

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2016**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT

Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader/Public Service Delivery), 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), Ahmet Oykenner (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), George Savva (Enfield South East)

ABSENT

Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection)

OFFICERS:

Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration & Environment), Tony Theodoulou (Director of Children's Services), Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director Legal & Governance Services), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Planning, Highways & Transportation), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Tony Gilling (Assistant Director Human Resources), Paul Kearsey (Assistant Director Transformation), Andrew Thomson (Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Gerry Ansell (Principal Planner), Detlev Munster (Head of Property Programmes), Heather McManus (Interim Assistant Director Property, Strategic Property Services), Bindi Nagra (Assistant Director Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Glenn Stewart (Assistant Director Public Health), Rocco Labellarte (Assistant Director ICT), Andrew Golder (Press and New Media Manager), Jon Judah (Cycle Enfield Project Director), Demos Kettenis (Cycle Enfield Programme Manager) and Richard Eason (Cycle Enfield Consultation Manager) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

Also Attending:

Councillor Derek Levy (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee), Councillor Mike Rye (Enfield Town Ward Councillor), Councillor Terence Neville (Leader of the Opposition and Grange Ward Councillor), Alex Stebbings (Jacobs), approximately 40 members of the public

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection).

**2
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

NOTED, that there were no declarations of interest in respect of any items listed on the agenda.

**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, with the exception of Report No.153 – Revenue Monitoring Report 2016/17: October 2016 and 2017/18 Budget Update (Minute No.9 below refers) and, Report No.161 – Bury Street West – Development (Minute No.15 below refers).

AGREED, that the above reports be considered at this meeting.

**4
DEPUTATIONS**

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) advised those present that he had received deputation requests from Councillor Mike Rye (Enfield Town Ward Councillor) in respect of Report No.151 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for Enfield Town (Minute No.7 below refers); and from Councillor Terence Neville (Leader of the Opposition and Grange Ward Councillor) and from Clare Rogers (Co-ordinator – Enfield Cycling Campaign and Better Streets for Enfield representative) in respect of Report No.151 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for Enfield Town and Report No.152 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 (North) (Minute Nos.7 and 8 below refer).

**5
ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL**

AGREED, that the following reports be referred to full Council:

1. Report No.156 – Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan
2. Report No.157 – ICT Capital Investment 2017-2020

Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director – Legal and Governance) took this opportunity to advise those members of the public present at the meeting of the Council's filming policy.

6

CHANGE IN ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) advised those present that he would vary the order of the agenda to facilitate the attendance of Councillor Terence Neville for the discussion on Report Nos. 151 and 152 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for Enfield Town and the A1010 (North), as detailed in the minutes below.

For ease of reference the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda, however, the order of the consideration of the reports at the meeting was as follows:

- Report No.156 – Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (Minute No.11 below refers)
- Report No. 161 – Bury Street West – Development (Minute No.15 below refers)
- Report No.155 – Quarterly Corporate Performance Report (Minute No.19 below refers)
- Report No.160 – Award of the Substance Misuse Recovery Service Contract (Minute No.14 below refers)

The order of the published agenda was then resumed.

7

APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR ENFIELD TOWN

Councillor Taylor (Leader of the Council) welcomed those members of the public present at the meeting and advised all in attendance that a copy of the large scale plans for the proposals for both Cycle Enfield reports were available at the meeting for viewing, Appendix A to the reports referred.

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.151) seeking approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for

CABINET - 14.12.2016

segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield Town. Councillor Anderson drew Members' attention to the Cabinet report and supporting pack of appendices setting out the detailed background information to the proposals under consideration.

NOTED

1. That the proposals now presented were the result of a two year process of engagement. Section 4 of the report outlined the detailed consultation process which had been undertaken. A public engagement event had been held in February 2015 and, a TfL sponsor review had been carried out in June 2015, as set out in the report. A 12 week consultation had taken place, as outlined in section 4 of the report. This had included writing to approximately 53,000 properties within a 1km radius of the centre of Enfield Town; consultation with specific community groups; a business event; and, public exhibition. The public consultation had started on 25 September 2015 and had run until 18 December 2015. A high level of response had been received, as set out in the report. The results of the consultation and resulting changes to design were set out in Appendix B1 of the report.
2. That throughout 2016, the Council's designers had continued to amend the initial proposals to take account of the extensive consultation feedback, which had favoured Cecil Road remaining one-way with two-way cycle lanes, and Church Street remaining open for all vehicular access.
3. The specific engagement which had been undertaken with young people, as outlined in section 4 of the report, to ensure that their views were considered; approximately 1,100 young people had been involved in the engagement events.
4. The comments which had been received from the emergency services and the impact assessments which had been undertaken. Particular attention was drawn to the Economic Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment. Councillor Anderson highlighted the challenges faced with regard to air quality and reported that representations had been made to the Mayor of London that the proposed ultra-low emission zone needed to include the M25; restrictions were currently only proposed for Inner London; this would have a negative impact on outer London boroughs. The challenges faced by Enfield, due to an increasing population and increased car usage, were recognised.
5. Councillor Anderson acknowledged the level of engagement and extensive comments which had been received and also noted the points that had been raised by Councillor Mike Rye in recent correspondence. All comments had been and would continue to be considered and fed into the scheme design process. Subject to Cabinet approval this evening, the scheme would progress to statutory consultation in the New Year. Co-design workshops would take place.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

