

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 25 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT**

Bernadette Lappage (Mayor), Christine Hamilton (Deputy Mayor), Abdul Abdullahi, Daniel Anderson, Dinah Barry, Chris Bond, Yasemin Brett, Alev Cazimoglu, Nesil Cazimoglu, Erin Celebi, Lee Chamberlain, Bambos Charalambous, Jason Charalambous, Katherine Chibah, Lee David-Sanders, Dogan Delman, Nick Dines, Guney Dogan, Sarah Doyle, Christiana During, Patricia Ekechi, Nesimi Erbil, Peter Fallart, Krystle Fonyonga, Achilleas Georgiou, Alessandro Georgiou, Ahmet Hasan, Elaine Hayward, Robert Hayward, Ertan Hurer, Suna Hurman, Jansev Jemal, Doris Jiagge, Eric Jukes, Nneka Keazor, Adeline Kepez, Joanne Laban, Michael Lavender, Dino Lemonides, Derek Levy, Mary Maguire, Donald McGowan, Andy Milne, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Ahmet Oykenner, Anne-Marie Pearce, Daniel Pearce, Vicki Pite, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Toby Simon, Alan Sitkin, Edward Smith, Andrew Stafford, Jim Steven, Claire Stewart, Ozzie Uzoanya and Glynis Vince

**ABSENT**

Ali Bakir, Turgut Esendagli and Haydar Ulus

**1**

**ELECTION IF REQUIRED OF THE CHAIR/DEPUTY CHAIR OF THE MEETING**

Not required.

**2**

**THE MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN TO GIVE A BLESSING**

Father Limbert from Christ Church, Southgate gave the blessing.

**3**

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ORDINARY COUNCIL BUSINESS**

The Mayor began by wishing councillors and members of the public "good evening", "a happy new year", "health and success for the coming year" and by thanking Father Limbert for his blessing.

**1. Past Engagements**

November and December had been very busy months for the mayoral team and the Mayor thanked the officers, the deputy mayor, her consort, the deputy mayor's consort for their support and the people of Enfield for their invitations.

The Mayor had attended the following:

- Remembrance Events - the armistice services at Broomfield Park, followed by a service of remembrance at City Hall with Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London, and the Remembrance Day parades at Southgate, Enfield and Edmonton.
- Long Service Awards - attended with the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council, which she said were always a pleasure where she was able to thank the staff for their continued hard work.
- Fund raisers including the Masquerade Ball and the Syrian Quiz Night.
- Commemoration of a golf trophy named in the honour of the late Neil Isaac with his family and close friends present.
- An afternoon tea, hosted by the Mayor, for a 90 year old resident in the parlour – the resident had had her picture taken in one of the Mayoral chairs – a happy memory for her friends and family, who were also present.
- The Arctic Commemoration on the 20th January 2017 which the Mayor said had allowed us to think once again about our valued soldiers and what they had and continued to do for us.
- The Mayor and her family had been honoured to attend the Christmas Day Lunch following mass for the Homeless and Elderly at Our Lady of Mount Carmel & St George Catholic Church. When they had arrived home eventually, they had reflected on the dignity of those people and their gratitude which was very humble given their daily circumstances.

## **2. Mayor's Charity, Enfield Sounds Great, Fundraising Events**

The following events had raised money for the Mayor's charity:

- A successful Taste of Italy evening with Councillor Glynis Vince which raised £414.50.
- Various Christmas concerts including the Christmas Parade of Lights, Forty Hall Christmas Concert, the Enfield Choral Society Christmas Concert and Christmas carol services and performances at many schools.
- An International Music Evening hosted on the 21st January 2017, where various musicians had performed some beautiful pieces. The evening was well attended and much fun was had by all. It raised £777.00 on the night and the breadth and the standard of the music from all parts of the world was astonishing.

The Mayor also said a big thank you to the many local businesses, churches and parishes which had provided great support over the Christmas period to her charity. These included Our Lady of Mount Carmel & St George, St Mary Magdalene Church and the Chickenshed Theatre.

### **3. Afternoon Tea for Olympians**

The Mayor had been excited to host an event for Enfield Olympians and honour their success. She said that Desiree Henry had been a delight, together with a fellow Paralympian, Vanessa Daobry. Some young people from the Crystal Palace Youth Games had also attended and had been very excited to meet Desiree and Vanessa, and to have their pictures taken with them. Local MP's were also present, including Kate Osamor and David Burrowes.

### **4. New Year's Day Parade**

The New Year's Day Parade in London had been an amazing display of excellent floats and had been attended by many people. Unfortunately Enfield's float had not won this year, but it had been an honour for the Mayor to be part of the day. It had also been wonderful for the Mayor to be on the top deck of a London bus with all the London mayors wishing everyone "a Happy New Year".

### **5. Haven House Children's Hospice**

The Mayor said that she had made a crucial connection with Haven House Children's Hospice, which although based out of Enfield, took many Enfield children. She looked forward to raising funds for their music therapy and to raising their profile in Enfield.

### **6. Primary Schools**

The Mayor had been delighted that two Enfield primary schools, Eversley and Worcester's, had been recognised as centres of excellence in this year's Parliamentary Review. Both of these maintained schools had been graded as outstanding by Ofsted and had contributed to school improvement across the borough.

