

DECISION NOTICE OF THE Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 20th October, 2026

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the meeting of Cabinet held on Tuesday, 20 October 2026.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Richard Plummer, Committees Manager.

9. ACCEPTANCE OF LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND (LAHF) GRANT FUNDING

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, following consideration of exempt information:

1. In accordance with Contract Standing Order CSO 21.01 and Contract Standing Order 9.07.1(d), approved the acceptance of capital funding (£21,771,000) and revenue funding (£124,575) from the Local Authority Housing Fund, third funding round (LAHF R3), to enable the Council to acquire 84 homes in the borough.
2. In accordance with Contract Standing Order CSO 21.01 and Contract Standing Order 9.07.1(d), approved the acceptance of capital funding (£38,448,000) and revenue funding (£259,604) from the Local Authority Housing Fund, fourth funding round (LAHF R4), to enable the Council to acquire 152 homes in the borough.
3. Delegated authority to the Director of Capital Projects and Property, following consultation with the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources and the Director of Legal and Corporate Governance (Monitoring Officer), to agree and enter into the final grant documentation and contracts, including the LAHF R4 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and any other necessary documentation.
4. Delegated authority to the Director of Capital Projects and Property, following consultation with the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources and the Director of Legal and Corporate Governance (Monitoring Officer), to accept subsequent rounds of LAHF funding from MHCLG.

Reasons for the Decision

The Council was committed to providing good-quality housing for residents of the borough. This decision represented an important step towards achieving that aim.

Acceptance of the grant provided an opportunity to leverage additional funding into the programme, enabling the Council to deliver a greater number of homes for rent overall.

The purchase of these homes also helped to meet housing needs in Haringey, reduced pressure on the Temporary Accommodation budget, and enabled the Council to use Right to Buy receipts to fund other stock replacement projects.

Alternative Options Considered

The alternative option was not to accept the grant funding. This would have meant that additional homes were not purchased in the borough, resulting in more people remaining in temporary accommodation at greater cost to Haringey.

10. ANNUAL FEEDBACK AND RESOLUTIONS REPORT

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Delegated authority to the Member Responsible for Complaints (MRC) to finalise a Governing Body Statement for submission to the Housing Ombudsman Service, reflecting and taking account of Cabinet's consideration and discussion of the report and its appendices.
2. Noted the 2025/26 Annual Feedback and Resolutions Report.
3. Noted the Housing Ombudsman Service Annual Self-Assessment at Appendix F and the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Self-Assessment.
4. Noted the Complaints Improvement Plan at Appendix D and the Housing Service Sub-Improvement Plan, which set out the Council's approach to addressing the issues identified in the Annual Report and the self-assessments.

Reasons for the Decision

In line with the statutory requirements set out in the Housing Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code, it was essential that the governing body maintained oversight of complaint performance. Presenting the report to Cabinet ensured transparency, accountability and strategic governance in relation to complaint handling processes. It enabled Cabinet to assess organisational responsiveness, identify areas for improvement, and ensure that service delivery remained resident-focused and compliant with regulatory expectations.

In addition, the Council was required to submit annual self-assessments to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and the Housing Ombudsman Service, demonstrating how these had been reviewed and how the identified risks and issues would be addressed.

Alternative Options Considered

Publishing an Annual Feedback and Resolutions Review was a requirement. As a result, no alternative options were considered.

11. BETTER BUS PARTNERSHIP TFL FUNDING PROGRAMME

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the acceptance of £10 million from Transport for London as part of its Better Bus Partnership Programme, subject to the terms and conditions of the funding agreement.
2. Delegated authority, in accordance with the Council's Constitution and Contract Standing Orders, to the Director of Built Environment and Highways, in written consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member, for all project changes, approvals and procurement activities required for programme delivery.
3. Noted the high-level programme of projects set out in Tables 1, 2 and 3, recognising that individual projects would be subject to further feasibility work, design development, stakeholder engagement, statutory processes, funding availability and detailed approval processes, as required.

Reasons for the Decision

The £10 million Better Bus Partnership investment represented a significant opportunity to improve Haringey's transport network and public realm, delivering benefits for residents, businesses and visitors across the borough. The programme supported a wide range of users, including bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists, and those accessing town centres, community facilities, employment areas and cultural destinations.