Councillor Anderson highlighted the benefit of the scheme to Enfield including the potential improvement to the health and well-being of residents and improvements to the public realm.

6. The recommendations set out in the report for Members' consideration.
7. At this point, Councillor Doug Taylor invited Councillor Mike Rye to present his deputation to the Cabinet. Councillor Rye raised a number of issues for Members' consideration including the following points:
 - Thanks were expressed to Councillor Anderson for his prompt response to issues raised.
 - The vast range of shopping centres in the Borough relied on passing trade and the ability to park conveniently. It was noted that the capacity of roads in Enfield was limited.
 - Concern was expressed in relation to the impact of the cycle scheme on the viability of Enfield Town retail centre especially in the light of the number of current vacant retail units.
 - The Enfield Town Masterplan proposals were acknowledged.
 - The Economic Impact Assessment did not guarantee an uplift in trade but indicated that the scheme was likely to result in a downturn in trade particularly through the construction stage. This would require careful management and suggestions were made to consider the provision of appropriate free parking periods; clear signage; engagement with landlords; and, potential business rate relief for those adversely affected.
 - The displacement of traffic and potential negative pollution impact on residential properties in the surrounding area. Pollution levels could increase from queuing traffic in some areas.
 - The traffic survey had been undertaken in July 2015 in good weather and when schools were not at their full capacity. It was therefore not a true reflection of the impact on traffic flows at busier times of the year.
 - Displacement of traffic could have an adverse effect on particular junctions and areas such as Gentleman's Row and Willow Road/Parsonage Lane.
 - Councillor Rye was pleased to note the changes that had been made to the original scheme as a result of consultation responses however there were a number of specific areas still to be addressed including access to the service areas in Cecil Road and loss of residents' parking. Thorough consideration would be required of all of the issues that had been raised.
 - Councillor Rye welcomed the proposed public realm improvements however, he expressed concern regarding the bus terminus and ugly toilet block located opposite the Stag public house and asked that the Council and TfL give consideration to improving the public realm of this area which was an entrance to the town centre.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

- As the original scheme design had been subject to change, Councillor Rye requested that the consultation period be extended beyond the statutory period.
8. Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Rye for his deputation. He supported Councillor Rye in his concerns regarding the bus terminus and had also expressed the view that improvements needed to be made. Representations would continue to be made to TfL. It was noted that a number of issues had been raised for consideration. Members' discussion continued on the proposals in the report as set out in the minutes below.
 9. Glenn Stewart (Assistant Director Public Health) responded to the issues which had been raised with regard to public health and air quality. He stressed the importance of increasing the physical activity of residents in the Borough and enabling exercise to become a part of everyday life. The huge financial pressures faced by the NHS in dealing with patients with long-term health conditions such as diabetes was noted together with the positive impact physical activity could have on reducing the instances of such conditions. Cycle Enfield was supported by public health and local NHS health care providers for the potential health benefits that it encouraged.
 10. In response to one of the questions raised, positive comparisons were made with other countries where cycling was encouraged and the benefits highlighted. In response to specific concerns with regard to air quality and potential pockets of increased pollution levels, Members were advised that the health benefits of cycling outweighed any pollution exposure. Whilst it had been acknowledged that there could be some increase in pollution at particular junctions the overall assessment was of a minor net benefit. Councillor Taylor requested that consideration be given to the use of appropriate planting and screening where possible to minimise the effects of any increased levels in pollution. The personal health benefits of cycling were reiterated by Councillor Oyken.
 11. That the consultation undertaken had been meaningful and comments received had been taken into account and, had resulted in changes to the original scheme proposals.
 12. Councillor Sitkin outlined his ambitions for town centres in the Borough and acknowledged the widespread issues that were currently being experienced due to other factors regardless of the introduction of cycle lanes.
 13. Councillor Taylor invited Councillor Terence Neville to present his deputation to the Cabinet. Councillor Neville raised a number of issues for Members' consideration including the following points:

