



# **LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**

Written Questions with Responses

Council Meeting 21 September 2016

## **COUNCIL QUESTIONS – 21 September 2016**

### **Council Questions - Wednesday 21 September 2016**

#### **Question 1 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

Would the Leader tell the Council how many posts are presently established or have been deleted (and not replaced in some other guise) at Assistant Director level (including interim or other temporary appointments) since May 2014?

#### **Reply from Councillor Taylor**

There has been a net reduction of 2.6 full time equivalent Assistant Directors since May 2014 with further reductions anticipated over the next 12 months.

#### **Question 2 from Councillor Charalambous to the Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

Given recent press queries can the Cabinet Member for Environment explain the policy when the decision was taken, on enforcing against pavement clutter?

#### **Reply from Councillor Anderson**

The London Local Authorities Act 1990 regulates street trading such as the display of goods on the pavement, and allows a London borough to permit street trading in their borough by passing a resolution. After a consultation exercise Enfield Council passed just such a resolution in 2008 under the then Conservative Administration to allow restricted street trading in designated streets by way of tables and chairs adjacent to restaurants, cafes and pubs. It also allows farmers and seasonal markets.

However, the resolution does not permit the display on the pavement of goods for sale. If goods are displayed on Enfield's pavements in contravention of the policy, irrespective as to how long they have been doing so, this constitutes an offence under the Act for which the proprietor can be prosecuted. This was the policy designed by the Conservative Administration.

Since 2009, we have received 360 complaints regarding illegal display of goods on the pavement. A total of 362 warning letters have been sent as a result of reactive and proactive street inspections. In the vast majority of cases, shopkeepers comply with this warning letter and remove their goods from the pavement.

However, I have recently taken the decision for the policy to be reviewed and this will be going out for public consultation in the near future.

### **Question 3 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

How much money has been spent by each Directorate in the last financial year 2015/2016 on both oral/written translation?

#### **Reply from Councillor Taylor**

Department	2015/16 (£'s)
Chief Executive	120
Regeneration & Environment	2,717
Finance, Resources & Customer Services	23,547
Health, Housing & Adult Social Care	31,260
Schools & Children's Services	135,011
<b>Total</b>	<b>192,655</b>

### **Question 4 from Councillor Savva to Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency**

Now that the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency has been in post for just over 3 months, would he set out his view of the forthcoming budget round?

#### **Reply from Councillor Lemonides**

This year's budget round will again be challenging, as funding continues to decline whilst pressures increase. As before, we will deliver a balanced budget that focuses on our priorities and ensures good value for money. We will consult widely with residents and Councillors will be fully involved, and all aspects of the budget will be closely scrutinised. Funding information that forms part of this process will still not be confirmed until early 2017.

With the 4 Year settlement currently under consideration there may be more certainty around Government spending for the Medium Term Financial Plan. The process will, as always, be finalised at full Council in February 2017.

### **Question 5 from Councillor Dines to Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

Given the Deputy Mayor for Housing, James Murray in the Evening Standard on 23rd August 2016'...insisted the Mayor would live up to his promise never to build on the green belt...' will Councillor Sitkin please guarantee that no green belt land will be recommended for release for housing in the upcoming Enfield Local Plan?

#### **Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

We are aware of the views of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor on development on the Green Belt. These do contrast with those of the Government, which has recently consulted on the need for development on the Green Belt in the form of the promotion of building of starter homes on brownfield sites. This would result in unplanned, piecemeal and chaotic development of high density housing over every redundant farm building, glass house and shed in Enfield's countryside areas. It is my intention that the Local Plan Review, currently in preparation, will do considerably better in protecting our biodiversity and countryside assets.

No decision has been taken on the future of the Green Belt and the Local Plan Review, and no decision will be taken until all of the evidence has been collected and development options properly presented for public comment and debate. This should be early in the New Year.

**Question 6 from Councillor Ekechi to Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

Would the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development update the Council on the work being done to maximise the number of Enfield residents benefiting from future Meridian Water construction streams?

**Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

Ensuring that local people access the Meridian Water construction jobs will be primarily led by Barratt as part of their bid. Barratt are on track to ensure that when construction commences local people will benefit. The number of local people accessing training, apprenticeships and the jobs will increase over time, as it takes time to train and prepare local people.

**Question 7 from Councillor Dines to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection**

Will Councillor Orhan please detail the number of conversations she has had and who they were with about the provision for a new secondary school for North London with the following groups over the last three months: the government, a free school provider and an academy school provider?

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

North London' is a very wide region and as lead member for schools for Enfield, I have not had any specific conversations regarding the provision for a new secondary school for 'North London' with any of the 3 groups listed by Councillor Dines over the last three months. As I have stated previously my officers have been in conversation as appropriate with the Education Funding Agency (EFA) and the proposed providers of the secondary schools that have been given permission to open in Enfield and will continue to do so as requested by them.

### **Question 8 from Councillor N Cazimoglu to Councillor A Cazimoglu, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care**

Can the Cabinet Member for Adult Health and Social Care please identify how the key outcomes from the Annual Adult Safeguarding Report impact on the quality of care provided to Enfield Residents?

#### **Reply from Councillor A Cazimoglu**

The Council is a statutory partner of the Safeguarding Adults Board and assists with the co-ordination and project management of actions undertaken by all partners through the Boards work plan in its response to abuse.

