

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2016**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT

Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community Organisations and Culture), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care), Nneka Keazor (Cabinet Member for Public Health and Sport), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykener (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration), Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) and Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency)

Associate Cabinet Members (Non-Executive and Non-Voting): Bambos Charalambous (Enfield West), Vicki Pite (Enfield North), George Savva MBE (Enfield South East)

OFFICERS:

Rob Leak (Chief Executive), Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration & Environment), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ray James (Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services), Bindi Nagra (Assistant Director - Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director Legal & Governance Services), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Regeneration and Environment), Paul Rogers (Cycle Enfield Project Manager), Mark Stone (Assistant Director - Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Helen Waring (Project Manager, HRA Reform), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Liam Mulrooney (Traffic & Transportation), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Peter George (Programme Director - Neighbourhood Regeneration), Mike Weston (Head of IT Technical Design), Andrew Golder (Press and New Media Manager) and Magdaline Paraschou (Legal Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

Also Attending:

Councillors Ertan Hurer, Derek Levy, Don McGowan, Terence Neville and Mike Rye.
Members of the public in attendance for Report No.174 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A105 (Minute No.9 below refers)

1

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) advised those present that the proceedings were being filmed for the purpose of broadcasting them into Room 6 which was being used as an overflow facility for members of the public should there be insufficient seating within the Conference Room to accommodate those wishing to attend the meeting.

There were no apologies for absence.

2

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director of Legal and Governance and Monitoring Officer) stated that a dispensation had been granted to all Cabinet Members in respect of Report No.174 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposal for the A105 (Minute No.9 below refers) to enable them to participate in and vote on this item. The dispensation had been granted as the majority of Cabinet Members had a disclosable pecuniary interest in the matter which would therefore “impede the transaction of the business” if a dispensation was not granted by the Council’s Monitoring Officer.

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 the reports listed below. These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear days in advance of meetings.

Report Nos. 176 and 179 – Neighbourhood Regeneration Programme (Minute Nos. 11 and 20 below refer)

Report Nos. 177 and 180 – IT Delivery (Minute Nos. 12 and 21 below refer)

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

4

DEPUTATIONS

NOTED, that no requests for deputations had been received for presentation to this Cabinet meeting.

Members were advised that Mr Peter Gibbs, Chair of FERAA, had asked to make a statement to the Cabinet as part of their consideration of Report No.174 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A105 (Minute No.9 below refers).

5

ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

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

1. Report Nos. 171 and 178 – Budget 2016-17 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/17 to 2019/20 (General Fund)
2. Report No.172 – Housing Revenue Account (HRA) 30-Year Business Plan, Budget 2016/17, Rent Setting and Service Charges, Temporary Accommodation Rents

NOTED, that Report Nos.176 and 179 – Neighbourhood Regeneration Programme no longer required referral to full Council as the budget implications were dealt with in Report No. 171 detailed in 1 above.

6

BUDGET REPORT 2016-17 & MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016/17 TO 2019/20 (GENERAL FUND)

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) informed Members that the Council budget had been drawn up on the basis of the provisional Local Government settlement, as set out in full in the report. Enfield had not benefitted from any transitional funding elements. Pressures were particularly being experienced by Outer London Boroughs. Cabinet this evening was being asked to consider the budget being presented and make recommendations to full Council for the final budget approval. Members were asked to note that the proposed overall increase over the 2015/16 Council Tax was 1.78%, as detailed in the report.

Councillor Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the detail of the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.171).

NOTED

1. That Report No.178 also referred as detailed in Minute No.19 below.
2. That the proposals within the report would enable the Council to balance the 2016/17 budget. Members were asked to note the level of savings required and the further central government funding reductions that were expected over the next 3 years.
3. The budget consultation that had taken place as set out in detail in section 4 of the report. The feedback from all of the consultation processes had been presented to the Budget Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 1 February 2016, the minutes of which were tabled for Members' consideration this evening as part of their consideration of the budget proposals; and would form part of the report to full Council. It was noted that the majority of consultation responses received had indicated that a rise in council tax would be preferable to further cuts in services. It was felt that further cuts in council services could not be sustained. Councillor Stafford outlined the

CABINET - 10.2.2016

proposed increase in the level of Council Tax as set out in detail in the report.

4. The report included full detail on the budget considerations and proposals including treasury management, risk analysis and the capital programme. The Council's capital programme continued to be significant and would benefit the regeneration and economy of the Borough.
5. The recommendations in the report were drawn to Members' attention. In particular Members were asked to note recommendation 2.12 of the report regarding the Government's 4 year funding offer and that a further report would be presented to Members once sufficient details to make a recommendation were made available by the Government.
6. That recommendation 2.13 of the report sought approval to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to agree any necessary changes in preparation of the budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Plan report to Council on 24 February 2016.
7. Councillor Ayfer Orhan highlighted the work which had been undertaken by the Council and London Councils as a whole in raising the issue of, and concerns over, cuts to schools' budgets.
8. The significant population growth in Enfield and Outer London as a whole, which was not being recognised in the Government's funding allocations. The demand for services continued to grow at a time when central government funding reductions were implemented.