The benefits of the programme were particularly significant for groups most reliant on bus travel, including young people, older residents, disabled people and lower-income households. By improving access to employment, education, healthcare, leisure and cultural opportunities, the programme supported inclusive growth and helped to reduce transport inequalities across the borough.

The Council sought to leverage investment into the Tottenham area for the benefit of businesses and residents, recognising that the UEFA European Championship in 2028 would bring an influx of visitors to the borough, many of whom would use public transport and the connecting footways and public realm leading to Tottenham Hotspur Stadium. The opportunity to provide an enhanced public realm and gateway into the borough, together with a lasting legacy for local communities, represented a significant opportunity for Haringey.

There was a funding delivery deadline of the 2029/30 financial year, which was further emphasised by the UEFA European Championship taking place in June 2028.

Detailed engagement and consultation were to be undertaken on the various workstreams as they developed, involving key stakeholders, internal teams and the wider public. At that stage, the programme represented a high-level summary of potential projects, with detailed proposals to be developed by design teams and informed by engagement activities once projects had commenced.

The projects set out in Table 3 were to use Better Bus Partnership funding for design development only. Alternative funding sources, including Section 106 developer contributions, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding and Transport for London Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding, had been identified for delivery of these schemes. This approach maximised the outcomes achievable through the Better Bus Partnership Programme.

Alternative Options Considered

The alternative option was not to accept the funding and not to proceed with the programme. This would have resulted in the Council foregoing the £10 million investment in highway assets, and the associated benefits of improved bus journey times, enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure, and improvements to the public realm would not have been realised. For this reason, the option was rejected.

12. CONTRACT AWARD - PROCUREMENT OF ENFORCEMENT AGENCY SERVICES VIA THE YPO FRAMEWORK TO COLLECT PCN RELATED DEBT FOR THE AUTHORITY

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, following consideration of exempt information:

1. Pursuant to Contract Standing Order 7.02 (use of a compliant framework) and 2.01(c), approved the award of a contract for the provision of Enforcement Agency Services to six suppliers set out in the exempt appendix (Part B) (active and reserve), for a period of two years from 16 November 2026 to 15 November 2028, with no option to extend. The estimated aggregate contract

value was £4 million over the two-year term, representing statutory enforcement fees anticipated to be recovered directly by the appointed providers from debtors, rather than expenditure payable by the Council.

2. Approved four bidders becoming active providers from contract award, with the remaining two bidders designated as reserve providers. Active suppliers could be moved to the reserve list, and reserve suppliers could become active providers, in accordance with the Enforcement Agency Specification and Code of Practice.
3. Noted that the number of Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) registered at the Traffic Enforcement Centre (TEC) over the term of the contract was estimated at 120,000. The registration cost was £11.00 per PCN, resulting in a total cost of £1.32 million. Although some PCNs remained unpaid, the overall costs were expected to be recovered through income generated from the contract from the overall number of PCNs that were paid.

Reasons for the Decision

This report followed the successful completion of a further competition conducted in accordance with the rules of the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation (YPO) Procurement Framework No. 1200 for Enforcement Agency Services. The framework was already being used for other debt types within Haringey and by other councils, including Council Tax, Business Rates and Business Improvement District (BID) Levy collection.

The Council had statutory duties relating to the effective management of parking and moving traffic. Enforcement was necessary to improve compliance and effectively manage limited kerbside space. The use of enforcement agents was always a measure of last resort. The new multi-provider model was intended to strengthen service resilience, improve recovery performance through competition, provide clearer performance management arrangements, and maintain safeguards for vulnerable residents and those experiencing financial hardship.

Enforcement Agencies recovered their statutory enforcement fees directly from debtors in accordance with legislation and did not charge the Council for core enforcement activities. However, the Council incurred the Traffic Enforcement Centre registration fee for cases progressed to debt registration, which was £11 per PCN. Where recovery was successful, the registration fee formed part of the balance owed by the debtor. The service model also included pre-TEC activity designed to identify cases where escalation might be inappropriate or unlikely to result in recovery, helping to avoid unnecessary registration costs. The fees that Enforcement Agencies could charge in recovering debt were prescribed by legislation.