CABINET - 14.12.2016

- Councillor Neville acknowledged that town centres in general were already facing difficulties but emphasised the need to carefully consider the impact that the introduction of cycle lanes would have on the town centres. The Council was dependent on the success of its town centres and it was important to ensure that any negative impact on trade was minimised.
 - Councillor Neville questioned the consultation which had been undertaken and expressed the view that the revised scheme presented to Members' this evening had not been subject to consultation. He requested that a full consultation process be undertaken on the revised scheme proposals rather than relying solely on the statutory consultation period. It was important that an opportunity was given for all views to be expressed prior to proceeding with the scheme. The consultation needed to make clear the proposals and what it would involve including loss of parking provision and loading bays and the subsequent inconvenience to residents and businesses. He felt that statutory consultation would not be sufficient. The public needed to see what was now proposed and have an opportunity to make its views known.
 - Councillor Neville questioned whether the Economic Impact Assessment related to the original scheme or the revised scheme and expressed concern that a business walk had taken place in relation to the A1010 (North) scheme but not for this scheme.
 - Members' attention was drawn to paragraph 8.2.6 of the legal implications in the report which stated that "before making any decision with respect to this matter, the Cabinet must conscientiously consider the consultation responses". Councillor Neville expressed the view that the consultation process was flawed and that a further period of consultation should be allowed.
 - Concerns were raised with regard to the potential impact on air quality and that the introduction of cycle lanes would not provide any improvement. It had recently been reported that cyclists in London were being harmed by air pollution and the Government needed to act. Councillor Neville reiterated his concerns on the potential negative impact on Enfield Town centre and on surrounding areas through displaced traffic flows.
14. Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Neville for his deputation and highlighted the issues raised for response by officers present.
15. Councillor Yasemin Brett sought reassurance regarding the routes that would be available for use by the emergency services following the introduction of cycle lanes, particularly for instances of more than one emergency vehicle requiring access in opposite directions at any one time.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

16. At this point in the discussion, Councillor Taylor invited Clare Rogers, Co-ordinator, Enfield Cycling Campaign and Better Streets for Enfield representative, to present her deputation to the Cabinet. Clare Rogers raised a number of issues for Members' consideration including the following points:
 - She felt that Enfield had achieved its capacity with regard to the level of car usage. The negative impacts of vehicle use included public health implications, increased number of car collisions, lack of physical activity, pressures on the NHS, air pollution, poor child development and health. Clare expressed the view that it was vital to improve public health and this could be assisted by providing safe routes for cycling reducing the current levels of vehicle use. The proposals would provide safe cycling routes including to schools and shopping centres and could potentially replace a lot of short car journeys.
 - Research had shown that the introduction of cycle lanes reduced traffic congestion and would be of benefit to the future of Enfield Town. She expressed disappointment that the scheme had changed with regard to the proposals for Church Street, which would no longer be pedestrianised. She felt that it was important to put people first and encourage a healthier population in Enfield.
17. Councillor Taylor thanked Clare Rogers for her deputation and acknowledged the issues that had been raised.
18. David Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation) responded to a number of the issues that had been raised. Members were advised that the Economic Impact Assessment had been undertaken on the current scheme proposals. The overall conclusion was that the impact of the scheme was neutral or slightly positive dependent on the proposed mitigating measures. With regard to the emergency services, Members' attention was drawn to the responses which had been received, as set out in the report. It was confirmed that emergency vehicles could pass on both directions on areas of lightly segregated cycle routes.
19. With regard to the consultation, Officers present confirmed that the original proposals had been consulted on some time ago, the scheme had since evolved taking on board the significant feedback which had been received. There would be further opportunity for engagement in the New Year with an exhibition and co-design workshops. The public would be invited to give their views on the proposals. Leaflets would also be distributed to local households and businesses highlighting how they could become involved.
20. In response to further questions raised by Councillor Neville, it was stated that a meeting had been offered to the Palace Exchange manager but that this had been deferred to the New Year at the manager's request. Business Walks had begun in London Road and

CABINET - 14.12.2016

officers were engaging with local businesses. Regular meetings were held with TfL who had the duty to engage with their bus operators. There was a statutory requirement to notify bus operators of the proposals.