Alternative Options Considered: The Council operated a budget planning and consultation process during which a wide range of options were considered in detail before recommendations were made. Issues raised and discussed had greatly contributed to this report including information from the Budget Consultation set out elsewhere in this report. As part of its planning for both 2016/17 and future years the Council had considered future levels of Council Tax.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

1. To note that the attention of Members was drawn to the comments in paragraph 2.15 of the report regarding S106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 which required any Member who was two months or more in arrears on their Council Tax to declare their position and to not vote on any issue that could affect the calculation of the budget or Council Tax.
2. With regard to the revenue budget for 2016/17:

CABINET - 10.2.2016

- (i) Set the Council Tax requirement for Enfield at £107.915m in 2016/17.
 - (ii) Set the Council Tax at Band D for Enfield's services for 2016/17 at £1,144.17 (paragraph 8.1 of the report), being a 1.98% general Council Tax increase and a 2.00% Adult Social Care Precept.
 - (iii) Approves the statutory calculations and resolutions set out in Appendix 10 of the report.
3. With regard to the Prudential Code and the Capital Programme:
- (i) Notes the information regarding the requirements of the Prudential Code (section 9 of the report).
 - (ii) Agrees the Approved Capital Programme for 2016/17 to 2019/20 as set out in section 9 of the report and appendix 9. To also note the Indicative Capital Programme and recommend that Council agrees that these indicative programmes be reviewed in the light of circumstances at the time.
 - (iii) Agrees the Prudential Indicators, the Treasury Management Strategy, the Minimum Revenue Provision statement and the criteria for investments set out in section 9 and appendices 4 and 5 of the report.
4. To agree the Medium Term Financial Plan and adopts the key principles set out in paragraph 10.11 of the report.
5. With regard to the robustness of the 2016/17 budget and the adequacy of the Council's earmarked reserves and balances:
- (i) Notes the risks and uncertainties inherent in the 2016/17 budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan (sections 10 and 11 of the report referred) and agree the actions in hand to mitigate them.
 - (ii) Note the advice of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services regarding the recommended levels of contingencies, balances and earmarked reserves (section 12 of the report) and has regard to the Director's statement (section 13 of the report) when making final decisions on the 2016/17 budget.
 - (iii) Agree the recommended levels of central contingency and general balances (section 12 of the report).
6. To agree the Schools Budget for 2016/17 (section 5.13 and Appendix 13 of the report).
7. To agree the Fees and Charges for Environmental Services for 2016/17 (section 10.14 and Appendix 12 of the report).
8. To agree the Fees and Charges for Adult Social Care Services for 2016/17 (section 10.15 and Appendix 11 of the report, subject to consultation).

9. That the New Homes Bonus be applied as a one-off contribution to the General Fund in 2016/17.
10. To approve the policy for the calculation of Minimum Revenue Provision (Section 9 and appendix 4 of the report).
11. To approve the adoption of the new flexible use of capital receipts as announced by the DCLG for 2016/17 to 2019/20 and note the Council's Initial Efficiency Plan for new capital receipts (appendix 14 of the report).
12. To note the Government's 4 year funding offer and that a further report would be presented to Members once sufficient details to make a recommendation were made available by the Government.
13. To consider the feedback and results from the Budget Consultation and Overview and Scrutiny Committee Budget Meeting on 1 February 2016.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to agree any necessary changes in preparation of the Budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Plan Report to Council on 24 February 2016.

Reason: To set out the Council's Budget requirement and level of Council Tax for 2016/17 within the timescales set out in legislation. To agree the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators and, the Capital Programme for 2016/17.

(Key decision – reference number 4175)

7

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) 30 YEAR BUSINESS PLAN, BUDGET 2016/17, RENT SETTING AND SERVICE CHARGES AND TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION RENTS

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.172).

NOTED

1. That this was the annual report for consideration of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and rent setting, and temporary accommodation rents. The report commented on the HRA 30-year business plan; the HRA budget 2016/17 and 5 year capital programme; rent setting 2016/17 for HRA properties and temporary accommodation properties; and, proposed service charges 2016/17.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