The contract award moved the Council from reliance on a single Enforcement Agency to a competitive model consisting of four active providers and two reserve providers. This provided greater operational resilience and enabled the Council to adjust allocations and active or reserve status in response to performance, in accordance with the Enforcement Agency Specification and Code of Practice. The model included checks to identify cases involving hardship and vulnerability that might require earlier

intervention before the formal debt recovery process commenced. Earlier case reviews ensured that the Council did not unnecessarily incur statutory court fees and supported value for money.

Alternative Options Considered

Do nothing

Continuing with the existing single Enforcement Agency arrangement would have maintained dependence on a single provider, limited the Council's ability to use competition to improve recovery performance, and reduced resilience in circumstances where performance or service issues arose. It would also have prevented implementation of the enhanced performance, vulnerability and service safeguards contained within the new Enforcement Agency Specification and Code of Practice.

Cease using Enforcement Agencies

Ceasing to use Enforcement Agencies altogether would have significantly affected the collection of legitimate debt and overall income. Parking income was ring-fenced, and Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 set out how any parking surplus could be allocated. In summary, any surplus could be used for off-street parking provision, public transport services, such as concessionary travel, and the authority's costs of maintaining publicly funded roads. This option would have materially weakened the Council's ability to recover unpaid debt once the statutory notice and appeal processes had been exhausted.

Insource the service

Unlike Civil Enforcement Services, which use Civil Enforcement Officers who are often employed directly by councils, either in-house or through contractors, parking debt enforcement is typically outsourced to certificated enforcement firms. Most, if not all, London authorities outsourced warrant enforcement to specialist enforcement companies. Establishing an in-house enforcement service would have required the Council to develop expertise it did not currently possess and would have involved significant upfront investment in infrastructure, recruitment and training. The Council therefore considered outsourcing through the compliant framework to be a more proportionate and resilient approach.

13. DIRECT AWARD AND OF RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING CARE BLOCK CONTRACTS WITH OURRIS

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, following consideration of exempt information:

1. In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 2.01(a) (approval to commence a procurement exercise) and 2.01(d), approved the direct award of two contracts for a total of 39 block-purchased residential and nursing care beds:
 - a. To Ourris Properties Limited for 28 beds at Autumn Gardens; and
 - b. To Ourris Residential Homes Limited for 11 beds at Anastasia Lodge.
2. Approved the award of contracts for a period of eight years commencing on 22 November 2026, with a break clause exercisable after four years, at an estimated maximum aggregate contract value of £19.67 million over the full contract term.
3. Noted that the proposed award was supported by the evidence contained within the Needs and Gaps Analysis and was compliant with the Council's obligations under the Procurement Act 2023 in relation to user choice services.
4. Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Adults, Housing and Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Wellbeing, the Director of Finance, and the Head of Legal and Governance, to finalise and enter into all contractual arrangements necessary to implement the decision.

Reasons for the Decision

Across the two care homes, Ourris provided a service that was difficult to replace. It represented Haringey's only block-purchased residential and nursing care arrangement and offered culturally responsive support for Greek, Cypriot and Turkish communities. Residents were supported in environments that reflected their language, culture, faith and community connections.

Demand for the service remained strong. Occupancy levels were consistently high, and both homes continued to perform well. Contract monitoring demonstrated high levels of resident and family satisfaction, stable staffing arrangements, low levels of complaints and safeguarding concerns, and continued compliance with the Council's quality expectations.

The Council's Needs and Gaps Analysis found no equivalent provider within approximately 75 miles that was capable of delivering the same combination of residential care, nursing care and culturally specific support. A direct award was therefore considered the most proportionate and least disruptive option available. It protected resident choice, maintained continuity of care, and supported the Council in meeting its duties under the Care Act 2014.

The proposed contract also provided stability for residents, families and the provider.

Alternative Options Considered

Option 1: Do Nothing

This option was rejected.

Without these contracts in place, the Council would have lost guaranteed access to 39 culturally specific residential and nursing care beds and would have been required to

rely on spot-purchasing arrangements. Residents could have experienced reduced choice, and there would have been no assurance that culturally appropriate alternatives could be sourced when placements were required. The Council would also have lost the ability to agree longer-term pricing and performance expectations through a contractual arrangement.

Option 2: Competitive Procurement

This option was considered but rejected.

