

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 29 JANUARY 2020**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Kate Anolue (Mayor), Sabri Ozaydin (Deputy Mayor) Huseyin Akpinar, Mahmut Aksanoglu, Maria Alexandrou, Daniel Anderson, Tolga Aramaz, Guner Aydin, Dinah Barry, Ian Barnes, Mahym Bedekova, Sinan Boztas, Anne Brown, Alev Cazimoglu, Nesil Caliskan, Mustafa Cetinkaya, Katherine Chibah, Will Coleshill, Lee David-Sanders, Birsen Demirel, Clare De Silva, Chris Dey, Elif Erbil, Ergin Erbil, Susan Erbil, Ergun Eren, Achilleas Georgiou, Alessandro Georgiou, Margaret Greer, Charith Gunawardena, Christine Hamilton, Ahmet Hasan, Elaine Hayward, James Hockney, Stephanos Ioannou, Rick Jewell, Nneka Keazor, Joanne Laban, Bernadette Lappage, Dino Lemonides, Tim Leaver, Derek Levy, Mary Maguire, Andy Milne, Gina Needs, Terence Neville OBE JP, Ayfer Orhan, Ahmet Oyken, , Lindsay Rawlings, Michael Rye OBE, George Savva MBE, Edward Smith, Jim Steven, Claire Stewart, Doug Taylor, Mahtab Uddin, Glynis Vince and Hass Yusuf

**ABSENT** Saray Karakus, Chris Bond, Yasemin Brett, Guney Dogan and Vicki Pite

**1**

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

The Mayor's Chaplain was unable to attend the meeting.

**2**

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

**1. Mayor's Announcements**

- 1.1 The Mayor began by wishing everyone a happy new year, hoping they had had a good Christmas and a safe journey when travelling.
- 1.2 The Mayor expressed her sadness about the death of a good friend of 30 years that she had lost recently.
- 1.3 The Mayor hoped that the Mayor's Charity would raise lots of money to help vulnerable people.
- 1.4 The Mayor was planning to arrange a visit from the Mayor of Gladbeck in Germany. On 5 May 2020 it would be 50 years since the town twinning arrangement between Enfield and Gladbeck had been set up,

but, up until now, the Mayor of Gladbeck had never been invited to Enfield. She planned to make up by arranging a programme of events and visits to show the Gladbeck mayor some of the best places in Enfield. The visit would celebrate the 50 years of the association between the places.

- 1.5 In March the Mayor would be taking part in International Women's Day celebrating the achievements of some wonderful women. She asked members to put forward some suggestions of achievements to mark.

## **2. Young Mayor's Speech**

The Young Mayor, Mr Okan Gurhan, updated members on the work he and the deputy young mayor were doing, visiting schools in Enfield, talking about who they were, their goals and helping to inspire younger children.

In April they planned an event called the Big Speech to involve year 8 pupils.

*The meeting was suspended at this point due to a climate change protest by members of Extinction Rebellion.*

## **3**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 NOVEMBER 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

## **4**

### **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bond, Brett, Dogan, Karakus and Pite and for lateness from Councillors Alessandro Georgiou and Levy.

## **5**

### **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Jeremy Chambers made a statement in relation to declarations on the Council Tax reports.

"In accordance with guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government, there is no requirement for members to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to items 7 and 8.

The exception to this being any councillor who is two or more months in arrears on their Council Tax, in which case they will need to declare this and not take part in the vote."

There were no declarations of interest.

6

**OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

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

1. Issues highlighted by Councillor Laban were as follows:

- The concern of the opposition group that the Council budget was not sustainable in the medium term, despite assurances from the Cabinet members and senior finance officers.
- Concern that the Council's ability to balance the budget in the future was in doubt as reserves might not cover projected expenditure.
- Concerns about increasing debt and that by 2028/29 the Council could owe £2 billion which could result in interest payments of £1.4 million a year which would impact on services.
- Whilst being supportive of project renewals, such as the plans for Joyce Avenue and Snell's Park Estate, there were concerns about affordability and that these proposals could add £600 billion to the debt.
- There were also concerns regarding auditor comments about a significant risk that the Meridian Water project may not provide value for money.
- Concerns that it would not be possible to build 10,000 homes at Meridian Water as problems around the GLA requirements on Strategic Industrial Land had not been resolved. In the draft London plan, Enfield was being required to find more Strategic Industrial Land, not less.
- There would be a serious impact on day to day services if the Council could not achieve the return on investments that they were planning for.
- The view that the administration should stop overspending and sort out their financial problems to make sure that the budget was sustainable.