2. With regard to the HRA 30-year business plan, this had previously been updated and considered by the Cabinet in November 2015. Significant work had been carried out to rebalance the plan following the Government's July budget and subsequent Welfare Reform and Work Bill which required the Council to reduce rents by 1% per annum for 4 years from 2016/17. This meant a shortfall of £2.2m in 2016/17 and £325m over 30 years. Due to the significant work that had been undertaken previously, only minor amendments had now been made, as set out in section 4 and Appendix 1 of the report.
3. With regard to the HRA budget 2016/17, due to the work that had been undertaken in 2015/16 to find £1.5m ongoing savings (detailed in paragraph 5.1 of the report), the 2016/17 budget had relatively few variations. The main ones were set out in section 5.2 and Appendix B of the report.
4. That the HRA 5 year capital programme was set out in section 7 of the report and totalled £237.7m.
5. Members were advised that the majority of rents would go down by 1% as required by the Welfare Reform and Work Bill. An amendment to the recommendations was tabled, as reflected in recommendation 1 (e) below, which related to sheltered accommodation rents which had arisen as a result of the Government making Supported Accommodation an exception to the requirement for rents to reduce for 1 year only. The proposal to increase Sheltered Accommodation rents by CPI plus 1% meant that they would go up by 0.9% or approximately 90p per week. This would give the HRA an additional £78k in 2016/17 and the impact on 30 years would be an additional £3.3m. This was a late amendment as the Welfare Reform and Work Bill was still progressing through the House of Lords and changes were still being made before it became an Act. Subject to Cabinet approval, the report presented to full Council would be updated to take account of this amendment.
6. That Temporary Accommodation rents would remain as per last year.
7. The proposed HRA service charges for 2016/17 were set out in section 10 of the report. These were based on full cost recovery. Two new charges were proposed for external CCTV charges (82p per week) and communal cleaning charge (59p per week). The service charges had been discussed with the Customer Voice and Housing Board.
8. That this year's budget had been made more complex because of the Welfare Reform and Work Bill and Housing and Planning Bill which were progressing through Parliament and were not yet Acts. There remained two big risks to the HRA 30 year business plan: the sale of high value assets and pay to stay. It was understood that both of these

policies might affect the 2016/17 budget, further information was awaited.

9. An amendment to the report as follows: the last sentence of paragraph 3 in section 16.2 of the report to be amended to read: "The Welfare Reform and Work Bill will not apply to this category of tenancies and the local authority will not have to decrease the rent by 1% for the next four years".

Alternative Options Considered: The Council no longer had a choice about the level of rents it sets for Council tenants and Temporary Accommodation tenants. A number of different options had been considered around budget levels required both for 2016/17 and in the medium term, and the preferred option, to meet the priorities of the service and the Council, was presented in the report. Service charges could be set at alternative levels, but those set out in paragraph 10 of the report would result in improved services to tenants and leaseholders.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

1. To approve and note the following:
 - (a) Approval of the HRA 30-year Business Plan.
 - (b) Approval of the detailed HRA Revenue Budget for 2016/17.
 - (c) Approval of the HRA Capital Programme and Right to Buy (RTB) One for One Receipts Programme as set out in paragraph 7 of the report.
 - (d) To note the rent levels for 2016/17 for HRA properties and Temporary Accommodation properties subject to the Welfare Reform and Work Bill receiving Royal Assent in April 2016.
 - (e) To increase rents for sheltered accommodation tenants in line with Government guidance. This would result in an average increase of 0.9% for Enfield's Sheltered Accommodation tenants.
 - (f) Approval of the level of service charges as set out in paragraph 10 of the report for those properties receiving the services.
 - (g) To note the heating charges for 2016/17 as set out in paragraph 12 of the report for those properties on communal heating systems.
 - (h) Approval of the proposals for increases in garages and parking bay rents as detailed in appendix F of the report.

2. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration and the Director of Regeneration and Environment to approve tenders for Major Works.

Reason: The Council must comply with the law in setting its rents for Council tenants and Temporary Accommodation tenants. Setting an annual budget, capital programme and balanced HRA 30-year Business Plan were also legal requirements. Increasing service charges would allow the Council to provide new and better services to tenants, and the charges set out in the report were supported by the Council's Housing Board and Customer Voice (the Tenant and Leaseholder representative body).

(Key decision – reference number 4174)

8

ADULT SOCIAL CARE TRANSPORT POLICY

Councillor Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (No.173).

NOTED

1. That the proposals had been subject to a 13 week consultation process and subsequent further 5 weeks of engagement and discussion. The consultation had been extensive with 22 engagement events and feedback from over 500 people, including service users, their families, representatives and the service providers. Councillor Cazimoglu took this opportunity to thank all those who had been involved.
2. The Council was doing its best to mitigate the effects of any changes in service provision. The Council would continue to assess those people who requested support as it was statutorily obliged to do. It was the Council's intention to ensure that a range of appropriate, flexible and cost effective transport options were available to the people who needed them. This would mean that the Council would look at the transport options that were currently on offer and establish whether they were appropriate, flexible and provided value for money.
3. Councillor Cazimoglu outlined the detailed discussions and considerations that had taken place which the Council had listened to and amended its draft transport policy accordingly. The Council would not now consider the use of mobility benefits to fund eligible needs for transport support. The policy would provide a clear framework for delivering personalised transport for people who needed it most. The report made the case for a review of the council's current transport offer in order to deliver the kind of services that were flexible and efficient and which delivered the quality, choice and control which the council would want for those very vulnerable people in need.