The Mayor had been delighted that the Queen, in her New Year's Honours list, had awarded an OBE to Marva Rollins, Headteacher at Raynham Primary School, for the outstanding contribution she had made to education. Marva had been Headteacher at Raynham for 17 years, and has worked tirelessly to put teams and systems in place to ensure that children in one of the poorest areas in the country received an education that increased their chances of moving out of poverty.

Marva Rollins was presented with a bouquet of flowers.

### **7. Holocaust Memorial Day**

Finally the Mayor said that she had been very honoured and moved to attend the Holocaust Memorial Day Commemoration at City Hall on Monday 23 January 2017, with Sadiq Khan, the Mayor of London, and Councillors Derek Levy and Daniel Anderson.

She also reminded members about the Enfield Holocaust Memorial Day Commemoration due to take place on the following evening and said that she hoped to see many of them there.

## **8. Future Engagements**

- Enfield Sounds Great LIVE Event - 5th February 2017, at the Chickenshed Theatre. Tickets would be available from the Chickenshed box office. She hoped that this would be a wonderful event involving local Enfield musicians coming together to support the Mayor's charity.
- A St Patrick's Eve Fundraiser - 16th March 2017 with local musicians.
- The Mayors Ball – 25 March 2017 at the Royal Chase Hotel. Tickets were now on sale. Lisa McEwan would have some in the Mayor's Parlour if anyone wanted to buy one that evening.
- Dick Whittington Walk – the Mayor would be walking with all the London mayors in aid of her charity, starting at the Whittington Hospital and finishing at Mansion House, with the Mayor of Islington providing light refreshments. The Mayor said that she would appreciate members' sponsorship and that Lisa McEwan would have sponsorship forms available, in the parlour, after the meeting.
- Finally in celebration of Burns Night, "a wee bit of haggis" would be served in the parlour, that evening.

The Mayor reminded members that the meeting had a timed agenda, and that she would inform the chamber 10 minutes before the end of the time allocated for each section, so that members were aware of the need to sum-up.

The Mayor also asked that members, in order to keep as much as possible to the timings, be aware of their conduct during the meeting, and said that she expected that they would behave courteously and respectfully to each other and herself as Mayor. She added "please remember when you are rude to me as the first citizen you are rude to all the residents of Enfield".

She asked that members were mindful of the requests she made as Mayor, to ensure the smooth running of the meeting, and that if there was behaviour which she considered to be disruptive to the business of the meeting, she would have no recourse but to ask that that member leave.

A comfort break would be announced at a suitable time in the proceedings, around 8.30pm.

## **4**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 NOVEMBER 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2016 were agreed as a correct record, with an amendment to the figure in Item 23 AGREED 2 which should read £21.44m.

**5**

**APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali Bakir and Turgut Esendagli.

**6**

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Before inviting members to declare any interests, the Mayor asked Asmat Hussain (Monitoring Officer) to make a short statement regarding a mayoral dispensation and the declaration of interests requirements, in relation to Item 8 (Council Tax Support Scheme and Tax Base).

The Monitoring Officer reported that the Councillor Conduct Committee had agreed a dispensation for Councillor Bernadette Lappage, as the Mayor, for all the Council meetings during her year of office 2016/17.

This dispensation was in relation to item 10 on the part one and item 20 on the part two agenda, the Council's main investment decision in energetik!, and was in regard to her disclosable pecuniary interest arising because of her husband's position at the North London Waste Authority.

The Monitoring Officer also reported that, in accordance with guidance from the Secretary of State, there was no requirement for members to declare disclosable pecuniary interests in Item 8 on the agenda, even though they may pay council tax within the borough, or may be in receipt of council tax support.

She advised that there was, however, a legal requirement for any member who was two months or more in arrears on their Council Tax to declare that fact and not vote on any issue that could affect the calculation of the budget or council tax more specifically. No declarations were made in this respect.

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

- Councillor Achilleas Georgiou declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to item 10 on the part 1 and item 20 on the part 2 agenda concerning the Council's Main Investment Decision in energetik!. He left the meeting during the discussion on this item and did not vote.
- Councillors Alan Sitkin, Doug Taylor and Ahmet Oykenner declared non pecuniary interests in relation to item 10 and 20 as Councillor Sitkin was the chair and the others were members of the energetik! board.

**7**

**OPPOSITION BUSINESS - THE POOR CONTROL OF THE COUNCIL'S FINANCES AND SERVICE DELIVERY**

Councillor Neville introduced the issues paper, prepared by the Opposition Group.

Issues highlighted were as follows:

1. That it was necessary for all councillors, not just the majority group, to have confidence in the control and management of the Council's finances. The opposition group had no such confidence. They were concerned about the £8m, now £7.2m, projected over spend. Decreases had been promised but had not occurred.
2. While acknowledging that some parts of the over spend were due to spending demands in demand led services, others were not.
3. The Opposition Group had concerns about the high levels of Council borrowing which were now significantly higher than they had been in 2010. They felt that the capital programme was being added to in an unplanned way and that if there had been better financial planning during the Labour administration's first term, the Council would not be in the current situation.
4. Reference was made to report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management to the Audit Committee in July 2016 which had identified some failings across the Council. He cited Property Services as an example: the report had indicated that the Council had no corporate asset management strategy, no performance management framework and that income targets had not been informed by strategic objectives. Whilst these issues had subsequently been addressed, it was felt that there were still issues around shortfalls in rents, benefits paid out to people who were not entitled, mismanagement of payments to those with no recourse to public funds, business resilience and private sector leasing.
5. In his view, Cabinet members appeared to have done nothing to address these issues and had showed no clear sense of direction. Criticising the Government was not felt to be the answer. Even if the Government were to blame, he felt that officers should still be called to account to address failings of financial management within the Council.
6. The Opposition were calling for an immediate response and for a special meeting to be arranged to discuss how to bring down the over spend in the three areas listed in the Opposition Business Paper. He felt that Cabinet members should be taking action, the capital programme should be more carefully planned and a business plan put in place.