2. Councillor Mary Maguire, Cabinet Member for Finance, responded on behalf of the Majority Group highlighting:

- That there was nothing of substance in these concerns. The Council's Section 151 officer had written to the administration to assure them that the Council's finances were sound. If she had been concerned, she would have issued a section 151 notice.
- It was a challenging time for all local authorities as they had been underfunded for many years. There were budget pressures, particularly in adult social care and special educational needs transport.
- The Council grants had been cut by £11 million. representing £80 for every household.

## COUNCIL - 29.1.2020

- The Council had robust and realistic savings targets. In 2010 it had £52 million reserves, this March £39m. Spending reserves helps to smooth the budget. Other authorities do the same.
  - The Auditors were stating a risk, not a conclusion.
  - The administration had high ambitions, investing in the future, protecting the vulnerable, to make Enfield a better place. Estate renewal was needed.
  - There was a robust 10-year capital programme and a 10 year financial management strategy. The Council were planning for the future, unlike government which could not provide a five year budget plan.
  - The Council would make sure that the plans are affordable and would set a legal balanced budget
  - It was a myth that the Conservative Government were good with money, as the country was currently £1.8 trillion in debt and austerity was still here.
3. Other issues highlighted during the debate were as follows:
- a. The need highlighted by the members of the Opposition Group:
- Although both sides were committed to improving services there was a difference in how they wanted to achieve this.
  - The continuing concern about the financial viability of the Council and whether council tax payers were getting value for money.
  - The view that the Council had a poor achievement record, many projects had been delayed and were taking much longer than anticipated to complete.
  - Acknowledgement that the quality of the financial reports produced had improved.
  - Concern that the auditors had failed to sign off the accounts for two years running.
  - That fiscal responsibility was key and the Council had to be competitive.
  - That legacy projects were unaffordable.
  - The view that bringing services back in house was unaffordable and an ideological position.
  - That revenue overspends were having to be funded through reserves, which could not continue.
  - Concern about high borrowing which would result in high interest payments which could otherwise be spent on front line services.
- b. The need highlighted by members of the Majority Group:
- To recognise that the Council was receiving insufficient funding from Government and had no choice but to use reserves and spend capital receipts
  - The Opposition were quoting from reports very selectively.
  - Confidence that the long-term plans were sustainable.

## COUNCIL - 29.1.2020

- Residents had a right to be balloted on projects, before plans were approved.
  - The Council was borrowing to invest in projects which could change life chances.
  - The Government confidence in the Meridian Water project was shown by the commitment they had made through the Community Infrastructure Fund.
  - The Labour administration believed that good terms and conditions for workers should be maintained and were pleased to be able to bring services back in house.
  - The Council was suffering increased spending pressures including failure to meet targets on traded services, on special needs transport and unaccompanied asylum seekers.
4. At the end of the debate, Councillor Laban summed up on behalf of the Opposition Group as follows:

Councillor Laban said that she shared the desire to improve the borough, but good finance and good budgeting were essential. She felt that it was important to ensure that the Council got back money invested, and that borrowing was sustainable. Too much borrowing could impact services. The IWE business plan had failed and had had to be bought back in house. She felt that the Council needed to get back on track financially.

5. Councillor Maguire then summed up on behalf of the majority group responding to the recommendations in the Opposition Priority Business Paper:

The recommendations in the Opposition Business paper were not necessary. Officers were continually reviewing the Council's finances. They were in the process of producing a 10 year capital strategy and a 10 year treasury management plan. They try not to overspend, but cannot turn away those who need help. There is a need to increase budgets to cover increasing costs as in adult social care. Reserves exist to smooth things over. The finances are being looked after, realistic spending targets being set.