4. In summary Councillor Cazimoglu outlined what the Adult Social Care Transport Policy would deliver:
 - Good information/advice and support to ensure vulnerable people access transport which was appropriate and safe for them.
 - A transport offer with clear costs that is efficient and contributed to the savings that the Council was required to deliver.
 - More choice, control and flexibility in good quality transport options.
 - Making the best use of all available resources in the community.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED the alternative options which had been considered as set out in section 5 of the report and summarised below:

1. Do nothing – this had not been considered to be a financially viable option (section 5 of the report referred).
2. Alternative savings options suggested during the consultation – the draft Transport Policy for Adult Social Care was clear about the scale of the financial funding gap facing the Council by 2020 as part of the context within which the new draft policy had been drafted and consulted upon. There was a very strongly held view, widely shared within those consulted, that the draft Transport Policy targeted vulnerable disabled groups unfairly and that alternative savings options should be explored. There had been a number of potential savings proposals communicated back to Council officers during the consultation period. Recurrent themes included increasing Council Tax, agreement that reducing the cost of the current transport service was sensible, reduced frequency of refuse collection and proposed changes to the way business rates were distributed. The response from Council officers had been consistent, that given the scale of the savings required, every department within the Council would be exploring all options available to them in order to deliver savings.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to

1. Note the consultation process followed, feedback received and the responses provided in Appendix E to the report.
2. Approve the Transport Policy, attached as Appendix A to the report, including removal of consideration of mobility benefit and revised charging process as part of the financial assessment.
3. Agree the implementation of this policy with effect from 1 April 2016.
4. Agree to a programme managed project with the purpose of delivering a more personalised and cost effective transport offer for Adult Social Care which would work in partnership across Adult Social Care, Children's Services (Special Educational Needs (SEN)) and Environment which currently manages and delivers transport for both

areas. This project would contribute towards delivery of the savings plan in Adult Social Care for transport.

Reason: The proposed approach was in line with the Council's commitment to the personalisation of services and enabling clients to live independently for as long as possible. The policy was necessary so that the provision of assisted transport was equitable and consistent for service users. The implementation of the policy provided an opportunity to commission a more cost effective transport offer and delivery models representing better value for money.

(Key decision – reference number 4086)

9

APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A105

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) invited Mr Peter Gibbs (Chair of FERAA) to present his statement to the Cabinet.

Mr Gibbs raised a number of points in relation to the proposals presented in the report which included the view that safer cycling and an increase in cycling in the Borough was supported by all. However, concerns were expressed over the detailed proposals, the consultation process and the benefits claimed from the scheme. He highlighted the extent of the difference between the original bid in 2013 and the proposals now being considered. He expressed the need for effective consultation with all parties involved. It was felt that the proposed scheme did not have the support of the majority of residents. Particular issues were highlighted with regard to the impact on air quality and economic issues, and the needs of vulnerable groups in the borough and the potential impact on them.

Mr Gibbs highlighted the change in the Mayor of London later in the year and the impact that this could have on going forward. He highlighted the possibility of a judicial review being sought.

In conclusion, Councillor Taylor thanked Mr Gibbs for his contribution and invited a spokesperson from those present at the meeting, in support of the proposals, to make a statement to the Cabinet.

Clare Rogers, representing nearly 300 Facebook supporters of the scheme, took this opportunity to inform Members that the supporters were excited and proud of the proposals being put forward. The scheme would benefit a large number of cyclists and provide benefits to the next generation in the provision of safe cycling routes to school and tackling childhood obesity. Air pollution in the Borough was recognised as an important issue that needed to be addressed. Support was expressed for the consultation which had taken place.

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.174) seeking approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for

segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green A105.

NOTED

1. Councillor Anderson acknowledged the considerable and healthy debate which had taken place to date on the scheme proposals. He recognised the differences of opinion which had been expressed and the challenges which had been made. All comments had been taken into account in considering the way forward.
2. Members were reminded that in March 2013 the Mayor of London had published his Vision for Cycling with the overarching aim to double the number of people cycling by 2023. One of the key elements had been the Mini-Holland programme with all outer London boroughs having the opportunity to bid for funding. Enfield's bid had been successful. It had had cross-party support and included within the bid had been the provision of segregated cycle facilities along the A105 and enhancements to both Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill town centres. This is what the current proposals set out to deliver. It was noted that the support of the Conservative Group had now shifted.
3. That the number of cyclists in Enfield was relatively low, the aim was to increase cyclists in the borough by providing safe routes to use.
4. That the funding for the scheme was external, it would not be directly funded by the council. This represented a significant level of investment in the borough.
5. That this was a transformational project which would rejuvenate the areas in question. The significant population growth in Enfield was acknowledged as was the need to facilitate alternative forms of travel alongside the use of cars.
6. That consultation had been undertaken and over 1,600 responses had been received, the majority in favour but some against. The comments received had helped shape the scheme and had resulted in a number of significant changes that had improved the scheme. Extensive discussions had taken place and thanks were expressed to all of those who had participated. It was noted that the consultation was not a referendum. The different views which had been expressed on the scheme were acknowledged.
7. That the Council needed to show leadership in implementing such schemes whilst recognising that all forms of change could create fears and concerns.
8. That if the proposals were agreed tonight, there would be further opportunity to engage in the detailed design process and work would be undertaken to address the concerns raised by some disability