## **COUNCIL - 25.1.2017**

Councillor Lemonides, Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

1. A large amount of work, to eliminate the over spend, was going on behind the scenes that opposition members might not be aware of. The deficit had been discussed in great detail in many meetings including at the Corporate Management Board and between directors and their lead cabinet members.
2. Since 2003/4, as a result of “damping”, the Council had lost over £100m. If the Council had received this money they would not have had to borrow - the cost of the borrowing was equivalent to the cost of the over spend.
3. The Council had had to balance rationing and efficiencies and finding innovative ways to provide services against declining Government funding. Earlier planning would only have meant more rationing, less innovative ways of saving money, more inappropriate schools, more taxes or more cuts.
4. It was not possible to use capital to hide deficits. The cost of an asset cannot exceed its worth.
5. The Council had undergone huge changes in the last few years as a result of the reduction in funding including the introduction of the internal hubs and the loss of 40% of Council staff.
6. Councillor Neville had been selective in the way that he had quoted from the Audit and Risk report. Management had responded positively to the recommendations highlighted in the report. Internal Audit had tracked the progress made to implement the agreed actions to address the risks.
7. Positive assurance opinions were provided for seven of nine key financial systems audited in 2015/16, including high assurance for three key systems: payroll, national non-domestic rates (NNDR) and housing benefits/discretionary housing payments. In addition, a review of housing rents provided high assurance over the collection of rental income. Action plans for improvement are being developed with each of the service areas, where required. If there had been any serious issues, the accounts would have been qualified, which they were not.
8. The Capital Programme was planned. The Council was investing to save by borrowing to purchase assets, to build new houses, to invest in heat networks. Housing Gateway was providing homes for homeless people and saving money on overnight rents. The Council was also looking at ways to make people more self-sufficient.
9. The Council had suffered from migration from wealthy London boroughs, exporting their problems to poorer Outer London boroughs.

10. The Council had balanced the books in 2015/16 and would also do so in 2016/17 as it was required to do by law. The Government should be going after the rich and increasing corporation tax, not using local government as a scape goat for adult social care.

Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:

- a. The need highlighted by the members of the Opposition Group:
- To acknowledge that it was the Labour party in 2010 which had left the country with no money. When the Conservative administration had lost power there had been £70m in reserves, which had since been wasted on projects such as the Residents Priority Fund.
  - To acknowledge that if there had been better planning there would be less of a deficit and that more detail should be provided on how it would be covered.
  - To highlight concern about the waste of money on communications, depletion of the Council's reserves and increased borrowing.
  - To acknowledge that the Opposition was committed to campaigning for fairer funding for Enfield and had acknowledged that demand led adult social services created pressures on funding.
  - To recognise that it was not just rich Conservative Inner London boroughs that were exporting people to Enfield but also rich Inner London Labour boroughs.
- b. The need highlighted by members of the Majority Group:
- To acknowledge the huge cut backs in Government funding since 2010 which had led to the decimation of Council services, despite the efforts of the administration to meet peoples' needs and preserve services while maintaining standards and making ends meet.
  - To recognise that most Cabinet members already met weekly with their directors, regularly monitoring budgets, assessing risks and controlling expenditure.
  - To acknowledge the demographic changes in the borough.
  - To acknowledge that Enfield was providing what were recognised as excellent services such as those for vulnerable children, despite having one of the lowest spend per child, for which the department and all involved were to be congratulated.
  - To recognise that statutory duties could not be avoided or the events that gave rise to them controlled. More and more duties were being placed on local government.

Councillor Alessandro Georgiou proposed and Councillor Neville seconded a proposal to increase the amount of time for discussion on this item by 10 minutes. This was not agreed.



At the end of the debate Councillor Neville summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group as follows:

He felt that no real answers had been provided on the financial issues under discussion and said that he had not been convinced by the arguments put forward. More needed to be done to control the Council's finances. It was not sufficient to note reports, members should be taking decisions. The over spend had been projected since July 2016, mismanagement was not acceptable and was he felt partly responsible for the current situation.

Councillor Taylor then summed up on behalf of the majority group commenting on the recommendations in the Opposition Business Paper by saying that:

The money in reserves was there to cover hard times according to Councillor Hurer so it was sensible to use it now. Two thirds of London boroughs were also showing overspends due to demand pressures. He wanted the Opposition to be mandated to indicate what services they believed should be cut when they discussed the budget for 2017/18 next month if they were taking their role seriously. The situation was challenging, but the administration was working to keep services and in his opinion was managing the budget effectively, despite being penalised by government. He did not agree with the recommendations in the Opposition Business paper.

