DST – Ref No:

NAME OF PANEL: Overview & Scrutiny cttee

DATE OF PANEL:

---

(1)   Reason why decision is being called in:

The Development of Edmonton Cemetery

Borrowing. This project will have to be funded through the redirection of capital expenditure. The Council's borrowing is already at unprecedented levels.

General Fund. The Council is predicting a £7.9 million overspend for 16/17 whilst this decision includes capital investment the interest charges are revenue creating an additional pressure.

Tennis Courts. The development of Edmonton Cemetery will mean the reduction of 10 tennis courts.

Mitigation funding. The £250,000 investment into tennis courts does not change the fact that 10 tennis courts will be got rid of. £250,000 is not a vast sum in terms of council funding it will not create show courts in our parks.

Current state of A10 tennis courts. The arguments for the removal of the tennis courts include the fact that the current ones are not in the best of condition, however that is down to the Environment Department so it is Enfield Council's own fault. It is extraordinary that the other tennis courts in the borough are not in a bad condition but these ones have been left so they are not of the same standard.

Improved choice: The department knew that by offering more burial options capacity would run out probably sooner. I understand that a lot of the custom comes from outside of the borough rather than from existing residents.

Decision of convenience: The expansion on to the tennis courts is just a decision of convenience because they are located next to the cemetery.

Not a decision for the long term. The expansion of Edmonton Cemetery is a short term option; Enfield needs to find appropriate capacity for the next 30 years.

Only option. This decision does not explore in detail why using an existing site in Enfield is so uneconomical nor buying land outside of the borough.

Demand. What if demand changes and people's choices differ due to changing demographics and cheaper options become available. Brexit may make difference as well to this.

Public Health. OSC has recently heard how bad our obesity levels are in the borough and our Public Health strategy talks about promoting exercise and better lifestyle choices yet we are removing tennis courts where people can exercise. We have not also promoted use of our facilities in particular these tennis courts so that more people would be attracted to play there.

Booking. The draft agreement between the LTA and Enfield Council talks about measuring activity through bookings. At present there is no need to book at any of our tennis courts in the borough making them reasonably available.

Location. The decision states that one of the reasons that the tennis courts are not used more is their location by the A10. This did not of course matter to Power League just a few minutes up the road. The Environment Department did not feel the same way when recently it had a planning application granted for an artificial pitch located at Enfield Playing Fields adjacent to the A10.

Consultation. There was not consultation with residents regarding the removal of 10 tennis courts.

Measuring usage exercise. This time period was selectively chosen and it conveniently missed the busiest time in the year when the tennis courts are used to capacity.

Outline of proposed alternative action:
The decision to be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration of the available options in view of the concerns raised under the call-in relating to the funding, level of mitigation action proposed given the loss of facilities, lack of detail on alternative options and justification for the decision in relation to the location of the existing facility and public health implications.

Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?

No

(4) If **Yes**, give reasons:

FOR S. & O. USE ONLY:

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –

Name of Proper Officer:

Asmat Hussan

Date: 31/10/2016.