groups. Many elements of the scheme required the making of traffic management orders and the consultation required as part of this process would provide further opportunity to make representation on the scheme. Discussions would continue with local businesses.

9. Councillor Anderson asked those officers present to highlight some of the key design changes following the consultation as well as what had been done to address concerns about the impact of the scheme on air quality, congestion, parking, town centre vitality, and older and disabled people.
10. David Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation) on behalf of the Director of Regeneration and Environment, provided a full and detailed statement to Cabinet Members and highlighted a number of issues included within the report being presented for approval. In summary the statement included the following:

Process of Consultation

- Section 4 of the report highlighted the engagement and consultation that the Council had carried out. The detail of the consultation was set out for Members. The consultation had run from 17 July to 9 October 2015. The range of consultees was highlighted including day centres and sheltered housing complexes.
- A total of 1,646 responses to the A105 consultation had been received: 50.7% (835) fully supporting, 8.6% (142) partially supporting, 38.9% (640) not in support and, 1.8% (29) no opinion or unsure.
- Many of the comments and suggestions received had resulted in design changes, as detailed in Appendix B of the report. The key changes were highlighted for Members.
- Key concerns that were raised in respect of air quality, town centre vitality, parking, and impact on disability were set out in section 5 of the report. Two external assessments had been commissioned to ensure that these impacts were fully understood. The detail of the two assessments regarding air quality and economic impact, were outlined to Members and were addressed within the report.
- Parking implications were set out in section 5.9 of the report and the mitigation measures that were under consideration.
- The detail of the equalities impact assessment set out in Appendix E of the report.
- Public realm improvements addressed in section 5.8 of the report.
- Effects on journey times detailed in paragraph 5.12 of the report.
- The positive health implications explained in section 14 of the report.

Feedback from West Enfield Partnership Board

CABINET - 10.2.2016

- During the preliminary design stage, the Cycle Enfield Partnership Board (Enfield West) had met on four occasions to enable stakeholders to influence the designs and share information with the organisations that they represented.
- Following the Board meeting on 21 January 2016 a number of comments had been received from members of the Board which had been provided to Cabinet Members in advance of this meeting to allow time for consideration, the documents that had been circulated were listed for clarification, totalling 18 documents. Councillor Taylor confirmed that these had been received.
- The common themes of the comments were highlighted and references made back to the relevant parts of the report. It also set how the Council proposed to deal with the issues raised.
- Members were asked to note the points that had been raised as part of their consideration of this report.

Feedback from Project Board

- The Cycle Enfield Project Board meeting on 2 February 2016 had made a number of recommendations to the Cabinet which were set out in detail for Members' consideration.
11. In conclusion of the officers' statement, the next steps were outlined, should the Cabinet approve the proposals set out in the report. There would be further detailed design work to take on board the issues that had been raised. A period of statutory consultation would take place including consultation on the traffic management orders. There would also be a public engagement event on the revised scheme plans.
 12. Councillor Taylor noted the content of the comments and representations that had been received which ranged from general to more specific issues. All comments received would be considered at the next stage by the design team.
 13. Councillor Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield West) reported that he had chaired the Partnership Board meetings. Extensive discussions and thorough consultation had taken place. He highlighted a number of specific issues which had been raised and welcomed constructive comments on the proposals. Councillor Charalambous reiterated the impact of population growth and the need for long-term transport solutions. It was not an option to do nothing. Approval of this report would move the scheme on to the next stage.
 14. Following the information provided above, Cabinet Members were invited to comment and ask questions which would be responded to by officers present. Some of the issues highlighted were summarised below.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

15. Councillor Sitkin expressed his support for local businesses, he acknowledged the concerns which had been stated and highlighted that the scheme could be positive for businesses. He asked officers to outline how the economic impact assessment had been carried out.
16. Councillor Cazimoglu sought assurance on how the Council could ensure that the scheme would be delivered in the best way possible.
17. Councillor Taylor questioned the process to be followed in keeping the Cabinet informed as the scheme progressed.
18. Councillor Brett was reassured that the equalities impact assessment had been well-considered and questioned how the results would be used to inform the scheme design and address the needs and concerns of vulnerable groups. Councillor Brett noted that the London Ambulance service had not yet responded to the consultation and sought assurance that the scheme could proceed without this having been received.
19. That other issues raised by Cabinet Members for clarification included the need to address health inequalities in the Borough and tackle childhood obesity; the air quality implications particularly around junctions; the impact on parking and parking provision; and, the proposed public realm improvements.
20. That the proposed provision of free time in specific pay and display car parks had increased to 45 minutes.
21. At this point in the meeting, Councillor Neville (Leader of the Conservative Group) was invited to address the Cabinet. Councillor Neville presented a full and detailed statement highlighting a number of issues for Members' consideration. He reiterated the need for the statutory consultation to be comprehensive and for further engagement on the proposals going forward. Councillor Neville requested that the wording of recommendation 2.2 of the report be amended to delete the words "and implementation" and outlined the reasons for this.