The Council has duty to lead or cause others to make enquiries in safeguarding, with an emphasis on recovery and resilience for adults at risk. Enfield Council were recognised as working at Gold Standard level in Making Safeguarding Personal in March 2015 and over the last financial year have supported all partners on the Safeguarding Adults Board to develop and implement action plans to extend the making safeguarding personal agenda and practice across all organisations which work with adults at risk. This will directly impact on how adults at risk are responded to when harm does occur, ensuring they have choice and control over actions to keep them safe and the outcomes they require.

Safeguarding adults concerns being raised continue to increase in numbers; in the last financial year 3,511 reports were made to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub. Of these, 1,602 were on the Police Merlin database, 665 were from partners around vulnerability but not related to safeguarding and the remaining 1,244 were safeguarding concerns raised to the Council. The multi-agency and cooperative approach between partners through the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub means that information is shared proactively and timely between partners to respond proportionately to adults at risk of harm. Safeguarding enquiries not only look at keeping the person at risk safe from further abuse, but holding perpetrators to account through robust investigations and safety planning to reduce repeat victimisation.

Applications for the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards continue to be a pressure across all authorities nationally, and Enfield are responding through robust planning while ensuring we have regard for our statutory duty. These safeguards are an important protection for adults whom do not have capacity to consent to the care and treatment. Enfield Council have noted a 39% increase in Quarter 1 of this financial year compared to last year.

The Provider Concerns Process is directly managed by the Strategic Safeguarding Adults Service in the Council. This process is instigated where there are serious and systemic quality issues within provider services. Over 2015/2016 there were seventeen different providers whom were supported to put in place improvements and assure the safety of those whom use the service. This work is undertaken alongside key partners such as the Care Quality Commission, Health and Police.

Prevention of harm is a key outcome identified by the Safeguarding Adults Board;

the Safeguarding Information Panel is one of the mechanisms to identify providers whom are failing to deliver the quality and level of care expected. The Safeguarding Information Panel shares both soft and hard intelligence, such as safeguarding concerns, complaints, number of deaths or regulatory notifications, to identify emerging patterns of themes where risk is increased in care provision.

The Board responded to a national report which suggested residents from care homes are more likely to be dehydrated upon admission to hospital than residents admitted from their own homes. A Hydration Group led by Quality Assurance in Enfield Council was set up to look into this, and started by having Quality Checkers undertaking 20 visits to care homes. A number of activities are underway, including training in care homes and card prompts for staff.

### **Question 9 from Councillor Rye to Councillor A Cazimoglu, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care**

How many serious case reviews have there been in your portfolio during the last 12 months specifying any recommendations that were made as a result to Council?

### **Reply from Councillor A Cazimoglu**

During 2015/2016 there were four Safeguarding Adult Reviews (SAR), two of which completed and two which remain in progress. In the first quarter of 2016/2017 there is a further one SAR which was commissioned by the Safeguarding Adults Board.

In the first SAR which concluded there was one recommendation for the Council, which was to quality assure that timely reviews are taken in relation to safeguarding cases and that there is a system to confirm all recommendations are implemented. This action has been implemented by means of an updated safeguarding adults audit tool from August 2016 which specifically considers this theme. In addition, the implementation of the new London Multi Agency Adult Safeguarding Policy and Procedures included revised training which emphasized the types of reviews and their importance in preventing harm through organisational learning. Thirdly, data relating to reviews have been added to the performance scorecard which will be presented to the HASC Performance Board, to measure the numbers of reviews being completed and address any gaps as they emerge.

The second review completed was not in relation to care or support offered by the Council.

There is a statutory duty to report on all Safeguarding Adult Reviews in the Safeguarding Adults Board annual report. Full information relating to all SAR raised can be found in the SAB Annual Report 2015/2016. This report is being presented to Cabinet on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

### **Question 10 from Councillor Doyle to Councillor Brett, Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture**

Community cohesion has been undermined by the recent racist attack in Harlow on a man of Polish origin leading to his death. Can the Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture say what the current situation in respect of community cohesion in Enfield is?

### **Reply from Councillor Brett**

I thank my member colleague for raising this important issue. It is certainly true that in many parts of the country the advent of 'Brexit' appears to have given some of our less enlightened folk the excuse they were looking for in order to try and poison communities with their ignorance and hatred. They will not succeed.

I can report that thankfully we have not seen a significant spike in reported incidents of this nature in Enfield since the referendum result and that community cohesion appears to remain strong in our borough.

We are however not complacent and realise that the issue remains one of concern to local people. To this end we are continuing to work with our Faith Forum and local partner agencies to maintain vigilance, keep positive messages flowing out into the community and provide the reassurance some of our vulnerable residents need.

Enfield is proud to be a tolerant and dynamic multi-cultural borough and we are determined as an administration to ensure it remains that way.

### **Question 11 from Councillor Milne to Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency**

It was reported in the Local Press that in the financial year 2015/2016 that 430 Enfield Council Staff were made compulsorily redundant at a cost to the rate payer in excess of £8m. During the same period published figures show that the Council spent at least £29.5m on temporary staff. We have been repeatedly informed, indeed assured, that the high temporary staff costs were to prevent any compulsory redundancies, what is the breakdown of the £8m in redundancy costs?