After the debate, the Leader's response to the Conservative Opposition Business paper, was agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 38  
Against: 17  
Abstentions: 0

7

**COUNCIL TAX AND BUSINESS RATE COLLECTION FUND 2020/21**

Councillor Maguire proposed and Councillor Caliskan seconded the report of the Acting Executive Director of Resources seeking approval for the 2020/21 Council Tax and Business Rate Bases. (Report No: 202)

**NOTED**

1. The amendments to the report set out in the green update sheet.
2. That the report set out changes to the discretionary scheme, proposing an increase to the empty homes premium Council tax for dwellings, that have been empty for more than 5 years, from 100% to 200%. This would affect 650 properties.
3. That the Band D equivalent tax base for 2020/21 is 97,726 properties, an increase of 652 last year. The current collection rate is 98% and growing.
4. The council tax base was set out in appendix A and the business rate tax base in appendix B to the report.
5. Enfield will be able to retain a share of the business rates across London through the business rates retention scheme. This was estimated to be at least £33,812,239, based on a 30% allocation.
6. There would also be a discretionary scheme to provide support to business.
7. The Government had recently announced that it would increase the retail discount from one third to 50% which would be extended to include cinemas and music venues with a rateable value of less than £51,000. They had also agreed to extend the £1,500 business rates discount for office space occupied by local newspapers for a further 5 years.
8. The Opposition said that they would not be supporting the raising of the empty homes' premium.
9. That Increasing the empty homes premium was necessary given the need for housing in the borough.

Following the debate recommendation 1 in the report was put to the vote and agreed with the following result:

For: 38  
Against: 13  
Abstentions: 0

Recommendations 2 and 3 were agreed without a vote.

**AGREED**

1. To increase the empty homes premium for Council Tax dwellings, empty for more than 5 years, from 100% to 200% from the 1 April 2020 as set out in section 4 of the report.

## COUNCIL - 29.1.2020

2. Pursuant to the report (see section 5 and appendix A) 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 2020/21 shall be 97,726 Band D equivalents.
3. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government NNDR1 Business Rate base return for 2020/21 (see section 6 and Appendix B of the report) and a change to the Council's existing discretionary rate relief policy outlined in paragraph 6.3 of the report to take advantage of the government funded rate reliefs.

### 8

#### COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME FOR 2020/21

Councillor Maguire proposed and Councillor Caliskan seconded the report of the Acting Executive Director Resources reviewing and seeking approval to changes in the local Council Tax Support Scheme 2020/21. (Report No: 157)

#### NOTED

1. The additional information provided on the green update sheet.
2. The 2020/21 scheme proposes reducing the minimum payment for working age claimants from 26.5% to 24.5% and increasing the excess income taper from 20% to 22.5% (representing 22p in every pound). Seven thousand three hundred households would be affected and would gain an extra 56p a week. Earned income will be adjusted so that the more earned the less support received.
3. The scheme also reduces the earned income threshold for working age council tax support claimants receiving universal credit from £1,265 to £1,100 a month.
4. The Council tax hardship policy was also being updated to help mitigate the impact on those affected.
5. The scheme reduces the tax payable for residents on the lowest incomes including care leavers, under 25s and pensioners.
6. The cost of the scheme to the Council is £32m but this would be reduced by the measures proposed in the report.
7. The changes proposed have been subject to consultation.
8. The Opposition support for a scheme which supports the most vulnerable and provides good transitional arrangements.
9. The Council was limited in its ability to make changes but the administration was pleased that it was able to continue the scheme and to provide some support to those suffering from poverty and inequality.

Following the debate, the recommendation in the report was approved without a vote.