21. In conclusion, Councillor Anderson acknowledged all of the points which had been raised in discussion and the responses which had been provided. The consultation undertaken had been extensive and there would be further opportunities for input into the scheme. The scheme proposals had been amended in response to the consultation responses received. The proposals were the result of two years of consultation and engagement. The proposals were seeking to make Enfield a better and healthier place for its residents.
22. Councillor Taylor noted the comments which had been raised and sought clarification of the process going forward for the benefit of all present. He noted the differences of opinion which had been expressed.
23. Subject to approval of the recommendations in the report, capital expenditure of £288,000, fully funded by TfL, would be used to develop the detailed design and undertake statutory consultation. Leading up to the period of statutory consultation there would be a public exhibition and engagement with residents and local businesses. Leaflets would be distributed inviting further comments. Consideration would be given to all related issues including traffic management, economic impact assessment, air quality assessment and equalities assessment before any final decision was taken to proceed further.
24. Councillor Taylor reiterated a number of specific concerns that had been raised requiring further consideration including: loading and drop off facilities in Cecil Road; access for people with disabilities; the future of market square and millennium fountain; the challenges to be addressed particularly during the construction period and the options and potential impact in agreeing the way forward and timescales for implementation.
25. Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Mike Rye, Councillor Terence Neville and Clare Rogers for their contributions to the full and detailed discussion that had taken place.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, that the Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.7 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £37.6 million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed

CABINET - 14.12.2016

1. To note the results of the public consultation on options 1 and 6A and the resulting changes made to the design.
2. To note the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment, the parking assessment, the traffic modelling, the equalities impact assessment and the comments of critical friends. These assessments had been made in respect of the emerging design following public consultation.
3. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield town centre.
4. That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £288,000 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 further traffic modelling, consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and made any additional changes as appropriate.

Reasons: As follows:

- To create better, healthier communities.
- To make cycling a safe and enjoyable choice for local travel.
- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone.
- 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 4112)

8

APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 (NORTH)

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) stated that in the light of the comprehensive discussion on the previous report, Members and Officers present were asked to raise specific issues in relation to the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A1010 (North) rather than issues relating to cycling in general.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.152) seeking approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements on the A1010 North between Southbury Road/Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/Mollison Avenue.

NOTED

1. That these proposals were more advanced than those of Enfield Town in so far as the co-design workshops had already taken place. Section 4 of the report detailed the consultation process that had been undertaken leading to the proposals being presented for consideration by Members this evening. In April 2015 the Council had held a public engagement event at the Ordnance Unity Centre and in April 2016 the scheme had undergone a TfL sponsor review, as detailed in the report. A 12 week consultation period had been held, including an exhibition and engagement with various representative community groups. A business event had been held at the Dharma Centre. The consultation period had run from 1 July 2016 until 23 September 2016. A booklet had been delivered to more than 50,000 properties. The results of the consultation and resulting changes to design were detailed in Appendix B1 of the report. A business walk had taken place and specific youth engagement held, section 4 of the report referred.
2. That section 5 of the report set out the scheme design proposals. The scheme involved the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A1010 Southbury Road/Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/Mollison Avenue; additional traffic signals to reduce conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions; public realm improvements; the installation of bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes, new zebra crossings, side road entry treatments and raised tables; and remodelling of key junctions, as shown in the report and appendices.
3. Councillor Taylor specifically raised the issue of the proposed removal of a right-turn pocket at The Ride junction, which provided access to two schools and an industrial area and asked that this be reviewed as the scheme proposals progressed.
4. Councillor Cazimoglu praised the consultation which had taken place and the engagement with the ward councillors who had responded on behalf of the residents that they represented. It was noted that comments received during the consultation had been taken into consideration when developing the scheme designs.
5. Councillor Fonyonga was pleased to note the specific youth engagement which had taken place and commended officers for undertaking this specific consultation.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