Councillor Neville referred to section 3.3 of the report with regard to cross-party support and pointed out that at that stage the scheme bid had not been subject to public consultation. He questioned the consultation that had been undertaken and the results received which had included respondents from out-borough. No alternative option had been provided in the consultation. Councillor Neville stated his reasons for believing that the consultation process had been flawed.

Councillor Neville highlighted the need for effective engagement with the emergency services. He further outlined the results of the economic impact assessment and its effectiveness. Section 5 of the report was referred to in detail and a number of specific issues noted.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

In conclusion Councillor Neville asked Cabinet to consider all comments received fully; to engage and work together with all parties, as requested in Mr Gibbs' statement; and to address the wider picture and look at all possible alternatives.

22. Members noted that alternative routes had been considered and dismissed on safety grounds, including the use of the towpath as a cycle route.
23. Councillor Taylor agreed that the wording of recommendation 2.2 of the report be amended with the deletion of the words "and implementation". This change is reflected in decision 2 below.
24. In response to the points of clarification and questions raised by Members, Officers responded in full and provided a number of reassurances which included the following points. The Economic Impact Assessment had considered town centre vitality, not individual businesses, a range of issues had been considered for both the construction period and final stage. The Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix E of the report) was a dynamic document and included a clear action plan. Engagement would continue with vulnerable groups. Positive feedback had been received on the assessment undertaken, as detailed by officers at the meeting. It was noted that the statutory consultation stage would include engagement with the London Ambulance Service and that a decision could be made at Cabinet tonight without this input.
25. Detailed design issues were highlighted including implications for junctions, public realm improvements and the positive health benefits that could be promoted.
26. Whilst recognising the potential impact on air quality at junctions there would be an overall improvement in air quality along the cycle routes. The mitigation measures with regard to parking provision were highlighted as were the proposed public realm improvements.
27. In conclusion Councillor Anderson acknowledged all of the points raised during the debate and the proposals for moving forward. He thanked Councillor Neville for his contribution and involvement in the Partnership Board. A number of suggestions received had resulted in an enhancement to the scheme. The original bid submitted by Enfield had had to meet a number of detailed criteria to be successful to which both political parties in Enfield had been committed. Councillor Anderson highlighted the detailed response figures from the referendum which had been carried out by David Burrowes MP (over 14,000 of the 17,000 polled had not responded. The 1,973 who had responded and indicated that they were opposed had therefore been 11.6% of those polled, not 75%. The 1,973 responses represented 3%

CABINET - 10.2.2016

of the 65,000 in the constituency). The proposals before Cabinet this evening represented a viable and practical scheme.

28. A vote took place and all Cabinet Members approved the recommendations in the report, as amended at the meeting.
29. Councillor Taylor acknowledged all the statements that had been made at the meeting and reiterated that this was an on-going process and all interested parties were encouraged to participate and influence any further improvements to the current scheme.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED that alternative options that had been considered as set out in section 6 of the report and summarised below:

1. The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £5.9 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £24.1 million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.
2. It had been suggested that the Council should consider re-routing the cycle lanes along an alternative road route parallel to Green Lanes or via the banks of the New River. These alternative options had been ruled out for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.2 of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To note the results of the public consultation.
2. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design, statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green.
3. That subject to TfL's Surface Board releasing the next tranche of Mini Holland funding, approval be granted for capital expenditure of £5.9m for detailed design, statutory consultation, implementation and client costs.
4. 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.

Reason: NOTED the reasons for the recommendations as set out in section 7 of the report: To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone; to make cycling safe and enjoyable choice for local travel; to create better, healthier communities; 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; and, to enable transformational change to our town centres.

(Key decision – reference number 4111)

10

DRAFT MERIDIAN WATER REGENERATION FRAMEWORK AND ACTION PLAN

Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.175) seeking endorsement of the draft Meridian Water Regeneration Framework and Action Plan.

NOTED

1. The content of the draft framework and action plan as set out and, the intended benefits and support for all communities in the vicinity of Meridian Water.
2. Final versions of each of the documents would be developed in partnership with the chosen Developer Partner, once appointment had been confirmed.