As an outcome of the debate Councillor Neville requested that a roll call vote be taken on the recommendations within the Opposition Priority Business Paper. The Mayor refused a roll call vote but allowed that names would be recorded in the minutes. The outcome of the vote was as follows:

For: 22

Councillor Celebi  
Councillor Chamberlain  
Councillor Jason Charalambous  
Councillor David-Sanders  
Councillor Delman  
Councillor Dines  
Councillor Fallart  
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou  
Councillor E Hayward  
Councillor R Hayward  
Councillor Hurer  
Councillor Jukes  
Councillor Laban  
Councillor Lavender  
Councillor Milne  
Councillor Neville  
Councillor AM Pearce  
Councillor D Pearce  
Councillor Rye

**COUNCIL - 25.1.2017**

Councillor Smith  
Councillor Steven  
Councillor Vince

Against: 35

Councillor Abdullahi  
Councillor Anderson  
Councillor Barry  
Councillor Bond  
Councillor Brett  
Councillor A Cazimoglu  
Councillor N Cazimoglu  
Councillor B Charalambous  
Councillor Chibbah  
Councillor Dogan  
Councillor Doyle  
Councillor During  
Councillor Ekechi  
Councillor Fonyonga  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou  
Councillor Hasan  
Councillor Hurman  
Councillor Jemal  
Councillor Jiagge  
Councillor Keazor  
Councillor Kepez  
Councillor Lemonides  
Councillor Levy  
Councillor Maguire  
Councillor McGowan  
Councillor Orhan  
Councillor Oykenner  
Councillor Pite  
Councillor Savva  
Councillor Sitkin  
Councillor Simon  
Councillor Stafford  
Councillor Stewart  
Councillor Taylor  
Councillor Uzoanya

Abstentions: 1

Councillor Erbil

**AGREED** not to approve the following recommendations within the Opposition  
Priority Business Paper:

**Recommendations**

1. That without further delay the Cabinet, prepares and presents at the Council meeting on 28 February 2017, being the Council Tax setting meeting, a separate report with clear proposals for the management of the projected overspend for what is left of this financial year, and for preventing a similar occurrence in the ensuing financial year.
2. That Individual Cabinet Members, particularly in those areas where overspends are occurring, monitor their departmental spending on at least a monthly basis, giving direction as to taking avoiding action.
3. That the Capital Programme should, going forward be much more carefully planned, and that requires both Directors and Cabinet Members to ensure that they have effectively a business plan in place and that they stick to it except in the most exceptional and urgent circumstances, and until such time as improved and more careful planning is put into place there will be no further increase in the council's overall borrowing".

## **8**

### **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Stewart moved and Councillor Ekechi seconded a proposal under paragraph 2.2(B) of the Council procedure rules to change the order of items on the agenda so that item 10 be taken at the end of the meeting, after item 18. Thirty minutes within the time allocated for the meeting would be set aside for discussion on this item.

The change in the order was agreed without a vote.

The minutes reflect the order of the agenda.

## **9**

### **COUNCIL TAX AND COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME FOR 2017/18 AND BUSINESS RATE BASE 2017/18**

Councillor Lemonides proposed and Councillor Levy seconded the report from Executive Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services reviewing and seeking approval to changes to in the local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2017/18, which the Council is required to produce under section 12A(a) and meeting 1A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The report also recommended the 2017/18 Council tax and business rate bases.

### **NOTED**

1. This had to be agreed before the 31 January 2017.
2. The report recommended an increase in the minimum contribution for working age households not in a protected group to 26.5%. This was in line with wider funding reductions and to ensure that the scheme was self-funding.

3. This was an opportunity to simplify the administration in anticipation of the introduction of universal credit. Residents will be consulted further in 2017/18.
4. There had been an increase of 726 properties in the borough. The business rate income was estimated to increase by £3.9m to £114,166,246. Enfield's rate retention share would be £34,249,874, an increase of £1.2m.
5. The Opposition Leader's acceptance of the report.
6. Some concern about what was seen as an unprecedented attack by Government on all local government, taking away funding and adding responsibilities.

The recommendations were then put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

**AGREED**

1. To approve the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2017/18 to provide financial support for households on low incomes in paying their Council Tax taking into account the consultation responses (Appendix C) and the Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix B).
2. For the 2017/18 scheme, the minimum contribution for working age households not in a protected group will increase from 25% to 26.5% to ensure the scheme retains the principle of a fully-funded scheme.
3. There are also statutory regulation amendments and national uprating of social security benefit rates that have been incorporated into the scheme as set out in Section 6 in the report.
4. Pursuant to this report (see Appendix D for full detail) and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of the Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the London Borough of Enfield as its Council Tax Base for 2017/18 shall be 95,043 Band D equivalents.
5. To approve the Department for Communities and Local Government NNDR1 Business Rate base return for 2017/18 (Appendix E).
6. To approve the amendment to the discretionary rate relief scheme as set out at 2.2 of Appendix E to the report.