6. Councillor Pite congratulated officers for their engagement with hard to reach community groups and questioned the detail of the breakdown of respondents to the consultation. In response to a comment made by Councillor Neville previously, Councillor Pite stressed the importance of safe and direct cycle routes for young people and other cyclists, and outlined a number of reasons for the justification of the use of main roads rather than back routes for cycling. Councillor Pite expressed the view that habits can change when developments take place.
7. Councillor Taylor invited Councillor Neville to present his comments to the Cabinet in respect of the report under consideration. The points raised included the following:
 - Councillor Neville reiterated his view that particular daily used driving routes can become a habit if difficulties were faced in using other alternative routes. Councillor Neville noted that alternative cycle routes along canals for example were successful in other areas such as Kingston and Camden.
 - Councillor Neville noted the consultation which had been undertaken on the proposals for the A1010 (North) and that the results had been relatively low as outlined in paragraph 4.10 of the report.
 - It was noted that a business walk had been undertaken, Councillor Neville sought more information on the information arising and the reaction of the businesses who had been contacted.
 - The parking implications set out in section 5.8 of the report were highlighted and questions asked as to how the impact of the proposals would be mitigated. This included clarification on the provision of free crossovers subject to the planning process.
 - Further information was requested with regard to the number of bus routes using this part of the A1010 (North) and the bus companies involved. Councillor Neville's view that TfL would not be consulting with the bus companies concerned.
8. Councillor Taylor invited Clare Rogers to present her comments to the Cabinet in respect of the report under consideration. The points raised included the following:
 - A number of the comments made previously with regard to the Enfield Town scheme also applied to this scheme. In addition, it was noted that the East of the Borough was a more deprived area with relatively lower incomes and increased instances of childhood obesity. Clare quoted from a report addressing the issue of fairness in a car dependent society and highlighted the unfairness for those who did not have access to a car and were excluded from this form of travel. Cycle Enfield would go some way to address this unfairness and by opening up other cheaper travel options for those living in the East of the Borough. Successful implementation of the scheme could result in a

CABINET - 14.12.2016

decrease in car usage, increased levels of physical activity and have positive benefits in tackling childhood obesity if children were able to cycle safely.

9. Councillor Charalambous drew attention to a number of points included within the Economic Impact Assessment report and noted that most of the shopping undertaken in the area was by public transport or walking. The proposals were assessed as having a neutral or negligible impact on the town centres affected.
10. In response to the issues which had been raised, officers present provided a number of points of clarification. It was noted that the reduction in parking provision was minimal. The majority of users to the shopping centres concerned were by public transport or walking. It was felt that the parking provision available would be sufficient to meet demand whilst acknowledging the demands particularly at the southern and northern ends of the route, section 5 of the report referred.
11. With regard to the provision of free crossovers, an assessment was still to be done, and would be subject to the restrictions of the planning process.
12. Councillor Levy was able to confirm for Members the bus routes that used this part of the A1010 (North) and the bus companies concerned.
13. In response to questions raised, officers provided a more detailed breakdown of the responses that had been received, the level of support and the age groups represented by the responses.
14. The business walk had been undertaken towards the end of the consultation period to ensure that businesses were aware of the proposals and had an opportunity to participate. Parking and loading restrictions had been addressed as part of this. An additional loading bay at Albany Road had been proposed in the scheme.
15. In clarifying the process in going forward, it was noted that subject to approval of the recommendations, £368,000 of capital expenditure, fully funded by TfL, would be used for the detailed design and statutory consultation as detailed in the report. Co-design workshops had already taken place. There would be a public exhibition and a significant level of publicity of the proposals going forward.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, that the Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.7 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £37.6 million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

CABINET - 14.12.2016

1. To note the results of the public consultation.
2. To note the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment, the parking assessment, the traffic modelling, the equalities impact assessment and the comments of critical friends.
3. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 North, between Southbury Road/Nags Head Road and Bullsmoor Lane/Mollison Avenue.
4. That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £368,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation, which would be fully funded by Transport for London.
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 follows:

- To create better, healthier communities.
- To make cycling a safe and enjoyable choice for local travel.
- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone.
- To provide better travel choices for the 34% of Enfield households who had 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 4115)

9

REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2016/17: OCTOBER 2016 AND 2017/18 BUDGET UPDATE

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.153) setting out the Council's revenue budget monitoring position based on information to the end of October 2016.

NOTED

CABINET - 14.12.2016

1. For information, the £7.2m overspend revenue outturn projection. This position was the same as reported in September 2016.
2. For information, that Cabinet Members would continue to work with Directors to implement action plans to reduce the forecast overspend in 2016/17.
3. For information, the mitigating actions proposed to date by Directors of overspending departments as set out in Appendix A of the report.
4. For information, that Cabinet Members would continue to work with Directors to agree and implement plans to mitigate pressures being forecast in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
5. That Table 1 of the report set out the summary performance overview and the current red risk ratings in respect of the year end variances and schools budget as detailed.
6. Members' attention was also drawn to the forecast projected departmental outturn variances shown in Table 2 and detailed in the appendices to the report.
7. Councillor Lemonides highlighted the key risks as set out in section 13 of the report which included demand-led service pressures.
8. That work on the budget for 2017/18 and subsequent years was continuing, section 9 of the report referred, with the finalisation of budget proposals being reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2017.
9. That as previously reported, Enfield had accepted the Government's multi-year settlement offer, section 9.2 of the report referred.
10. Members' continued concerns that the Government was not providing adequate funding to meet the demands being faced by local authorities. Councillor Cazimoglu reiterated the need for increased funding with regard to Adult Social Care. Councillor Oykener also highlighted the continuing housing pressures being faced by local authorities.