### **Reply from Councillor Lemonides**

The cost of the redundancy payments should be considered in the context of the fact that the overall reduction in posts for the financial year 2015/16 was over 600. This was achieved through a range of measures including natural wastage and the deletion of agency positions. The temporary agency workers the Council engages are where either there is no internal capacity or there is a need to carry out a function for a limited finite period.

The breakdown of costs is as follows:

Department & Services	Redundancy £000	Pension Fund £000	Total Cost of Exit Packages	
			£000	%
Enfield 2017 (Hubs, FRCS & CE)	3,850	1,973	5,823	68.5%
Regeneration & Environment	111	101	212	2.5%
Health, Housing & Adult Social Care	156	0	156	1.8%
Schools & Children's Services	301	355	656	7.7%
Maintained Schools	955	79	1,034	12.2%
Housing Revenue Account	480	142	622	7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,853</b>	<b>2,650</b>	<b>8,503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 12 from Councillor Maguire to the Councillor Krystle Fonyonga  
Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health**

Could the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health give us the details Enfield Council support for Organ donation?

**Reply from Councillor Fonyonga**

I am proud to say that Enfield has become the first Local Authority in the country to use its website to promote organ donation. We are supporting this campaign because there are 6,500 people of all ages across the UK waiting for a transplant. In Enfield there are approximately 80 people on the organ donation register at any one time and there are usually between 3 – 5 deaths in Enfield every year in people waiting for transplants. This does not account for the loss of quality of life associated with waiting for a suitable organ. We are also keen to support this work as there is often a particular shortage of organs in some of the smaller populations that make up the Enfield population.

Enfield has worked extensively with NHS Blood and Organ services to understand what our current situation is and what might be effective on our website taking into account learning from the Behaviour Insight Team (nudge unit). One of our staff who herself has had a transplant for over 10 years has come forward to front and support the campaign. We have received press coverage and coverage in community communications. Donating your organs should you wish to do so is simple and could save a life which is why we are leading this campaign.

**Question 13 from Councillor Milne to Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency**

What is the breakdown of the £29.5m spent on temporary or agency staff (specifically the spend with Matrix Supply Change Management in the financial year 2015/2016), by the total number of people employed under these arrangements in each department, including the agency fees as a separate sum?



## Reply from Councillor Lemonides

Department	Agency Worker Pay rate	Supplier Charge	Total Charge rate	Rebate Amount	Charge rate net of rebate
Chief Executive's Service	£123,923.65	£19,645.48	£143,569.13	£7,708.67	£135,860.46
Finance, Resources and Customer Services	£4,502,130.29	£814,378.71	£5,316,509.00	£469,362.42	£4,847,146.58
Health, Housing & Adult Social Care Dept	£5,592,537.02	£1,228,406.82	£6,820,943.84	£748,460.31	£6,072,483.53
Regeneration & Environment	£10,823,578.85	£1,272,689.66	£12,096,268.51	£567,542.91	£11,528,725.60
Schools & Children's services Department	£3,755,827.76	£722,214.15	£4,478,041.91	£393,377.80	£4,084,664.11
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>£24,797,997.57</b>	<b>£4,057,334.82</b>	<b>£28,855,332.39</b>	<b>£2,186,452.11</b>	<b>£26,668,880.28</b>

### Breakdown by Department

#### Summary

Agency Worker Pay rate	£24,797,997.57
Supplier Charge	£4,057,334.82
<b>Total Charge rate</b>	<b>£28,855,332.39</b>
Rebate Amount	£2,186,452.11
<b>Charge rate net of rebate</b>	<b>£26,668,880.28</b>

*Supplier charge net of rebate*

*£1,870,882.71*

### Question 14 from Councillor During to Councillor Fonyonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health

The Annual Public Health Report 2016 was released in August highlighting that there were about 30,000 residents with high risk of Type 2 diabetes. I understand there is no silver bullet, but will the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health tell us what is being done by Enfield Council to address this?

### Reply from Councillor Fonyonga

The critical challenge presented to us by Type 2 diabetes is inextricably linked to an

obesogenic environment where access to unhealthy diet and low physical activity is easier than access to healthy diet and physical activity.

Enfield Council is leading the fight to address this in a variety of ways. For example, Cycle Enfield will make it easier for our residents to move more, and to build physical activity into their daily routine. Enfield has almost 20 outdoor gyms that give free access to exercise equipment for residents. Furthermore, our health trainers support 1,000 adults to make lifestyle changes every year. The ongoing work of our NHS Health Checks is also helping to identify pre-diabetes, while our schools are actively promoting healthy school meals. We also launched Move More Enfield, a wide ranging social media campaign to encourage residents to be active and move more.

Furthermore, following an excellent and innovative proposal, Enfield Council has recently secured a £1.2 million investment from NHS England and Enfield CCG into a diabetes prevention project that will detect 2,000 patients with pre-diabetes so GPs can offer targeted advice on their lifestyle.

**Question 15 from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection**

Will Councillor Orhan congratulate The Limes Trust on being given funding by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to build a much needed primary school on the Chase Farm site?

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

I believe Councillor Georgiou may have been misinformed in relation to the Limes Trust receiving funding to build a primary school on the Chase farm site. We are aware that the Limes trust has been given permission to open subject to the EFA finding a suitable site for the school.

**Question 16 from Councillor Pite to Councillor Achilleas Georgiou, Cabinet Member for Public Service Delivery**

Have you received any feedback on the latest edition of Enjoy Enfield, the new Council publication which encourages residents, visitors, workers and tourists to enjoy everything Enfield has to offer and to shop, spend and do business locally?