In accordance with the requirements introduced in February 2014, under the Standing Order Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken in relation to decisions 1-6 above, given their relevance to the budget setting process, with the result as follows:

For 52

Councillor Abdul Abdullahi

**COUNCIL - 25.1.2017**

Councillor Daniel Anderson  
Councillor Dinah Barry  
Councillor Chris Bond  
Councillor Yasemin Brett  
Councillor Alev Cazimoglu  
Councillor Nesil Cazimoglu  
Councillor Erin Celebi  
Councillor Lee Chamberlain  
Councillor Bambos Charalambous  
Councillor Katherine Chibah  
Councillor Lee David-Sanders  
Councillor Dogan Delman  
Councillor Nick Dines  
Councillor Guney Dogan  
Councillor Sarah Doyle  
Councillor Christiana During  
Councillor Pat Ekechi  
Councillor Nesimi Erbil  
Councillor Peter Fallart  
Councillor Krystle Fonyonga  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou  
Councillor Christine Hamilton  
Councillor Ahmet Hasan  
Councillor Elaine Hayward  
Councillor Robert Hayward  
Councillor Ertan Hurer  
Councillor Suna Hurman  
Councillor Jansev Jemal  
Councillor Doris Jiagge  
Councillor Eric Jukes  
Councillor Nneka Keazor  
Councillor Michael Lavender  
Councillor Derek Levy  
Councillor Mary Maguire  
Councillor Andy Milne  
Councillor Terence Neville  
Councillor Ayfer Orhan  
Councillor Ahmet Oykenen  
Councillor Anne Marie Pearce  
Councillor Daniel Pearce  
Councillor Vicki Pite  
Councillor Michael Rye  
Councillor George Savva  
Councillor Toby Simon  
Councillor Alan Sitkin  
Councillor Edward Smith  
Councillor Andrew Stafford  
Councillor Claire Stewart  
Councillor Jim Steven  
Councillor Doug Taylor

Councillor Glynis Vince

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

**10**

**PROPOSED SUBMISSION EDMONTON LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN**

Councillor Sitkin proposed and Councillor Savva seconded the report of the Executive Director of Regeneration and Environment on the proposed submission of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action plan.

**NOTED**

1. The name of the plan had changed from Central Leaside to Edmonton Leaside. Other changes, since 2014, when the plan was first produced for consultation, included Meridian Water achieving "Housing Zone" status, an increase in the number of homes for Meridian Water from 6,000 to 10,000 and the number of jobs from 3,000 to 6,700.
2. The plan was now more aspirational, notable progress had been made in assembling the sites to allow development for more mixed uses, there had been a shift to a higher economic base, increasing efforts made to improve the environment and cycling infrastructure, a new job centre and a new primary care facility included in the plans.
3. Enfield was open for business, even in difficult times for local government. The Council was supporting regeneration in the Eastern part of the borough; two new schools, leisure and culture facilities, better access were planned as well as the new primary care facility. The whole project, one of the biggest in London, was being supported by leaders of the community, local colleges and schools, and a premier league football club.
4. The qualified support of Opposition for the plan, which while welcoming the regeneration proposals had concerns as follows:
  - a. About the impact on the areas surrounding Meridian Water and the increased congestion on already heavily congested roads also resulting in a build-up in pollution affecting residents' health and wellbeing.
  - b. That more needed to be done to resolve the pressure on the roads, particularly those running North/East to avoid creating gridlock in other parts of the borough.
  - c. That many of the proposals were unfunded and un-prioritised.
  - d. The lack of progress on obtaining four tracking along the main railway line - three tracks were not felt to be sufficient - which was unfunded and now linked to the development of Crossrail 2.

This was seen as a major risk to the viability of the whole Meridian Water project.

- e. The impact on existing businesses especially those which would have to be relocated as a result of proposals in the plan.
  - f. The suspension of three staff working at Barratt Homes. However the Council had received a written response assuring them that these people had not been involved in any way with the Enfield proposals.
  - g. The lack of progress in securing the sites in Meridian Water and the delays to the start of the building works. Local residents needed more certainty.
  - h. That Housing Zone status should have been achieved earlier.
5. Councillor Sitkin summed up. He thanked Councillor David-Sanders for his support, acknowledging the concerns about congestion, but pointing out that the introduction of cycle lanes would reduce car use. He also highlighted the lack of support from the Opposition when lobbying for the 4 trains an hour and the introduction of Crossrail 2. Remediation works had already begun.

Following the discussion, the recommendations were put to the vote and agreed with the following result.

**AGREED**

For 36

Against: 0

Abstentions: 21

- 1. 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.
- 2. To note that Cabinet had agreed at its meeting on 14 December 2016 that:
  - a. The Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development be delegated authority to agree the publication of the supporting and supplementary documents (assessment and supporting evidence base documents) of the Proposed Submission Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan.
  - b. The Executive Director of Regeneration & Environment be delegated authority to make appropriate changes to the Submission version of the Edmonton Leaside AAP 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 will be considered by the Local Plan Cabinet Sub Committee.

Following this item the meeting was suspended for a 10 minute comfort break.

Councillors Rye and Vince left the meeting at this point as they felt unwell.

## **11**

### **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Stewart moved and Councillor Ekechi seconded a proposal under paragraph 2.2(B) of the Council procedure rules to change the order of items on the agenda so that item 12.5 would be taken next and followed by item 12.4. The minutes reflect the order of items on the agenda.