Alternative Options Considered: Not applicable to this report.

Reason: To ensure that Members were aware of the projected budgetary position, including all major budget pressures and underspends which had contributed to the present monthly position and that were likely to affect the final outturn.

(Key decision – reference number 4367)

**CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITOR SECOND QUARTER SEPTEMBER
2016 BUDGET YEAR 2016-17**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.154) informing Members of the current position up to the end of September 2016 regarding the Council's Capital Programme (2016-20) taking into account the latest information for all capital schemes including the funding arrangements.

NOTED

1. That the report showed that the overall expenditure was projected to be £227.3m for the General Fund and £65.2m for the HRA for 2016/17.
2. Members' attention was drawn to appendix A of the report setting out the detailed capital programme budget. Councillor Lemonides highlighted the significant spend with regard to Meridian Water and Housing Gateway; noted the capitalisation of interest charges; and, reiterated the close and continued monitoring of the programme, as set out in the report.
3. Councillor Terence Neville expressed his concerns over the cost of borrowing to the Council which would result in increasing pressures on the council tax and/or further reductions in Council services.
4. Councillor Alan Sitkin highlighted the need for a continued vision and aspiration for the future of the Borough for the benefit of future generations and therefore did not support the issues raised by Councillor Neville.
5. Councillor Lemonides concluded by reiterating the close monitoring of capital programme projects to ensure that the responsibilities of the Council were met and drew a distinction between those projects and the significant projects highlighted above which represented invest to save opportunities, for example, the savings on temporary accommodation costs being achieved through the work of Housing Gateway.

Alternative Options Considered: Not applicable to this report.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Agreed the revised Capital Programme totalling £292.5m for 2016/17 and noted the full four-year programme as detailed in Appendix A of the report and the indicative programme set out in Appendix B of the report.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

2. Noted that the additions to the programme were for information only and either required no additional borrowing as they were grant funded or had already been approved as part of the Council's democratic process as detailed in Table 3 of the report.

Reason: To keep Members informed of the current position regarding the Council's Capital Programme (2016-20).

(Key decision – reference number 4363)

11

PROPOSED SUBMISSION EDMONTON LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN

Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.154) seeking approval of the proposed submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan.

NOTED

1. That this had formerly been known as the Central Leaside Area Action Plan. The Plan was ambitious and aimed to deliver the spatial vision and land use strategy for this part of south east Enfield which included Meridian Water, as detailed in the report. The Plan reflected the progress which had been made to date and the aspirations for the future including employment in the area.

Alternative Options Considered: None. Having an adopted and comprehensive planning framework for the area provided a basis for setting the area specific planning policies by which decisions on development could be guided. This was essential to support the Council's regeneration programme, for on-going as well as future investment opportunities.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To endorse the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan and recommended to Council its approval for publication, under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and thereafter be subject to a statutory period of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State for public examination.
2. That the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development be delegated authority to agree the publication of the supplementary documents (assessment and supporting evidence base documents) of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

3. That the Director of Regeneration and Environment be delegated authority to make appropriate changes to the submission version of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan and undertake any further consultation required, in the run up to and during the public examination process into the document, in response to representations received, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice. Changes of a substantive nature would be considered by the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL to approve the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan for publication, under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and thereafter be subject to a statutory period of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State for public examination.

Reason: To fulfil the following aims:

- Supporting an acquisition strategy
- Providing a planning framework against which the Council could determine planning applications at Meridian Water and the wider Edmonton Leaside area.
- Providing a tool with which the Council could measure and assess the master developer's plans; and
- Giving the Council the confidence of having a long-term planning approach to Meridian Water

(Key decision – reference number 4389)

12

ICT CAPITAL INVESTMENT 2017-2020

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Chief Executive and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.157) outlining the required capital investment for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) over the next three years.

NOTED

1. That the report outlined the proposed next phase of ICT investment which would be mainly focused on essential modernisation of software systems for major council services and, essential updates to core ICT infrastructure and hardware.
2. That section 3 of the report detailed what ICT investment was required and provided a breakdown of the main areas of investment: £9m for keeping hardware up to date, compliant and data secure; and, £23m for upgrading and replacing software for external compliance, service integration, internal efficiencies and improved customer experience.