**Reply from Councillor Georgiou**

We are continuing to get great feedback on the latest edition of Enjoy Enfield from local residents and businesses. As well as receiving direct social media posts on the Council twitter feed we are also aware of positive conversations about Enjoy Enfield taking place on independent local community pages. We have even received an unsolicited email from the distribution company telling us how well they are being received face-to-face.

We have received very positive feedback from local shops and businesses that have featured in the first two editions of the publication. Whilst we cannot feature every area in the borough or business in every edition, we will continue to explore new fantastic shops, businesses and attractions from across the borough in future editions.

**Question 17 from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection**

Will Councillor Orhan admit she recklessly wasted local tax payer's money on buying (and overpaying) for the land at Chase Farm Hospital for a primary school that is now being funded by the Education Funding Agency?

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

I can assure Councillor Georgiou that I have neither been reckless nor have I wasted tax payer's money on buying the land on the Chase Farm site, as I stated in my previous response, your government announced on the 23rd July that Lime Trust has received approval to open a 3 form entry (3fe) primary school in the Chase Farm area subject to the Education Funding Agency finding a site.

As Councillor Georgiou will be aware the Council has a statutory duty with regards to both planning and providing pupil places to meet forecast demand. It therefore sought and received Targeted Basic Needs Funding from central government to provide 3fe additional primary school places in the Enfield Central Area in July 2013.

Following two unsuccessful attempts to purchase additional land to allow the expansion of two schools the Council sought and received approval in September 2014 from central government to transfer this funding to allow the purchase of Plot C on the Chase Farm site to allow an off-site expansion of Chase Community school, making this school an all-through school. The council commenced negotiation with the Royal Free Trust in September 2014 on the basis of Red Book value, completing on the purchase on the 31st March 2016.

For Councillor Georgiou's information, although The Limes Trust advertised the opening of their academy school in February and March 2016, The Council was finally advised by the Department for Education (DfE) that the Limes Trust submission had been approved on the 13th July 2016, but no site was identified.

Following the DfE's notification that the Limes Trust submission had been approved, the Council made contact with the EFA advising them of the potential substantial over provision of pupil places in the Enfield central area should the council proceed to open its proposed expansion of Chace Community and the EFA open the Limes Trust 3fe provision. The Council has therefore proposed to cease its expansion proposal and has offered to sell Plot C on the Chase Farm site to the EFA at current market value.

## **Question 18 from Councillor Dogan to the Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

Would the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development update the Council on the work being done to modernise the Montagu Industrial Estate?

### **Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

I am pleased that Councillor Dogan has used the term “to modernise” in his question, as indeed there is a need for us to embrace new ways of thinking to attract 21<sup>st</sup> Century businesses.

A basic visual inspection of Montagu Estate will not only reveal old and outmoded buildings that are no longer fit for purpose but also an estate suffering from congestion, uses and activities that are not necessarily well placed, and businesses that have relatively lower job densities in relation to the premises they occupy.

Montagu Estate originates from the post war period and has evolved since then. Today, much of the industrial property on the estate is second grade and poor in quality. Very little investment has taken place to improve the estate.

Over the last two years, officers have been considering options on how best to maximise the use of this Estate, not only as a Council asset from an asset management point of view given that the Council owns about 66% of the Estate, but also as an asset for Borough businesses and citizens as a strategically located employment use area that will attract new jobs and businesses.

Consultants (with specialisms in urban design, architecture, property development, traffic planning, finance, tax and law) were engaged to assist officers to consider appropriate strategies for the re-development of the Estate. Consultants have advised that given current property and economic trends, the demand for appropriately designed and located employment use premises, and supply constraints within the M25, that the Borough would benefit by comprehensively redeveloping the Montagu Estate. Soft market testing was also undertaken, and this revealed that there would be significant interest by investors and developers to partner with the Council and redevelop the Montagu Estate.

The objectives for the redevelopment of the Montagu Estate were set as:

- Use the Council’s assets as a catalyst to promote regeneration
- Provide the quality of environment and type of buildings that meet the demand characteristics of employment based occupiers and deliver a well-planned ‘fit for purpose’ estate
- Maximise employment opportunities
- Maximise revenue from Council assets
- Devise an effective Estate Management Strategy
- Support training & development initiatives

The emerging proposal addresses these objectives and the business case prepared

suggests a redeveloped estate is both feasible and viable and will generate much needed income for the Council.

Officers are now working on the implementation plan and will shortly commence with the procurement of a joint venture partner. In addition, the Council has considered several options for Unecol House and the preferred option is to demolish this building, as it is in a state of disrepair. This demolition will assist with bringing forward the first phase of development and demonstrate the council's commitment to regenerating and modernising the Montagu Estate.

**Question 19 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Fonyonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health**

How many police officers paid from Enfield Council's recent Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) contract are currently working to keep Enfield a safer place?

**Reply from Councillor Fonyonga**

The contract is currently being finalised with the Metropolitan Police. The provision is for 16 Officers.

**Question 20 from Councillor Jemal to Councillor A Cazimoglu, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care**

Can the Cabinet Member provide an update regarding the launch of Independence and Well Being Enfield Local Authority Trading Company?