## **12**

### **THE COUNCIL'S MAIN INVESTMENT DECISION IN ENERGETIK**

Councillor Sitkin moved and Councillor Fonyonga seconded the report of the Executive Director Regeneration and Environment seeking approval for the Council's main investment decision in energetik. (Report No: 175)

#### **NOTED**

1. This report was considered in conjunction with report No 180 on the part 2 agenda.
2. The view of the majority group that was a fantastic initiative which had widespread support: the entrepreneurial leadership in bringing this forward was saluted.
3. The proposal was for a high specification, high quality, sustainable, high social value, piece of infrastructure which had been professionally appraised by an independent board and KPMG. Significant work had been done to mitigate and manage any risks and to ensure that the business would operate on a solid footing. More financial detail was provided in the part 2 section of the meeting.
4. Members were informed that the project would bring significant economic, social, environmental and public health benefits, reducing air pollution by moving to low carbon. It would also reduce health inequalities, reducing the cost of energy and resulting fuel poverty which would be particularly beneficial to those on low incomes. Consequences also included alleviating respiratory diseases and improving mental health. The security of supply must be a benefit.
5. The business assumptions behind the scheme had been very conservative and the associated risks had been evaluated by an



independent board and KPMG. The project had the support of the GLA and was consistent with Government policy.

6. The priority of the Council was to reduce the cost of housing, rent and sale prices with clean green and affordable energy. Residents of Montmorency Park, formerly the Ladderswood Estate, would be the first customers to benefit from the scheme which would also cover Meridian Water, the Alma Estate and the Ponders End Electric Quarter.
7. The concerns of the Opposition Group that there be an acknowledgement that district heating systems, although reducing greenhouse gasses, did have downsides and risks.
  - Many existing schemes had poor customer service records. District heat networks were monopoly suppliers and heating costs could be uncompetitive. If things went wrong energy could become more and more expensive. If the back-up gas fired boiler had to be used, the promised reduction in greenhouse gasses would not be achieved. High technical standards would increase costs and may not resolve anticipated problems or prevent heat loss. If the system broke down, hundreds would be affected. The customer would end up paying any increased costs.
  - A recent "Which" report had been critical of district heating systems because of widespread customer dissatisfaction, system breakdowns, high charges - some were paying more than 25% more than those on standard gas tariffs. Customer complaint handling was also poor.
  - It was important to ensure fair service level agreements and transparent prices.
8. In summing up, Councillor Sitkin said that some of the risks mentioned by the Opposition had arisen as a result of poor construction which would not apply in this case. Energetik would be treating their customers well and customers would have the option of complaining to the Customer Complaints Ombudsman if they were not happy.

Following the discussion, the recommendations in the report were put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 36  
Against: 17  
Abstentions: 0

**AGREED** to note the recommendations which had been agreed by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January 2017.

Councillor Achilleas Georgiou declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, left the meeting when the item was discussed and did not vote.

Councillors Alan Sitkin, Doug Taylor and Ahmet Oykenner declared non pecuniary interests in relation to item 10 and 20 as Councillor Sitkin was the chair and the others were members of the energetik board. They remained in the meeting during discussion of the item and were able to vote.

### **13**

#### **CHANGES TO ARRANGEMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITORS**

RECEIVED the report from the Executive Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services seeking approval for changes to the arrangements for the appointment of external auditors.

#### **AGREED**

1. To note the options appraisal set out in this report for appointing the external auditor by 31 December 2017.
2. To approve the recommendation of the Executive Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services that the Council should opt in to the sector led body approach, and that the external auditor for the Council and for the pension fund from 2018/19 should be appointed by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd.

To note that the Opposition Group had indicated that, if there had been a vote, they would have voted in support of these recommendations.

### **14**

#### **MOTIONS**

##### **Motion 12.5 In the name of Councillor Alev Cazimoglu:**

"The British Red Cross has said that the NHS is experiencing a "humanitarian Crisis."

The NHS has seen the largest financial squeeze in its history and £4.6 billion has been cut from Social Care.

A third of hospitals have declared they needed urgent help to deal with the number of patients coming through the doors, including The North Middlesex University Hospital which has seen unprecedented demand on its services, resulting in the hospital being forced recently to divert ambulances from the Trust. This is a crisis for Enfield residents.

Accident and Emergency (A&E) departments have turned patients away more than 143 times between 1 December 2016 and 1st January 2017.

The Health and Social Care system needs immediate intervention to deal with the current crisis and a long term plan to stabilise Social Care.

This Council instructs the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition to send a joint letter, on behalf of Enfield residents, seeking the Government's urgent intervention in order to fix this crisis. This must include an increase in Government funding for both the NHS and Adult Social Care in Enfield."

Following the debate the motion was put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 36

Against: 17

Abstentions: 0

**Motion 12.4 In the name of Councillor George Savva:**

"This Council would welcome a new stance by the Government to increase infrastructure spend (as widely reported) to boost the economy, in contrast to the austerity position of the last leader of the Conservative government.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Inform residents of the impact of the Government's austerity measures upon their well-being.
2. Encourage the Government to increase funding of local authorities as the ideally positioned public bodies to best serve local people to increase their well-being and to develop the local infrastructure.
3. Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Prime Minister bringing to her attention that there should be fair funding for Enfield Council and the added value that this Council can bring for the residents of Enfield."

Following a debate the recommendations in the motion were put to the vote and agreed.

NOTED that the Opposition Group voted against recommendations 1 and 2 but in favour of recommendation 3 which was therefore agreed unanimously.

**DURATION OF THE TIME ALLOCATED FOR MOTIONS**

The Mayor advised at this stage of the meeting that the time available for motions had now elapsed, so Council procedure rule 9 would apply.

NOTED that in accordance with Council procedure rule 9 the remaining motions lapsed due to lack of time.