CABINET - 14.12.2016

3. In response to questions raised, Members were advised of the consequences if the required investment did not take place. Further reports would outline the planned programme of works.
4. Councillor Neville expressed his concern that the required funding had not been highlighted at an earlier stage for inclusion in the Council's capital programme.
5. Councillor Lemonides concluded by highlighting the funding requirements and advised Members of the progress which had been made in implementing the aims of Enfield 2017 which should be completed by April/May 2017. Councillor Lemonides outlined the Council's proposals for moving forward.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, the alternative options that had been considered as set out in full in section 4 of the report: Option 1 – continue to operate under the now rescinded ICT outsourced service, with a higher revenue funded proportion of transformation staff; and, Option 2 – do nothing.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL, to approve the addition of £32m to the capital programme for ICT capital requirements over the 3 years 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Reason: NOTED, the detailed reasons for the recommendations as set out in section 5 of the report under the areas of: improved customer experience and wider stakeholder engagement; ongoing external compliance and compatibility, fit for purpose internal solutions; and, securing the £29m annual revenue saving delivered by Enfield 2017 for the long term.

(Key decision – reference number 4410)

13

SENIOR JOB PAY STRUCTURE AND TITLES

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Assistant Director Human Resources (No.158) reviewing the current pay structure for senior leaders in the Council.

NOTED

1. That the proposals had previously been discussed and agreed by the Council's Remuneration Committee.
2. The processes that would need to be followed. There would be a requirement for the new posts to be supported by a sound business case, implementation of an external process to evaluate posts and the new Director level posts would be subject to ratification by the Remuneration Committee, section 7 of the report referred.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, that given the retention problems identified in the report, maintaining the status quo in the senior leadership pay structure could hinder the Council's ability to attract high quality candidates who could lead and manage the successful delivery of services with reduced resources in the future. Implementing an across the board pay uplift at the Assistant Director and Head of Service level would be extremely costly and potentially controversial in the current climate of austerity and job losses. Any pay uplifts would need to be objectively justified and targeted in areas where there was an organisational or business need.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. With effect from 1 January 2017:
 - (a) That the four posts of Director be renamed as Executive Directors to better reflect the organisational requirements of officers at this level.
 - (b) To reintroduce an intermediate grade of Director (where it was externally validated that the job size required this grade) to meet the need to provide additional capacity to Executive Directors with wide spans of control.
 - (c) To agree an external evaluation process to determine whether any new or existing posts should be graded at the new levels and the Director level posts should be subject to ratification at the Council's Remuneration Committee.

2. With effect from 1 April 2017, to reintroduce an intermediate grade of Head of Service 3m (where it was externally validated that the job size required this grade) to recognise the increased responsibilities and demands at this level resulting from the reduction in the number of managers.

Reason: To provide capacity in the pay structure to support the development of an organisation structure which enabled the delivery of value for money services with fewer resources.

(Non key)

14

AWARD OF THE SUBSTANCE MISUSE RECOVERY SERVICE CONTRACT

Councillor Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.160) seeking approval to the award of the substance misuse recovery service contract.

NOTED

CABINET - 14.12.2016

1. That Report No.162 also referred as detailed in Minute No.23 below.
2. That the proposed contract award was the conclusion of a successful procurement process which would also result in savings for the Council, as detailed in the report; and, the opportunity for further efficiency savings moving forward.
3. The proposed relocation of the family therapy services as set out in the report.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, that there had been no alternative option to tendering externally as Enfield Council was unable to directly provide such a specialist treatment service in-house, as outlined in full in section 4 of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Note that the tender process had adhered to Corporate Procurement Procedures, EU Procurement Regulations, and that the new contract would afford the Council with on-going annual savings of £225,448 and performance improvements.
2. The award of the new contract to the preferred bidder, as outlined in the part two report (Minute No.22 below refers), for an initial period of three years, with options to extend on a consecutive basis of three years and two years, therefore, rolling up to a further five years, subject to satisfactory performance.
3. Support a relocation of the family therapy service, which was a key element of this contract, to achieve £311,000 of on-going annual savings that were part of the overall planned reductions to the drug and alcohol budget of £585,000, subject to an acceptable property solution being realised.

Reason: NOTED, that the detailed reasons for the recommendations were set out in section 5 of the report.

(Key decision – reference number 4302)

15

BURY STREET WEST - DEVELOPMENT

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and Director of Regeneration and Environment (No. 161) reviewing the disposal strategy for the Bury Street West site.

NOTED

CABINET - 14.12.2016

1. The detail of the previous approvals in 2014 and subsequent negotiations and consultations as set out in the Executive Summary of the report. As a result of the changes to the potential development proposals, further consideration was now required on the disposal options for this site.
2. That a further report would be brought back to Cabinet in January setting out the disposal options for further consideration.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED, that the alternative options considered would be included within the forthcoming report to the January Cabinet meeting.

