the opportunity to drawdown external grant funding under the “Energy Company Obligations” and Renewal Heat Incentive sustainability initiatives, as set out in the report.
2. The proposals would help to tackle the issue of fuel poverty and reduce heating bills for a number of households.
3. The financial implications of the proposals were noted, as detailed in full in the report.
4. The success of the new heating system at Exeter Road and the positive feedback which had been received to date.
5. Councillor Sitkin expressed his support of the proposals and highlighted the benefits with regard to sustainability.

Alternative Options Considered: None.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve the proposed additional programme of heating renewal works for 2016/17 as indicated in Appendix 1 of the report (based on the current cost estimates contained within the report).
2. Delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration to approve the subsequent individual schemes as they were developed and procured (in accordance with the planned programme of activity).

Reason: NOTED the reasons for the recommendations as set out in section 4 of the report regarding the works required within specified timescales.

(Key decision – reference number 4244)

11

TAKING FORWARD ENFIELD COUNCIL'S IT OFFER

CABINET - 7.7.2016

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.32) setting out proposals for taking forward Enfield Council's IT offer.

NOTED

1. That recommendation 2.1.5 of the report was being amended to read: "That a business case is brought back to Cabinet for approval prior to the Company commencing trading once established and the board is in place" (decision 5 below reflects this amendment).
2. The reasons for setting up the proposed company and the potential benefits to the Council as outlined in the report.
3. That the Board of the ICT Company should comprise 4 Cabinet Members, rather than 3 as detailed in the report. Those 4 Members to be Councillors Georgiou, Lemonides, Orhan and Sitkin.
4. That Councillor Lemonides would be undertaking further work in the future with appropriate officers in considering the Council's companies which now existed, their establishment and membership; and, whether an umbrella company would be beneficial.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTE the alternative options that had been considered as set out in full in section 4 of the report: Do nothing; do the minimum i.e. to restructure the ICT team only; or, exploit ICT using restructured ICT team.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed to

1. Note the progress made since its February meeting on the development of the Enfield 2017 transformation offer.
2. The establishment of the IT company.
3. The governance model set out in the report.
4. Note that in parallel to the establishment of the new trading company, the Council's ICT team would be restructured in order to put in place the correct structure and skills needed to manage the services being transferred in from Serco, and ensure that Enfield's IT team was a good place to work, with excellent career opportunities.
5. That a business case be brought back to Cabinet for approval prior to the Company commencing trading once established and the board was in place.

Reason: NOTED the detailed for the recommendations set out in section 5 of the report: the Council had developed as part of the Enfield 2017 programme intellectual property rights (IPR) to the IT supporting the transformation. This IPR could be used to generate a potential income to the Council, when software using that IPR was sold on to other councils.

(Key decision – reference number 4314)

12

CONTRACTING WITH LEE VALLEY HEAT NETWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF HEAT ON ENFIELD'S HOUSING ESTATES

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.34) seeking authority to enter into a series of legal agreements with Lee Valley Heat Network Ltd.

NOTED

1. That Report No.39 also referred as detailed in Minute No.21 below.
2. That the Housing Development and Renewal team had included a requirement for a distributed heating network facility on all the major developments that they had procured, as outlined in the report. It was the intention to include similar requirements in the procurement of development partners on all future estate renewal projects where they were large enough to justify the requirement and were not within range of an economic extension to an existing district heating system. Councillor Oykenner outlined the benefits and implications of the proposals set out in the report, for Members' consideration.

Alternative Options Considered: That the Council manage the operation of each energy centre as they came forward. This had been discounted as the experience of managing distributed heating networks within the Council had a poor reputation, and the Council wished to improve the services received by both tenants and leaseholders on the new developments. That, the Council procure an external operator for each energy centre as they were completed. This had been discounted as, individually, each energy centre was not large enough to obtain the economies of scale that were considered necessary to be able to offer competitive heat prices to the consumers and certainly not on any basis that involved consistency between regeneration projects.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Noted the progress at paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 of the report that had been made to agree commercial arrangements between the Council and LVHN for both the operation and maintenance of known energy centre opportunities that would be developed as part of the estate renewal programme and to regulate arrangements for future distributed

CABINET - 7.7.2016

heating network facilities that might come forward from both the existing estates and from future estate renewal projects.

2. Agreed to delegate authority to the Director – Regeneration and Environment, acting in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services, to agree the terms of and enter into the agreements that need to be put in place to regulate the commercial arrangements between the Council and LVHN. These include a portfolio agreement, site energy agreements, and various other relevant template agreements.