**Motion 12.1 In the name of Councillor Anne Marie Pearce:**

“This Council is concerned that with the rise in population in Enfield, ever increasing demands are being placed on our local health services. Successive governments have failed to recognise that 'fair funding' has not supported local health services to the necessary levels. In comparison with neighbouring boroughs in the North Central London Sector, Enfield is under-funded. For example, Camden, with a population of 260,000 gets an NHS grant of £372 million, while Enfield receives £10 million less with the higher population of 320,000.

The Council instructs the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care together with the Shadow Cabinet Member to write jointly to the Secretary of State for Health requesting him to review the funding mechanism and allocate available monies in a more equal manner across London. The Council also calls upon Enfield's three Members of Parliament to support the Council in seeking a revision of the formula.”

**Motion 12.2 In the name of Councillor Alessandro Georgiou:**

“The people of the United Kingdom have voted to leave the European Union. Therefore the Council resolves that the flag of the EU should be removed from the flag pole on the civic centre premises and replaced with the Union Flag of the United Kingdom's of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.”

**Motion 12.3 In the name of Councillor Alessandro Georgiou:**

“This Council resolves that the National Anthem of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should have time reserved to be sung during the beginning of each Full Council Meeting.”

**Motion 12.6 In the name of Councillor Terry Neville:**

“Borough residents were once again exposed to an unnecessary and pointless 24 hour strike on the London Underground, including the Piccadilly Line locally, which brought chaos to our capital and put extra pressure on other transport services. As with previous disputes this strike served only to inflict the maximum inconvenience and misery on hard working Londoners trying to get to and from their place of work.

The Council condemns the actions of the Transport Unions involved, and calls upon the Government to fully implement the relevant provisions of the Trade Union Act 2016 to further restrict the ability to take industrial action in the public transport sector.”

**15**

**COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME**

**1.1 Urgent Questions**

There were no urgent questions.

## **1.2 Questions by Councillors**

NOTED

1. The thirty eight questions on the Council agenda and written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Members.
2. The following supplementary questions and responses received, for the questions indicated below:

### **Question 1 (Autumn Statement - £100 billion increase in borrowing) from Councillor Maguire to Councillor Taylor, Leader of the Council**

“Does the Leader recall statements made in 2010 by the Conservative Government that we were “all in this together”? Is he not sick and tired of being lectured by the party opposite about managing cuts? Does he agree that we are now in a situation where Government debt is up, the rich are richer and the poor poorer and local government is in crisis through lack of funds? Does he not agree that the people of Enfield would be better served if the party opposite turned their fire and bile on their own Government for their financial mismanagement?”

### **Reply from Councillor Taylor**

“This is a point well made. The Conservatives economic policy mantra was that they would bring the deficit down and balance the budget. The deficit has now increased to £122 billion, 90% of GDP (Gross Domestic Product) – What a mess. This is nine years after the Leman Brothers collapse. I agree that this Government is a shambles and should resign”.

### **Question 2 (Blue Badge Fraud) from Councillor Neville to Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

“Who enforces blue badge use?”

### **Reply from Councillor Anderson**

This is an issue. Since 2010, when the Labour administration took office, significant cuts have been made to Council funding. Up until 2012 the Council had a full time officer with admin support. Now, because of the cuts, we only have 0.2 full time officers – a much reduced resource. However we have now managed to make efficiencies and have maintained the level of prosecutions as before.

**Question 5 (Housing options for adults with disabilities) from Councillor Ekechi to Councillor A Cazimoglu, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care**

“Can the Cabinet Member tell the Council more about the extra care housing scheme for older adults with learning difficulties?”

**Reply from Councillor A Cazimoglu**

“Desmond Court, a housing scheme for older people with learning difficulties, has been much improved and is now fully accessible. It is a socially inclusive scheme, a flexible alternative to residential care which recently been shortlisted for a Housing Innovation Award.”

**Question 6 (Primary School Performance) from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Education, Children’s Services and Protection**

“Is Councillor Orhan proud of the parlous state in which she has left Enfield’s primary schools?”

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

“I reject the basis of this question. It is shameful. The Government has deleted £3m from the School Improvement budget which is for you to answer for not I”.

**Question 8 (Reading, Writing and Maths Primary School Performance) from Councillor Alessandro Georgiou to Councillor Orhan, Cabinet Member for Education, Children’s Services and Protection**

“Is Councillor Orhan proud of the fact that, although we are not only borough not to improve in reading, writing and arithmetic, is she proud of the results that have been released recently? Yes or No?”

**Reply from Councillor Orhan**

“I am very proud of the progress made by our young people despite the tremendous cuts to the education budgets. Across the country there has been a huge dip in the results in all types of schools including private schools. The Government is conducting a shameful experiment, setting a bar and framework threshold which are designed to enable poorer families and their children to fail. That is shameful.”

**Question 9 (Meridian Water and Small and Medium Sized Enterprises) from Councillor Chibbah to Councillor Sitkin, Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development**

“What steps are being taken to maximise direct employment in Meridian Water?”

**Reply from Councillor Sitkin**

Meridian Water will create permanent jobs as well as 10,000 construction jobs over the next 18-20 years. We are also looking at direct employment and I would like to refer the Council to the built environment training centre and its work.

**Question 10 (Litter and fly tipping in Turkey Street) Councillor Fallart to Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment**

“Could Councillor Anderson provide a list of the people who have been prosecuted for fly tipping in the area?”