**AGREED** the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2020/21 as summarised in Appendix A to provide financial support for households on low incomes in paying their Council Tax taking into account the Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix B) and the results of the customer consultation shown at Appendix

C. The 2020/21 scheme is based on the 2019/20 scheme, updated for legislative amendments, income uprating and administrative changes and the following changes which were the subject of public consultation:

For the 2020/21 scheme:

- Reducing the council tax support minimum payment for working age claimants from 26.5% to 24.5% and increasing the excess income taper from 20% to 22.5%, and
- Reduce the earned income threshold for working age council tax support claimants receiving Universal Credit from £1,265 to £1,100 per month (note the one-year transitional protection for existing claimants to be provided as part of the council tax support hardship scheme).

## **9**

### **DOCKLESS BIKE BYELAW - DELEGATION OF POWERS TO LONDON COUNCILS**

Councillor Ian Barnes proposed and Councillor Ergin Erbil seconded the report of the Executive Director Place seeking approval to delegate powers to London Councils to regulate the use of dockless bikes across London (Report No: 132).

#### **NOTED**

1. This report had been considered at Cabinet on 13 December 2019 and recommended to Council for approval.
2. Welcome for the concept of dockless bikes offering a healthy means of transport. However their use across London has increased and has caused some problems. Delegating powers to London Councils will enable a Londonwide approach but will not mean any loss of control. The extent of any scheme will still be up to individual boroughs.
3. The byelaw will ensure that their use is safe and manageable and all bikes are microchipped.
4. The opposition were happy to support the proposals, hoped there would be a way to avoid the chips being removed and were pleased that there would be a positive impact on older and disability groups.
5. This should be seen as part of the Council's strategy to reduce climate change by improving health and safety and encouraging cycling and walking.
6. A lack of confidence from opposition members in the ability of the council to deliver a functioning scheme and a plea that it should be properly implemented.
7. That ward councillors should be consulted on the positioning of bike parking spaces.
8. A desire for more cycle lanes.

Following the debate the recommendations in the report were agreed without a vote.

AGREED to approve the delegation of powers provided by s235 of the Local Government Act 1972 so that London Councils can make a London-wide byelaw regulating dockless bikes across the capital.

## **10 EDMONTON LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN - ADOPTION**

Councillor Caliskan proposed and Councillor Ian Barnes seconded a report from the Executive Director Place recommending formal adoption of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (ELAAP). (Report No: 164)

### **NOTED**

1. Cabinet recommended approval of the plan to Council at their meeting on 22 January 2020.
2. This represents the final stage in the adoption of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan and will help the Council realise its vision for Meridian Water.
3. It will help encourage major stakeholders, provide affordable housing and good public spaces to improve the quality of life for people living in the area.
4. It includes promotion of high quality design, the low carbon network with 40% affordable housing. Adoption of the plan gives planning weight to these issues.
5. The ELAAP covers a 12 year period, not the full 20 year Meridian Water project.
6. Great progress has been made in providing employment through meanwhile uses.
7. The action plan has been agreed and modifications made following comments from the planning inspectorate.

Councillor Edward Smith proposed and Councillor Joanne Laban seconded the following amendment to recommendation 2.1 in the report.

“That Council agrees the significant modifications recommended in the Planning Inspector’s final report (Annex 1) needed to make the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan sound and legally compliant.”

1. The Opposition wanted to make explicit the way the plan had had to be altered to meet the requirements of the planning inspectorate.
2. The response from the Leader that the action plan to be adopted already included the planning inspector’s amendments and that technically this was the plan.
3. The view that the plan would not meet the affordable housing needs of the community and that it was a glorified gentrification project.
4. The revised plan had significantly less housing than the Labour Group had wanted, that the administration had been slow to act and that it was important to recognise the inspector’s work as in the amendment.

## COUNCIL - 29.1.2020

Following the debate, the amendment was put to the vote and not agreed with the following result:

For: 13  
Against: 38  
Abstentions: 0

The debate continued:

### NOTED

1. Assumptions that the original plan would have been ratified were unrealistic as the opposition were always clear that the GLA would not agree to release the strategic industrial land and that the sites the Council had put forward to replace this such as Deephams Sewage Works would not be accepted. There was also no guarantee that Tesco and Ikea would give up their land for homes. The number of homes proposed in the plan had now been halved.
2. There was also concern that there had been no proper account of flooding taken or provision of flood mitigation schemes.
3. Ward Councillor Ergin Erbil said that this would provide much needed housing, attention and investment in this poor part of the borough and was welcomed by Edmonton ward councillors.
4. The opposition view that poor management was to blame for the failures and for the decrease in the number of affordable homes.