**Reply from Councillor A Cazimoglu**

I am pleased to advise that Independence and Well Being Enfield launched successfully on the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016. The staff have transferred into the company and all services have remained operational during the transition. The Company has developed its own website using the domain [www.iwenfield.co.uk](http://www.iwenfield.co.uk) and a commercial advertising the available services has been produced and played on screens in Palace Gardens and Edmonton Green Shopping Centre.

We have recruited our Non-Executive Directors who demonstrate a wealth of skills and experience and I am really excited about working with them.

Councillor Sitkin and Councillor Lemonides, who have made valuable contributions via the shadow board during the development phase will be joining the Oversight Board going forward and we appreciate their input and support.

The Executive Board will meet monthly, the oversight board quarterly with the proposal to provide a 6 monthly update to Cabinet.

**Question 21 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Fonyonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health**

Would the Cabinet Member confirm or deny whether there has been any delay between the abolition of the Parks Police and the new Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) contract arrangements being in place?

**Reply from Councillor Fonyonga**

As above, the new MOPAC contract is currently being finalised and additional police officers shall shortly be deployed to complement the hard working police officers already working to keep Enfield safe.

**Question 22 from Councillor Jjagge to Councillor Fongonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health**

Would the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health please update us about Enfield Council's work to combat hypertension in Enfield?

**Reply from Councillor Fonyonga**

Hypertension is often referred to as the 'silent killer', as it rarely has obvious symptoms. The only way of knowing one has hypertension is to have their blood pressure measured. In Enfield 31,200 people out of the 73,500 estimated to have hypertension do not know they have it. Thanks to the collaborative work between Health & Wellbeing Board members, Enfield's hypertension recognition and control is better than our neighbouring boroughs' and the London average. An additional 5,230 people have effective hypertension control since 2008/09. This would have translated into avoiding 25 heart attacks and 55 strokes in 5 years.

This year we are running a creative media campaign to support Blood Pressure UK's campaign. There will be A4 size posters in libraries, at the Civic Centre, a press release and social media campaign. Seven bus-stop sites will display our campaign posters. LBE is also considering options to support its employers in knowing their blood pressure. We also encourage other employers in Enfield to raise the awareness of hypertension as a part of workplace health. In addition to the media campaign, we will include hypertension awareness in our planned training of community health champions and the Making Every Contact Count training to 250 front line staff. Furthermore, we are working with Healthy London Partnership, British Heart Foundation and other regional partners to enable a systematic detection of hypertension.

**Question 23 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

Do you agree or disagree that your decision to include the additional £90,000 further savings proposal into main 2016/2017 budget is the cause of the reduction of the

cleanliness of the street scene including the current problem of overflowing litterbins?

### **Reply from Councillor Anderson**

The street cleansing savings have resulted in a minimal impact on standards of cleanliness with NI195 litter inspections and litter reports from residents indicating that outcomes are comparable year on year. Reports of overflowing litter bins are slightly reduced for the same period in 2015 although we will continue to monitor as we are aware that patterns do change at sites through the year. However, if there is any deterioration in standards across council services as a result of any budget cuts then the responsibility for that lies squarely with the Conservative Government who since 2010 have taken £118m out of our funding and now expects us to cut a further £56m by 2020.

### **Question 24 from Councillor Chibah to the Leader of the Council**

Could the Leader of the Council say what more consultation and environmental tests than those required by the Conservative Government should be in place if a fracking proposal for Enfield comes forward?

### **Reply from Councillor Taylor**

I would want to see no activity, as a principle:

- (a) unless an environmental impact assessment has been carried out;
- (b) unless independent inspections are carried out on the integrity of wells used;
- (c) unless monitoring has been undertaken on the site over the previous 12 month period;
- (d) unless site-by-site measurement, monitoring and public disclosure of existing and future emissions is carried out;
- (e) in land which is located within the boundary of a groundwater source protection zone;
- (f) within or under protected areas;
- (g) in deep-level land at depths of less than 1,000 metres;
- (h) unless planning authorities have considered the cumulative impact of hydraulic fracturing activities in the local area;
- (i) unless a provision is made for community benefit schemes to be provided by companies engaged in the extraction of gas and oil rock;
- (j) unless residents in the affected area are notified on an individual basis;
- (k) unless substances used are subject to approval by the Environment Agency
- (l) unless land is left in a condition required by the planning authority, and
- (m) unless water companies are consulted by the planning authority

However there is no interest in fracking in Enfield in any case and my response is simply to point out the public need proper protection when such proposals are made. I do not expect any such approaches in Enfield.

**Question 25 from Councillor Laban to Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

Would the Cabinet Member for Environment explain what his department is specifically doing to remove the new psychoactive substances (legal highs) capsules dumped on the public highway, in most cases near town centres and outside parks in our borough?

**Reply from Councillor Anderson**

The New Psychoactive Substances Act 2016 came into force on 26 May 2016 and tackles the trade in 'legal highs'. It made it illegal to produce or supply substances for human consumption that are capable of producing a psychoactive effect. The Police are the main enforcement body, and sanctions for supplying them range from a prohibition notice, which is a formal warning, to 7 years in prison.

However, we are currently consulting the public to seek their views on dealing with the possession and use (rather than just the supply) of legal highs in public places in Enfield under a Public Spaces Protection Order. If this is introduced, a failure to comply with a prohibition would result in fixed penalty notices of up to £100 per offence or a fine of up to £1,000 on prosecution.