Reason: LVHN HoldCo (with its wholly owned subsidiary operating company) Energetik was a Council-owned company that was being set-up to specialise in the operation and maintenance of a distributed heating networks with the aim of providing consumers with a competitive retail heat price, achieved through economies of scale, access to bulk purchase of fuel, access to competitive wholesale heat costs from the NLWA energy from waste plant and access to competitively priced funding, This would help achieve a key Council objective of reducing fuel poverty as well as reducing carbon emissions. Entering into a contract with Energetik for all heat network facilities that we know would come forward as part of the estate regeneration programme and for heat network facilities that would come forward in the future would help both the Council and Energetik achieve economies of scale that would not be achieved by contracting for each energy centre separately.

(Key decision – reference number 3988)

13

APPROVAL TO INCLUDE SUPPLIERS ON A FRAMEWORK TO DELIVER FLEXIBLE HOUSING

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.35) seeking approval to include suppliers on a framework to deliver flexible housing.

NOTED

1. That Report No.40 also referred as detailed in Minute No.22 below.
2. That the Council had implemented a range of initiatives to respond to increasing demand for temporary accommodation. Approval was now being sought to include suppliers on a framework to deliver flexible housing in accordance with previous decisions made, as outlined in the report. Once the Framework Agreement had been established, a further, more detailed mini competition would be held for each specific site, open to suppliers on the Framework, to appoint the supplier for individual schemes. This would include quality criteria that were specific to the location and housing need.

CABINET - 7.7.2016

3. Councillor Orhan praised the innovative and creative proposals which would assist in dealing with the serious housing shortage in Enfield. In considering the provision of such housing, Councillor Orhan highlighted the housing needs of single people as well as families when considering future housing provision. Councillor Oykenner confirmed that Members were being asked to agree the framework at this stage and that housing demands would be considered as each site specific contract was awarded in the future.

Alternative Options Considered: None to be considered.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve the award of a place on the Flexible Housing Framework Agreement to the suppliers listed in part 2 of this report (paragraph 2.2) (Minute No.22 below refers) to commence on September 2016 for a four year term.
2. Note the details of the evaluation exercise were contained in part 2 of the report (section 3) (Minute No.22 below refers).
3. Delegate the decision to award site-specific contracts to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, and the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
4. Note that appropriate approval would need to be given to increase the existing capital sums agreed for Housing Gateway if the decision was taken to purchase the units.

Reason: The tenders received from the contractors listed in the part 2 report were recommended for acceptance as their tenders achieved the highest overall combined (financial and quality) evaluation scores, in accordance with the tender requirements. The evaluation process had been detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.22 below referred).

(Key decision – reference number 4292)

14

WILLIAM PREYE DAY CENTRE, HOUNDSFIELD ROAD, N9 - REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.36) outlining the rationale for the proposed scheme.

NOTED

1. That Report No.41 also referred as detailed in Minute No.23 below.

CABINET - 7.7.2016

2. That the Centre had been declared surplus to operational requirements and had been disused for operational purposes since April 2015. Several options had been considered for this property, as outlined in the report. However, an options appraisal had suggested that the site should be redeveloped for residential purposes. The report outlined the rationale for the proposed scheme; sought in principle approval for the scheme; and, authority to progress the scheme with detailed feasibility work and the procurement of consultants to undertake such work.
3. The proposals to regularise the use of the adjacent Parker Centre by Age UK as outlined in section 3 of the report.
4. The proposal for the Council to directly develop this scheme to maximise its income potential, paragraph 3.14 of the report referred.
5. That the site was currently used as a polling station during elections and that an alternative polling station site in the area would need to be identified.

Alternative Options Considered: Not trying to redevelop the site was considered a lost opportunity to the Council. Alternative options had been considered; as detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below refers).

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Provisionally approved the redevelopment of the William Preye Day Centre, 6 Houndsfield Road, Edmonton, N9 for housing, subject to final details being approved by the Cabinet in a subsequent report.
2. Agreed the addition of the project to the capital programme as detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below referred) to enable the feasibility and demolition to proceed and noted the revenue cost which could be contained within the existing capital financing budget.
3. Approved the commencement of the procurement of consultants to prepare plans for the scheme as detailed within the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below referred), and delegated approval for the appointment of consultants to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency and Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
4. Agreed the procurement of a developer/contractor to take forward a scheme on receipt of planning permission; but the award of a contract to be subject to further Cabinet approval.
5. Agreed the grant of delegated authority to the Assistant Director – Property Services in conjunction with the Assistant Director – Legal and Governance enter into contracts and approve the demolition of the Centre.

Reason: The existing centre was no longer considered to be fit-for-purpose, had a significant repairing liability, and was surplus to the Council's requirements. The proposed redevelopment of this site with a residential scheme was considered to be financially viable and feasible in planning terms. The scheme would also generate much needed income for the Council. The relative simplicity of the scheme also presented a unique opportunity to deliver much needed family housing within a quick turn-around period.

(Key decision – reference number 4295)

15

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Adoption Scrutiny Work stream

Councillor Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health, and, former Chair of the Adoption Scrutiny Work stream) introduced the report (No.37) setting out recommendations based on the evidence and research undertaken.