Councillor Ergin Erbil proposed motion 13 (j) that the Council moves to the vote.

This was seconded by Councillor Nesil Caliskan and approved after a vote with the following result:

For: 37  
Against: 15  
Abstentions: 1

The recommendations in the report were then approved without a vote.

### AGREED

1. To note the receipt of the Planning Inspector's final report (Annex 1) that concludes the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan is sound and legally compliant subject to the main modifications being incorporated into the final plan.
2. To approve the formal adoption of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (Annex 2) to form part of Enfield's Local Plan.

11

**HOUSING AND GROWTH STRATEGY**

Councillor Caliskan proposed and Councillor Needs seconded the report of the Executive Director Place seeking Council approval for the Housing and Growth Strategy. (Report No: 166)

NOTED

1. That Cabinet had recommended that Council approve the Housing and Growth Strategy at their meeting held on 22 January 2020.
2. Homelessness was increasing and home owning was becoming increasingly out of reach for many people. To buy a house in Enfield took about 12 times the medium average salary. Enfield had one of the highest numbers of homeless households in the country.
3. The government was unwilling to intervene in this broken housing market. This strategy has been developed to address the problems. It included five priorities to achieve the vision of good homes in well connected neighbourhoods, five areas of focus including affordability. Households were spending on average 40% of their income on housing costs. The Council would be borrowing to invest in new 3,500 new Council homes and spending money to improve the existing housing stock. They planned to bring the Council maintenance service back in house. To improve the quality of housing in the private rented sector through the additional and selective licensing scheme. They were planning to set up their own ethical letting agent. They would continue to play a leading role in placemaking, involving residents in their own communities. Good growth was not just about homes but about meeting the needs of all residents including schools, infrastructure and health facilities.

At this point in the meeting Councillor Ergin Erbil moved and Councillor Maguire seconded a proposal that we move to item 16 on the agenda Motions.

This was agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 37  
Against: 16  
Abstentions: 0

**AGREED**

1. To approve the Housing and Growth Strategy.
2. To note that Cabinet is to agree the following at its meeting on the 22 January 2020.
  - To delegate authority to the Leader, as the portfolio for new housing supply and regeneration, to approve measurable targets to deliver the strategy.

- To note that key metrics will also be monitored in the 2020 Corporate Performance Report submitted quarterly to Cabinet.
- 2.2.3 To note that the targets will be published as an appendix to the strategy once these are finalised, with a planned date for publication being April 2020.

**12**

**ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID YEAR REVIEW 2019/20**

RECEIVED the report of the Acting Executive Director Resources on the Annual Treasury Management Mid Year Review 2019/20. (Report No: 127)

**AGREED** to note the 2029/20 Mid Year Treasury Position.

Councillor Laban indicated that if there had been a vote on this issue the Opposition would have voted against.

**13**

**CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Ergin Erbil moved and Councillor Nesil Caliskan seconded a proposal under paragraph 2.2(B) of the Council procedure rules to change the timing and order of items on the agenda.

It was proposed that motions should be taken as the next item of business in the following order: 16.13, 16.6, 16.12

This was agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 37  
Against: 16  
Abstentions: 0

The minutes reflect the order of the meeting.

**14**

**MOTIONS**

**Motion 13**

Councillor Tim Leaver proposed and Councillor Hass Yusuf seconded the following motion.

“Enfield Council welcomes the Election of Feryal Clark as MP for Enfield North Constituency; Re-Election of Bambos Charalambous as MP for Enfield Southgate Constituency; and Re-Election of Kate Osamor as MP for Edmonton Constituency in the General Election of 12th December 2019. We look forward to working with them in the interests of the residents of the Borough of Enfield whom we all serve.”