Our street cleansing staff remove any drug-related items during cleansing and this includes legal highs. However, the level of drug-related issues encountered by staff thankfully remains low, though we are keeping this under review. Nonetheless, we encourage residents to report any incidents and will ensure that these are treated as a priority.

**Question 26 from Councillor Savva to Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

Would the Cabinet member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development update the Council on the work being done to find new funding streams enabling festive lighting in Enfield?

**Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

The government's austerity programme has resulted in the loss or cuts to many public services in the country. Enfield Council has had to continue to deliver essential services in the face of having to make £118 million of savings since 2010 with a further £56 million of savings needed by 2019/20.

We appreciate that the festive period is an important time for many of our residents and businesses. We have sourced funding within the department to provide Christmas trees with lights in Enfield Town, Palmers Green, Southgate Circus and Cockfosters Green while Ponders End will have lights added to existing trees and Edmonton will see lights installed on the Welcome to Angel Edmonton Arch.

We will write to 50 of the largest businesses operating in the borough to see if they



are willing to support more extensive Christmas displays in town centres. If businesses make contributions, then we will be able to increase the amount of lights provided to include festive motifs or lights wrapped around lamp columns.

**Question 27 from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

Does Councillor Taylor believe that funding the position of Associate Cabinet Members is more important than providing funding for our residents that have hearing disabilities?

**Reply from Councillor Taylor**

Councillor Georgiou may not recall that the cost of ACM's was borne in its entirety by cuts to other special responsibility allowances not from front line services. Of course I regret any cuts to services but we are all aware in this Council that this is because of the massive cuts to Councils made by the Tory Government and its coalition partners before 2015 and continues today. I agree that it is a disgrace.

Perhaps Councillor Georgiou could write to the Prime Minister urging a retreat from unbridled austerity.

**Question 28 from Councillor Hasan to Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency**

Could the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency tell us what impact the BREXIT Vote has on the Council's finances?

**Reply from Councillor Lemonides**

So far there has been no significant impact on the Council's finances following the referendum vote to leave the European Union on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016. The UK economy appears to have weathered the initial shock although the pound remains near a 30 year low, which could increase inflationary pressures in the longer term. Britain lost its top AAA credit rating, meaning the cost of government borrowing will be higher. Share prices have recovered from a dramatic slump with some British-based companies trading higher than before the Referendum. The Bank of England reduced interest rates from 0.5% to 0.25% (a record low and the first cut since 2009) to stave off recession and stimulate investment.

Enfield at this stage, like all councils, is monitoring developments. Identified potential financial risks or opportunities include:

- The new Chancellor's first Autumn Statement to Parliament on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016. This may provide some first indications of the new Government's approach to Brexit. The Prime Minister has abandoned the Government's previous target of 2020 to eliminate the deficit and the Chancellor has said the Government would be willing to reset fiscal policy if the economy had slowed

down. This could involve infrastructure investment along with new fiscal policies (tax and spending plans) to compliment monetary policy (e.g. interest rates). This may include abandoning the Government's new £3.5bn cuts although increases in spending plans will only help if they include services provide by councils.

- The £5.3bn of EU regeneration funding up to 2020. EU funding in London is managed through London Councils and whilst Enfield is not a major recipient it does benefit from EU grant relating to employment initiatives. The Council is also using European Investment Bank borrowing to finance regeneration but it is expected that this will be unaffected by the Brexit decision.
- The Council's pension fund could be affected by fluctuations in investment and any decrease in the yields for high quality corporate bonds that are used to calculate the discount rate for the future obligation to pay pensions for the Council's scheme. These may increase the pressure on the Employer's contribution rates in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- EU regulations and law provide the framework on which many local government services are based. This provides the opportunity for political choices to be made to change laws which may be deemed to be 'gold plated' are simply out of date or no longer desired. The LGA has stated that there cannot be an assumption that power over these services is simply transferred from Brussels to Westminster. The argument is that if services are delivered locally, then the power to run them must reset at local level too including control over funding. The Local Government Association has identified affected laws and services covering:
  - Environment, waste and energy including environmental policy, air pollution and landfill
  - Workforce including the working time directive
  - Public procurement including the way councils buy goods, works and services and regulations on concessions
  - State aid, including how public money is awarded
  - Regulatory services including consumer rights and food safety
  - Public sector information and the treatment of personal and public data and licensing applications
  - Transport and highways including how bus services are run and commissioned (to which Enfield pays a statutory levy to London Transport and other transport operators)
- Greater devolution. Following Brexit, the new London Mayor has moved quickly to demand more powers for London government. The Centre for Cities notes that the capital generated almost as much tax as the next 37 largest cities in the country combined.
- The property market has been the focus of much speculation recently about construction and property prices and rents. At present, indications are that Brexit is not having a significant impact and that any market corrections would have happened anyway. It is worth noting that Barratt, Enfield's development

partner for Meridian Water was one of three of Britain's largest housebuilders reporting that the housing market has emerged unscathed from the turmoil surrounding the UK's vote to leave the European Union. Barratt, Redrow and Berkeley said they had seen little sign of a lasting slump as they reported their trading statements to the City.

The Council will continue to monitor the position and report back on any significant developments and actions needed in the coming months, especially as part of the 2017/18 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan process currently in progress.