NOTED

1. The report and the response to the recommendations of the work stream from the Cabinet Member and Director, detailed in appendix A to the report.
2. The recommendations from the Adoption Scrutiny work stream as set out in 2.1 to 2.5 of the report.
3. The significant work which had been undertaken and the timely and efficient support received from the officers involved. Based on the evidence gathered from adopters by members of the work stream, Members had been satisfied that the adoption service was good, as set out in section 1 of the report. Only minor improvements had been suggested to the service as detailed in section 2 of the report.
4. Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services) advised Members of the Government's proposals to regionalise adoption services. It was anticipated that a report would be presented to the October Cabinet meeting considering the detail of the proposal.

Alternative Options Considered: None

Reason: To improve outcomes for children with a plan for adoption.
(Non key)

16

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

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

17

MINUTES

AGREED, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 15 June 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

18

ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

NOTED, for information, a summary of the minutes of the Enfield Strategic Partnership Board meeting held on 7 June 2016. Councillor Taylor drew Members' attention to the different approach that was now being taken and the value of continued discussions in meeting the challenges faced within the Borough.

19

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

NOTED, that future meetings of the Cabinet were scheduled to take place on Tuesday 16 August and Tuesday 6 September 2016 at 8.15pm.

20

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED, in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the items listed on part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access for Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

21

CONTRACTING WITH LEE VALLEY HEAT NETWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF HEAT ON ENFIELD'S HOUSING ESTATES

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.39).

NOTED

1. That Report No.34 also referred as detailed in Minute No.12 above.

CABINET - 7.7.2016

2. The financial and legal implications of the proposals as set out in the report. The potential benefits to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) were noted together with the safeguards that had been put in place.

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No.34, Minute No.12 above refers.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed to note the financial contribution from the Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN) to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

Reason: As detailed in Report No.34, Minute No.12 above refers.
(Key decision – reference number 3988)

22

APPROVAL TO INCLUDE SUPPLIERS ON A FRAMEWORK TO DELIVER FLEXIBLE HOUSING

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.40).

NOTED

1. That Report No.35 also referred as detailed in Minute No.13 above.
2. The detailed evaluation which had been undertaken and the results arising as set out in section 3 and the appendices to the report. It was noted that each site would have different requirements and various models would be used. In response to questions raised by Members, a detailed explanation was given of the evaluation criteria that had been used and the results arising. Different options would be available to the Council in moving forward on individual projects.
3. Councillor Oykenner highlighted the benefits of having a range of contractors in order to ensure that the best solution for each project was implemented.
4. Members questioned any potential implications arising from BREXIT and were advised that EU regulations were still in force. The Cabinet was being asked to agree the framework only at this stage, and each contract would be fully assessed by the Council at the award stage.
5. Following further discussion, Councillor Taylor proposed that the Council host a meeting for local businesses and representatives of the voluntary sector to discuss any short-term implications arising from BREXIT and any local concerns that had arisen. Councillor Sitkin agreed to undertake this.

Alternative Options Considered: None to be considered.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To note, as outlined in the part 1 report (Report No.35, Minute No.13 above), the tables attached to the report which referred to the tender evaluation details.
2. That the suppliers, as set out in recommendation 2.2 of the report, be awarded a place on the Flexible Housing Framework Agreement.

Reason: The tenders received from the suppliers named in the report were recommended for acceptance as their tenders had achieved the highest overall combined (financial and quality) evaluation scores, in accordance with the tender requirements.

(Key decision – reference number 4292)

23

WILLIAM PREYE DAY CENTRE, HOUNDSFIELD ROAD, N9 - REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.41).

NOTED

1. That Report No.36 also referred as detailed in Minute No.14 above.
2. That Members' attention was drawn to the viability analysis of the options set out in section 6.6 of the report and the residual land appraisal shown in appendix 2 to the report. It was agreed that the financial appraisal made the decision clear for Members.
3. Councillor Cazimoglu, in her capacity as Ward Councillor, supported the proposals and outlined her reasons for doing so.
4. A typing error in the figures set out in Appendix 2 which was highlighted to Members at the meeting.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED that all of the options had been financially assessed and the results were set out in section 5 of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Provisionally approve the redevelopment of the William Preye Centre for a residential scheme, subject to the receipt of a subsequent report outlining the scheme's details including its final costings, financials and development approach.

CABINET - 7.7.2016

2. Approve the demolition of the William Preye Centre at Houndsfield Road, N9.
3. The addition to the capital programme for the sum detailed in recommendation 2.2 of the report, to enable the feasibility and demolition to proceed.
4. Note that the initial budget would be used to appoint consultants to assist in preparing scheme designs, feasibility studies, other investigations, site preparation and public consultation to support the preparation and submission of a planning application and appropriate documents to assist in the procurement of a developer/contractor.

Reason: As detailed in Report No.36, Minute No.14 above referred.
(Key decision – reference number 4295)