## COUNCIL - 29.1.2020

Councillor Laban proposed and Councillor Rye seconded an amendment to replace the last sentence with the following:

“This chamber also congratulates Boris Johnson on his landslide victory and looks forward to working with our local MPs and the new Conservative Government in the interests of the residents of the Borough of Enfield whom we all serve.”

Councillor Ergin Erbil proposed and Councillor Caliskan proposed that the amendment be taken. This was agreed after a vote with the following result:

For: 36  
Against: 16  
Abstentions: 1

The amendment was voted on and not agreed with the following result:

For: 15  
Against: 38  
Abstentions: 0

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

For: 36  
Against: 16  
Abstentions: 0

### **Motion 6**

Councillor Christine Hamilton proposed and Councillor Mahtab Uddin seconded the following motion:

“Britain and London are facing numerous Public Health Emergencies. Air Quality, Smoking, Obesity, Alcohol, Gangs & Youth Violence to name but a few but the Conservative government have seen it fit to slash public health grants over 5 years since 2015; amounting to a 60% cut in Public Health funding. Shocking!

Enfield's Public Health Allocation for next year is now expected to be £47 per head; compared with a London average of £73. Islington receives £103, Camden £100, Kensington and Chelsea £130; even our next-door borough Haringey with £69 per head is way above our allocation. The public health grant funds vital services and functions with the aim of Preventing ill-health and so contributes to the future sustainability of our NHS.

Councils are responsible for delivering important public health services, including sexual health services, drug and alcohol treatment, health visiting & school nursing, smoking cessation and obesity reduction. But Public Health Directors also have an input and influence into all the wider areas that influence health and wellbeing, including transport, planning, education and

housing services. We have introduced HiAP (Health in all Policies) in Enfield and aspire to becoming a truly Public Health Borough.

Taking funds away from Prevention is therefore a false economy and a direct contradiction to the aims of the NHS in the 10-year Forward Plan. Without proper investment in prevention our residents suffer; demand on local health services increases; and the local economy loses.

This Council believes that the impact of continued cuts to our Public Health Grant on our communities has become impossible to ignore. For this reason, we have supported the recent Cancer Research UK's and Enfield's Over 50's Forum calls for increased and sustainable public health funding. This Council therefore calls on the Government to deliver increased investment into public health and prevention through Local Government, which is the best place to deliver the changes we need to make for the benefit of residents.

Starving local government of its much-needed public health funds under an austerity regime that is literally killing people is short-sighted and needs to stop!

The current Public Health Grant allocation (which is based on a historical funding formula) needs rapid realignment to help us address the realities of health needs in Enfield. We therefore demand the Government reinstates replaces the Grant that has been cut over recent years and increases it to a level that accounts for the needs of our residents.”

Following the debate, the motion was agreed without a vote.

## **15 DURATION OF 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.

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.

## **16 AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19**

RECEIVED the report of the Audit and Risk Management Committee for 2018/19.

**AGREED** to approve the report.

## **17 URGENCY REPORT**

NOTED

1. The details provided of two decisions recently taken under the Council's urgency procedure relating to the waiver of the Council's key decision and call in processes along with the reasons for urgency.
2. The decisions were made in accordance with the urgency procedures set out in Paragraph 17.3 of Chapter 4.2 (Scrutiny) and Paragraph 16 of Chapter 4.6 (Access to Information) of the Council's Constitution.

## **18 QUESTIONS**

### **1. Urgent Questions**

There were no urgent questions.

### **2. Questions by Councillors**

NOTED

1. The thirty nine questions on the Council agenda and the written responses provided by the relevant Cabinet Members.

## **19 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

There were no changes to committee memberships.

## **20 NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

**AGREED** to confirm the following changes to the nominations on outside bodies:

- **EREC Executive** – Councillor Sabri Ozaydin to replace Councillor Derek Levy.
- **North London Waste Authority** – Councillor Ergin Erbil to replace Councillor Guney Dogan.

## **21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED that the next ordinary Council meeting will take place on Wednesday 26 February 2020 at 7pm.