**Question 29 from Councillor Delman to Councillor Fonyonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health**

We all watched the amazing achievements of the Team GB at the Rio Olympics with pride. We were particularly delighted to see the athletes from Enfield winning medals. Will Councillor Fonyonga consider inviting these athletes to the Civic Centre so that the Enfield community can congratulate them individually and celebrate their success?

**Reply from Councillor Fonyonga**

Thank you for your question. Yes, we have already been working on this because we are extremely proud and simultaneously uplifted by the outstanding achievements of Team GB, which we hope will encourage all residents to become more physically active in line with our Move More Enfield campaign.

**Question 30 from Councillor Stafford to Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

Would the Cabinet member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development update the Council on the Meridian Water in Principle Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)?

**Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

In accordance with CPO guidance the Council is continuing to acquire land via negotiation. So far 18 hectares have been acquired and a further 5 hectares will be purchased by the end of the year. All landowners have been written to informing them that the Council will resort to using CPO powers if negotiations are unsuccessful. The next step is to take a further report to Cabinet in early 2017 confirming the Meridian Water CPO strategy.

**Question 31 from Councillor Rye to Councillor A Cazimoglu, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care.**

Given the revenue monitoring report to Cabinet on 6 September 2016 showed significant overspends in Adult Social Care does she take responsibility for these,

particularly the loss of income from the two in-house residential homes being less than expected by £200,000 because she closed them?

**Reply from Councillor A Cazimoglu**

Councillor Rye will be well aware that Central Government funding cuts to local authorities are reported as 60% and these cuts are affecting vulnerable adults most severely. Adult Social Care has continued to contribute to the Council's Medium Financial Plan with a savings programme in 2016/17 of £10.8 million, in addition to managing demand. Demographic pressures, provider cost inflation, and additional unfunded new burdens such as those related to Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards all add pressures which cannot all be contained easily within a decreasing budget.

The provision of a brand new home due to come on stream early in 2017 will replace two care homes Coppice Wood Lodge and Bridge House which are no longer fit for purpose. The new home will provide for additional nursing home capacity which is much needed in the Borough. A reduction in income is now anticipated as it would be inappropriate to continue to make permanent placements in a care home which will be closing shortly, but the exact level is subject to a number of variables such as number of self-funders and phasing of the closer programme. However, I am sure you will agree the right thing to do is close these homes and provide care in settings which are modern and properly equipped to meet the needs of vulnerable older people with increasing levels of complexity and technical care requirements.

**Question 32 from Councillor Barry to Councillor Brett, Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture**

We understand the Government housing benefit cap may cause 67% of Women's refuges to close. Can the Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture tell us how this will impact on Enfield?

**Reply from Councillor Brett**

The Government's Housing Benefit Cap means that vulnerable adults including frail older residents, people with mental illness and those suffering domestic violence would in future have their benefit capped at the levels paid to private sector landlords. The higher rents paid to specialist housing associations who provide additional intensive care services provided by specialist housing staff, would no longer be available. This could result in many vulnerable adults being unable to afford to have housing with care. According to the National Housing Federation about 50,000 households could be affected over the course of a year, losing an average of £68 each" per week.

It is difficult to quantify in numbers of people effected or financial impact with any precision, but the consequences of this policy would mean many vulnerable people are not afforded the care and protection they need which will result in an ever increasing level of homelessness amongst this group and a greater strain on Health and Local Government Adult and Children's Social Care Services.

On Thursday 15 September 2016 the Work and Pensions Secretary confirmed that supported housing, which supports some of the most vulnerable people, will continue to be exempt from the Local Housing Allowance cap until 2019. From then a new funding model will protect the sector from the cap with a top up of additional ring-fenced funding. However, this appears to only apply to women’s refuges, homeless shelters and housing for those leaving care, whilst at the same time the Government has announced a cut to funding for disability supported housing to make “efficiency savings” which will see a rolling 1 per cent reduction in the rent payments for three years thereafter the cap will still come in the year 2019/20. Disability support housing would include older people shelter accommodation, and accommodation for vulnerable adults with Physical Disabilities, Learning Disabilities and Mental Health problems which will put even more pressure on Council’s Adult Social Care Services.

**Question 33 from Councillor Neville to Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency**

Further to his answer to question 2 at the 13 July 2016 Council Meeting, and to the answer to the supplementary question just received, both of which on his part were exercises in semantics, will he now confirm how many staff at Assistant Director or equivalent level including for this purpose Heads of Service, have been employed by the council on a temporary basis, however described, including the cost (inclusive of agency fees) since May 2014. The answer should disclose all job titles involved.

**Reply from Councillor Lemonides**

The job titles of the Agency workers engaged as Assistant Directors and Heads of Service since May 2014 were;

Head of FASH (Family and Adolescent Support Hub)
Interim Head of Operations ( Council Housing)
Interim Head of Integrated Commissioning
Interim Head of Service ( Asset management)
Head of Service: Assessment
Assistant Director - Council Homes
Interim Assistant Director Transformation
Interim Assistant Director for Economic Development
Interim Assistant Director Technology

The total cost from May 2014 to August 2016 was; £1,247,134.09

**Question 34 from Councillor Stewart to Councillor Brett, Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture**

Can the Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture tell us what steps have been taken by Enfield Council on the issue of Syrian refugees including unaccompanied asylum seekers?

## **Reply from Councillor Brett**

I thank my member colleague for raising these important issues and it is important that we consider both aspects individually.

With regard to Syria, following our motion in September 2015 committing us to work with other London Councils to play a part in the national response to the crisis we have continued to be active.