Alternative Options Considered: The Council had learnt the lessons of what had worked elsewhere on schemes of this scale. Therefore the development of a Framework was considered to be an essential part of the wider Meridian Water project. The alternative options to not develop a Framework would not have given the Council the necessary strategic guidance, nor ownership, of what it wants to achieve as part of the scheme. Having successfully procured Methods Advisory, no further options for delivery had been considered. The methodology used had been developed and refined over time in partnership between the Council and its consultant support team.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed

1. To endorse the draft Meridian Water Regeneration Framework.
2. To endorse the draft Meridian Water Regeneration Framework Action Plan.
3. In relation to 1 above, to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development, in conjunction with relevant officers, for the approval of the final Framework and Action Plan.

Reason: To provide the necessary political support to what the Council was trying to achieve at Meridian Water. Whilst final versions of both the Framework and Action Plan would be developed with the chosen Developer partner later in 2016, endorsement now would support negotiations with the chosen Developer Partner.

(Key decision – reference number 4252)

11

NEIGHBOURHOOD REGENERATION PROGRAMME

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No.176) seeking an increase in the Neighbourhood Regeneration capital programme to fund the next stages of a number of regeneration initiatives.

NOTED

1. That Report No.179 also referred as detailed in Minute No.20 below.
2. That the report explained what the increase to the Neighbourhood Regeneration Capital programme would be used to fund. It explained the progress that had been made to take forward regeneration projects in the Borough.
3. The report supported a key manifesto commitment of the delivery of 10,000 new homes.
4. Members expressed their appreciation of the work which had been undertaken by officers in taking these proposals forward.

Alternative Options Considered: As included within the main body of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Noted the request to increase the Neighbourhood Regeneration Capital Programme (approval was sought within Report No.171 – Budget report 2016-17 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/17 to 2019/20 (General Fund) (Minute No.6 below refers)) which would enable the development of the next stages of Meridian Water, Ponders End, Edmonton, New Southgate and Enfield Town.
2. Noted the progress made to date to acquire land at Meridian Water and the Council's intention and clear preference to acquire all developable land at Meridian Water by voluntary negotiation, based on the principle of a return on investment to the Council.
3. Noted that a part 2 report (No.179 – Minute No.20 below refers) which explained that a Meridian Water financial model had been developed to demonstrate how a return on the Council's investment could be achieved.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

4. Agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Members for Finance and Efficiency and, for Economic Regeneration and Business Development, in consultation with the Director of Regeneration and Environment and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to finalise the acquisition of the land (described in detail in Report No. 179, part 2 report) in accordance with the agreed Heads of Terms attached to Report No.179, containing exempt information.
5. Noted the progress made on the wider regeneration programme, including Ponders End, Edmonton, New Southgate and Enfield Town.
6. Noted that the part 2 report (No.179, Minute No.20 below) set out the financial implications for delivery of these programmes for 2016/17 and beyond.
7. Noted that before further commitment of expenditure on these programmes full financial models would be produced to inform investment/acquisition decisions.
8. Agreed to approve the capitalisation of the Neighbourhood Regeneration team, and resources against the capital programme.
9. Agreed to approve in principle the Edmonton Heartland Housing Zone 2 bid included in the part 2 report (No.179, Minute No.20 below).
10. Noted that updated information on the governance of all regeneration projects will be subject to a further report.

Reason: To provide an update on progress of the wider neighbourhood regeneration delivery programme, and to identify the financial resources required for continued programme delivery up to 2018/19. The resources identified in the part 2 report (No.179, Minute No.20 below) were necessary to ensure delivery of the objectives set out within the report.

(Key decision – reference number 4229)

12 IT DELIVERY

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.177) setting out proposals for future IT delivery.

NOTED, that Report Nos.180 and 180A also referred as detailed in Minute No.21 below.

Alternative Options Considered: NOTED the following alternative options considered as set out in section 4 of the report:

1. To cease the model of SIAM based delivery for IT. This would not be best practice. The retention of a mixed model of provision, which

CABINET - 10.2.2016

utilised a blend of in house and external resources, was clearly beneficial. The development of key relationships with major partners such of Microsoft was clearly beneficial to the Council.

2. To wait before registering an IT company to commercialise Enfield 2017 developed code and integration. Registering the company did not force the council to accept any commercial opportunities, but it did allow it to position itself so that it could take advantage of an opportunity should one arise in line with previous Cabinet requests. It would also allow the council to create the most mutually beneficial and supportive models of partnership where Enfield 2017 relies on code or products that were not owned by the council and would simplify licensing and development arrangements. The inclusion of a development and service desk capability would ensure that the council, and any future customers, benefit from an economy of scale and minimise duplication of effort.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed to approve

1. The retention of a mixed model of IT delivery with a range of providers for its IT service, based on the principles of the nationally recognised SIAM model.
2. The registration of a company, wholly owned by Enfield Council, to further develop, support and commercialise the Enfield 2017 offer. Further details regarding the exact make up and governance model for the company would be brought to a future Cabinet, along with a full business case. This would be undertaken prior to the commencement of trading activity by the company.