**Reply from Councillor Anderson**

Councillor Anderson agreed to provide a written response.

**Question 11 (Encouraging the Voluntary Sector to bid for external grants) Councillor N Cazimoglu to Councillor Brett, Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture**

“How is the Council supporting arts organisations?”

**Reply from Councillor Brett**

“The Council is supporting a good many arts organisations. Including Art Start and the Chickenshed Theatre, and a number of other organisations which provide opportunities for inclusion, allowing young people to express themselves. This is despite cutbacks and reverses.

**16**

**INDEPENDENT PERSON - EXTENSION OF TERM OF APPOINTMENT**

Councillor Stewart moved and Councillor Alessandro Georgiou seconded the report of the Executive Director Finance, Resources and Customer Services recommending a two year extension to the appointment of Sarah Jewell, Independent Person.

NOTED

1. The Councillor Conduct Committee had recommended the extension at their meeting on 7 December 2017.
2. The thanks of the Councillor Conduct Committee Chair, Councillor Stewart, to Sarah Jewell for her excellent work.

**AGREED** to extend the term of appointment of Sarah Jewell (Independent Person) by two years to 8 October 2018.

**17**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

**AGREED** to confirm the following changes to Committee Memberships:

- **Green Belt Forum** – Councillor Chamberlain to replace Councillor David Sanders
- **Pension Board** – Councillor Barry to step down as chair to be replaced by name to be notified.

**POST MEETING NOTE** Councillor McGowan to replace Councillor Barry as Chair of the Pension Board.

**18**

**NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

There were no changes to nominations on outside bodies.

**19**

**CALLED IN DECISIONS**

No called in decisions were discussed.

**20**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next Council meeting will be Tuesday 28 February 2017.

**21**

**EXTENSION OF THE TIME AVAILABLE FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING**

Councillor Stewart proposed and Councillor Ekechi seconded a proposal (under paragraph 9.2 of the Council Procedure Rules) that the time allowed for the Council meeting be extended by 30 minutes to enable discussion on the energetik! report on the part 2 agenda.

This was agreed without a vote.

**22**

**EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**AGREED** in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for consideration of Item 1 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**

**THE COUNCIL'S MAIN INVESTMENT DECISION IN ENERGETIK**

Councillor Sitkin moved and Councillor Lemonides seconded the part 2 report (Report No: 180A) of the Executive Director Regeneration and Environment on the Council's main investment decision in energetik.

**NOTED**

1. The report was considered in conjunction with item 9 report No: 156A on the part 1 agenda.
2. That Cabinet had approved the recommendations in the report including the business plan at their meeting on 18 January 2017, before referring the investment decision on to Council.
3. The supporting detailed information on the finances behind the investment proposals, the conservative estimates on the level of return expected based on fixed costs and the expert opinion that the Council should go ahead with the scheme.
4. That the scheme was financially viable and would be built to enable a doubling of capacity for future growth.
5. The concerns of the Opposition, while not opposed to the concept:
  - In relation to the finances and the ultimate risk to the Council taxpayer.
  - The risks because of the current uncertainties in the world and the economy.
  - The dependence of the project on Meridian Water being built as planned.
  - The lack of provider choice for consumers.
  - The lack of democratic transparency and accountability.
  - The lack of a role for the Opposition in the companies.
6. The view that there is a need for local authorities to be enterprising, to take the initiative, to do new things as far as is reasonable in the interests of the local residents and council tax payers.
7. Councillor Sitkin summed up by saying that the project was an investment in the future and would produce the highest dividends with the lowest rate of physical capital, saying that building society costs money. He commended the report to Council.

## **COUNCIL - 25.1.2017**

Following the discussion a vote was taken with the following result and the recommendations agreed:

For: 34

Against: 17 - The Opposition had asked that their names be recorded.

Councillor Celebi  
Councillor Chamberlain  
Councillor Jason Charalambous  
Councillor David-Sanders  
Councillor Delman  
Councillor Dines  
Councillor Fallart  
Councillor Alessandro Georgiou  
Councillor E Hayward  
Councillor R Hayward  
Councillor Hurer  
Councillor Jukes  
Councillor Laban  
Councillor Lavender  
Councillor Milne  
Councillor Neville  
Councillor AM Pearce  
Councillor D Pearce  
Councillor Smith  
Councillor Steven

**AGREED** to approve, following recommendation by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January 2017:

1. The addition to the Council's capital programme, as set out in detail in the part 2 report.
2. The addition to the indicative capital programme as set out in detail in the part 2 report. This will be subject to further reports to Cabinet.

Councillor Achilleas Georgiou declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, left the meeting when the item was discussed and did not vote.

Councillors Alan Sitkin, Doug Taylor and Ahmet Oykenner declared non pecuniary interests in relation to item 10 and 20 as Councillor Sitkin was the chair and the others were members of the energetik board. They remained in the meeting during discussion of the item and were able to vote.

## **24**

### **DURATION OF THE COUNCIL MEETING**

The Mayor advised, at this stage of the meeting, that the time available to complete the agenda had now elapsed so Council Procedure Rule 9 would apply.

**COUNCIL - 25.1.2017**

NOTED that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 (page 4-8 – Part 4), the remaining items of business on the Council agenda were considered without debate.

The only remaining item was Item 11 Changes to the Arrangements for the Appointment of External Auditors.