I have been leading a dedicated Cabinet sub-Committee with supporting officer working group to consider how best we could engage in the Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme once a pan-London settlement has been reached. We have been anticipating an outcome from the discussions between London Councils/Greater London Authority and Government which would meet our collective concerns. At the present time those discussions remain ongoing and we await further developments.

In the interim, we have not stood still. I have worked with officers to set up a dedicated web page providing information to local people and also a link to Save the Children's Syrian appeal to encourage donations towards relief efforts. I have also organised a charity event for next month that I hope my colleague can attend and give generously to.

With regard to the issue of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, many of whom are resident in the Calais area, this is a very different situation with different dynamics.

The Government has only recently announced (following the Dubs Amendment) to examine ways to receive young people from France. It is vital that members understand the dynamics at play here in order to inform local people of the situation and what can be done at present.

As reported in the Guardian on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2016, not a single child has been received from Calais and placed into local authority care. The picture is much more complex than the either the Government or mainstream media may lead you to believe.

Within Enfield, we have already seen a noticeable increase in the numbers of UASC needing to be supported by ourselves. We are already managing numbers of young people considerably above the anticipated ratio of UASC (0.07% of total child population) that it is believed is appropriate for each local authority to support as stated by Government. This increase in activity is already placing a great strain on Enfield's budgets, resulting in reduced expenditure on other highly valued early intervention services to balance the budget.

The Government would do well to take the advice of the Chair of the LGA's Asylum, Refugee and Migration Task Group and Deputy Leader of Conservative led Hillingdon Council, David Simmonds, who has strongly advised them that more Government funding is required if local authorities are to help provide further relief to these very vulnerable children.

Enfield Council continues to be committed to playing a role in the relief efforts relating to both issues. It is up to Government to provide the resources to allow us and many others to play our part and to ensure that the processing systems work in a speedy fashion.

**Question 35 from Councillor Celebi to Councillor Oykener, Cabinet Member for Housing & Housing Regeneration**

Can the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration please confirm to us how many fraudulent claims for housing, including subletting, were investigated by the team employed to address these issues including how many actual prosecutions were there in the year 2015?

**Reply from Councillor Oykener**

The Housing Investigations Team, part of the Council's Internal Audit and Risk Management Service, concluded 110 investigations involving suspected housing fraud during 2015/16.

Three of the cases were successfully prosecuted (2 Council Housing tenants and 1 Housing Association tenant).

In partnership with Council Housing's Estate Management Team, 76 Council properties were recovered in 2015/16, including 20 properties that were found to be either sublet or no longer occupied by the tenant as their main home, and 41 that were classified as abandoned.

In addition, the Housing Investigations Team recovered a further 20 properties that had been allocated as temporary accommodation.

The Housing Team has been reorganised on a patch basis and focused tenancy audits form a central part of the housing officers' role to ensure Council homes are occupied by those who are entitled to them.

**Question 36 from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection**

Will Councillor Orhan welcome new grammar schools to the borough that will help the most disadvantaged children receive a better education?

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

There is no evidence to support the contention that selective education, in the form of grammar schools, benefits disadvantaged pupils and increases social mobility. The government's green paper has provoked deep concern from a wide range of groups and individuals, including the Chief Inspector, the last Secretary of State for Education and many Conservative MPs. This is because it is obvious that any form

of academic selection results in pupils being judged as successes or failures, those who have made the grade and those who haven't, with all the inevitable impact on the self-esteem and confidence of those not selected. Inevitably, the schools attended by those not deemed to be worthy of a grammar school education have lower status and an over representation of those pupils with special educational needs and disabilities or those who face other barriers to learning and academic success. This imbalance is harmful to the academic and social development of the pupils in these schools.

At a time when 97% of our schools in Enfield are good or outstanding, way above the national and London averages of 87% and 91% respectively, and our public examination results at KS4 and KS5 are above the national averages, I would see no benefit in disrupting the excellent provision currently in place. Our young people of all abilities benefit from learning and growing together, where appropriate working in streamed settings for academic subjects such as English, mathematics and modern foreign languages. My party fully supports a comprehensive, inclusive system which meets the diverse needs of all pupils and does not put a ceiling on the aspirations of 50% or more of 11 year olds who see themselves as failures because they are not 'grammar school material'.

#### **Question 37 from Councillor Delman to Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

In your 'Response to call in' given at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on the 8th September 2016, you, what some might consider rather arrogantly and dismissively, referred to 'Save Our Green Lanes' group as 'so-called Save Our Green Lanes' group (3.4 on page 92). This, you might know, means inappropriately or wrongly named Save Our Green Lanes group. This is a well-respected group that speaks for thousands of residents of the borough on Cycle Enfield.

When you are prepared to mock such an important group in public, could you explain to us why the people of Enfield should have any confidence in your public consultation on Cycle Enfield?

#### **Reply from Councillor Anderson**

To be precise, I actually said 'so-called' Save Our Green Lanes (SOGL) group not 'so called Save Our Green Lanes' group. Be that as it may, 'so called' is a reference to an entity that is 'called or designated thus'. Nonetheless, Enfield's residents can have every confidence in our consultation for the A105 scheme of the Cycle Enfield programme, which followed 18 months of extensive engagement with the community, a process that has been robustly defended by the High Court in dismissing a request for a judicial review.