DECISION: Cabinet agreed to review the disposal strategy for the Bury Street West site which would ensure the Council sought maximum value for money for the site, taking into consideration current market conditions and the Council's current financial position.

Reason: As a consequence of the guidance given by the GLA to reduce the proposed number of units on the site, consideration should be given to reconsider the disposal options available to the Council, ensuring that the Council seeks maximum value for the site, taking into account current market conditions and the Council's financial strategy.

(Key decision – reference number 4008)

16

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

NOTED, that there were no items to be considered at this meeting.

Councillor Derek Levy (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) took this opportunity to advise Members of the planned training sessions for Members on the scrutiny function.

17

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

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

18

MINUTES

AGREED, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 16 November 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

19

QUARTERLY CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader) introduced the report of the Chief Executive (No.155) showing the latest available performance at the end of the second quarter of 2016/17 and comparing it to the Council's performance for the same period in 2015/16.

NOTED

1. For information only, the progress being made towards achieving the identified key priorities for Enfield.
2. Councillor Georgiou drew Members' attention to a number of the indicators set out in the report with regard to Housing, Adult Social Care, Sport and Culture, Income Collection, Employment and Worklessness, Planning and Crime Rates. Councillor Georgiou invited the Cabinet Members to address the issues raised within their own areas of responsibility.
3. Councillor Alev Cazimoglu addressed the indicators relating to Adult Social Care and took this opportunity to raise her continued concerns regarding the provision of insufficient Government funding to meet the growing demands of Adult Social Care. There was an increase in the number of residents going into residential care as there was insufficient support for caring for people in their own homes. The growing pressure on the NHS and adult social care provision was recognised. It was noted that Government discussions were currently taking place on the funding required to meet such demands.
4. Councillor Krystle Fonyonga highlighted the indicators with regard to crime rates and noted the exceptional work of the police and community safety unit in reducing certain levels of crime in the borough. It was noted that many of the indicators were beyond the Council's control. Members were advised of the work undertaken in raising awareness of domestic violence and encouraging the reporting of instances of such crime.
5. Councillor Fonyonga was also pleased to report on the growing success of the Council's campaign to increase participation in sport with the number of visits to the Borough's sports and leisure facilities having increased significantly.
6. Councillor Ahmet Oykenner noted the challenges facing the Council with regard to Housing and Homelessness and the impact of Government

CABINET - 14.12.2016

policy in this regard. Members noted that the current underspend on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) would be used for continuing programmes of major works. Councillor Oykenor noted the positive indicator in relation to rent collected by council homes as a proportion of rent due (excluding rent arrears); this continued to be a challenging area.

7. Councillor Alan Sitkin was pleased to report that the employment rate in Enfield had improved at a faster rate when compared to the rest of London and nationally. This was a significant achievement for the Borough. Councillor Sitkin highlighted the work that had been undertaken in attracting businesses to the Borough and praised the work of officers in this regard.

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 4330)

20

ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

NOTED, that there were no written updates to be received at this meeting.

21

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED, that the next Cabinet meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 18 January 2017.

22

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 to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

23

AWARD OF THE SUBSTANCE MISUSE RECOVERY SERVICE CONTRACT

Councillor Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.162).

NOTED

1. That Report No.160 also referred as detailed in Minute No.14 above.
2. The detailed information provided on the preferred bidder and the outcome of the evaluation which had taken place, as set out in the report.
3. That Members' attention was drawn to section 4.3 of the report setting out the terms of the contract and required performance improvements. The contract would be closely monitored to ensure that the performance requirements were being achieved.
4. The savings that would be achieved by the Council as detailed in the report, section 7, financial implications referred.
5. The proposed relocation of the family therapy service as set out in the part one report (Report No.160, Minute No.14 above referred).
6. In response to a question raised by Councillor Anderson, Members were advised of the monitoring mechanisms that would be put in place to ensure compliance with the performance requirements of the new contract.

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No.160, Minute No.14 above referred.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to note the additional information set out in the report in support of the recommendations in Report No.160 (Minute No.14 above referred) and, agreed the award of the new contract to the preferred bidder as detailed in section 4 of the report.

Reason: As detailed in Report No.160, Minute No.14 above referred.
(Key decision – reference number 4302)

24

BURY STREET WEST - DEVELOPMENT

CABINET - 14.12.2016

There was no part two report in respect of this item, Minute No.15 above refers.