Reason: To ensure the council maximises the security and availability of its core IT systems, whilst maximising value for money. To ensure that the council retains access to a skilled and knowledgeable IT service that was able to respond quickly, and appropriately, to the rapidly changing IT landscape. To ensure that the council was able to respond to any opportunity to commercially benefit from the Enfield 2017 programme as previously identified by Cabinet.

(Key decision – reference number U195/4263)

13

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

NOTED, that no issues had been submitted for consideration at this meeting.

Councillor Derek Levy (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) informed Members of the outcome of a recent meeting of the Committee which had considered three called-in decisions.

14

CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS

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

**15
MINUTES**

AGREED, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 20 January 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**16
ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

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

**17
DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

NOTED, that the next meeting of the Cabinet was scheduled to take place on Tuesday 15 March 2016 at 8.15pm.

**18
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).

**19
BUDGET 2016-17 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (GENERAL FUND)**

Councillor Andrew Stafford (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.178).

NOTED

1. That Report No.171 also referred as detailed in Minute No.6 above.
2. That the report provided the commercially sensitive information relating to specific fees and charges as outlined in the report.

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No.171, Minute No.6 above referred.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL that the Pest Control, Commercial Waste, Schedule 2 waste, Planning pre-application service, golf special offers and

annual season ticket, Events, Passenger Transport Services, Fleet Services and Schools Health and Safety fees and charges for Environmental Services be agreed as set out in section 3.1 and appendix 1 of the report.

Reason: As detailed in Report No.171, Minute No.6 above referred.
(Key decision – reference number 4175)

20

NEIGHBOURHOOD REGENERATION PROGRAMME

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Councillor Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration and Environment (No. 179).

NOTED

1. That Report No.176 also referred as detailed in Minute No.11 above.
2. That the report set out the basis of the financial model developed for Meridian Water and, the wider neighbourhood regeneration capital programme to fund the next stages of a number of regeneration initiatives.
3. Members acknowledged the positive work that had been undertaken to date and the assurances provided.
4. That approval was being sought for a bid to the GLA for Housing Zone 2 status to be given to the Edmonton Heartlands, as detailed in the report.
5. The on-going discussions with regard to the requested increase in the provision of the number of trains per hour.

Alternative Options Considered: As included in the main body of the report.

DECISION: The Cabinet

1. Noted the inclusion within the capital programme for the sum stated in paragraph 5.2 of the report, to acquire surplus land owned by IKEA in accordance with the Heads of Terms detailed in appendix 1 of the report, and agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration and Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, in consultation with the Director of Regeneration and Environment and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services to complete the acquisition of IKEA land.
2. Agreed to approve the capitalisation of the neighbourhood regeneration team against the capital programme.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

3. Noted the request to increase the Neighbourhood Regeneration Capital Programme (approval was sought in Report No.171 – Budget Report 2016-17 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/17 to 2019/20 (General Fund), as detailed in Minute No.6 above) which would enable the development of the next stages of Meridian Water, Ponders End, Edmonton, New Southgate and Enfield Town.
4. Agreed to approve the Edmonton Heartland Housing Zone bid included at appendix 2 of the report.

Reason: A revised neighbourhood regeneration capital programme would enable the continuation of wider programmes of delivery in the Council's priority regeneration areas, as set out in Report No.176, Minute No.11 above refers. Members also noted the reasons set out in paragraphs 13.2 and 13.3 of the report.

(Key decision – reference number 4229)

21

IT DELIVERY

Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director of Legal and Governance) advised Members that the reports under consideration were commercially sensitive and were the subject of a confidentiality agreement. Members were advised of the restrictions that applied to them and the grounds on which they would need to declare an interest.

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.180).

NOTED

1. That Report No.177 also referred as detailed in Minute No.12 above.
2. That a super part 2 report (No.180A) containing restricted exempt information was circulated at the meeting and collected in again following consideration by the Cabinet.
3. James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services) outlined in detail to Members the reasons for the proposals as set out in the reports and the impact for future IT delivery at the council. Members noted in particular the financial and HR implications.
4. That, Members were given an opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification on aspects of the proposals as detailed in the reports which were responded to by officers present.
5. The proposed contract terms as detailed and the due diligence which had been undertaken.

CABINET - 10.2.2016

Alternative Options Considered: As detailed in Report No.177, Minute No.12 above refers, and in the restricted super part 2 report considered at the meeting.

DECISION: The Cabinet agreed the recommendations in full as set out in the following paragraphs of section 2 of Report Nos. 180 and 180A: paragraphs 2.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.

Reason: As detailed in Report No.177, Minute No.12 above refers, and in paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of Report Nos.180 and 180A.

(Key decision – U195/KD 4263)