Market intelligence indicated that there were no providers capable of delivering the same culturally responsive model of residential and nursing care at this scale. A procurement exercise was therefore unlikely to attract equivalent providers and could have created uncertainty for residents and families. The wider care home market continued to operate primarily through spot-purchasing arrangements, and providers had limited incentive to participate in a competitive tender process where demand already exceeded supply.

Option 3: Direct Award (Preferred Option)

This option was recommended.

It maintained continuity of care, preserved resident choice, secured access to a specialist service, and allowed the Council to continue working with a provider that was performing well. It also avoided unnecessary disruption while providing time to consider future commissioning arrangements.

14. PROCUREMENT OF THE OUT OF HOURS (OOH) EMERGENCY CONTACT HANDLING SERVICE

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, following consideration of exempt information:

1. Approved the commencement of a competitive procurement exercise for the provision of an Out of Hours (OOH) Emergency Contact Handling Service from 1 June 2027.
2. Approved a proposed contract term of three years, with an option to extend for up to a further two years, subject to satisfactory performance, continued business need and the availability of budget provision.
3. Noted the estimated annual value of the contract as set out in the Exempt Appendix.

Reasons for the Decision

The Out of Hours service was a business-critical, resident-facing service that enabled the Council to receive, triage and assign all urgent and emergency contacts made outside normal working hours to the relevant on-duty team or contractor. This included evenings, overnight periods, weekends and bank holidays. The service helped to protect resident safety by ensuring urgent issues were routed appropriately, while protecting on-duty staff from receiving out-of-hours calls that did not meet the emergency criteria. The procured provider also formed part of the Council's wider business continuity arrangements by providing additional contact-handling resilience for daytime services where required, including where the Council's telephone lines were disrupted or during periods of exceptional demand, emergency incidents or other circumstances affecting normal daytime contact routes.

The service also enabled the Council to meet statutory responsibilities arising outside normal office hours, including duties under homelessness legislation to respond to households that might be homeless, eligible for assistance and in priority need, together with wider responsibilities relating to safeguarding, emergency accommodation, adult social care, children's services and civil contingency responses. Maintaining an effective Out of Hours contact-handling service was therefore necessary to ensure that residents could access urgent Council support when needed and that statutory functions could be discharged without avoidable delay.

A competitive procurement was required to secure a compliant, sustainable and value-for-money long-term service from June 2027, when the current contract with Capita was due to expire.

Through the procurement process, the Council would review and, where appropriate, strengthen the service specification, reconfirm operational pathways with service areas, establish a commercial performance management framework, ensure that future service provision reflected current and emerging resident needs, and ensure that the contract allowed for reductions in contract costs in line with any reductions in demand. Such reductions were expected to be supported by the Council's introduction of a voice-based digital triage tool.

The recommended approach enabled the Council to test the market, benchmark quality and pricing, secure best value, and promote service stability through a longer-term contract.

Although the procurement process was led by Customer Services, and the Out of Hours supplier would continue to be contract-managed by Customer Services, the cost of the contract would be met through the budgets of the three principal service areas that used the provision. These were Customer Services (General Fund), Homelessness (General Fund), and the Housing Repairs Service (Housing Revenue Account).

Alternative Options Considered

The following options were considered before recommending a competitive procurement for a new outsourced Out of Hours (OOH) service.

Option 1: Do Nothing

This option was not recommended.

Allowing the current contract to expire without securing future Out of Hours provision would have created unacceptable risks to resident safety and to the Council's ability to respond to urgent issues outside normal office hours.

Option 2: Bring the Service In-House

This option was not recommended.

The proposal involved establishing a dedicated Haringey Council Out of Hours operation. Previous modelling indicated that an in-house service would have been materially more expensive than the outsourced model. In addition, an in-house arrangement would have reduced the additional business continuity resilience provided by an external supplier in circumstances where the Council's daytime systems or services were disrupted.

Option 3: Purchase the Service from Another Council

This option was not recommended.

The proposal involved paying another local authority to provide out-of-hours emergency contact handling services for Haringey residents. However, no affordable option was identified. A shared service involving one or two councils would not have achieved the same economies of scale as established suppliers operating across a larger national client base. There were also resilience risks associated with London-wide incidents, such as extreme weather events, where multiple boroughs could experience increased out-of-hours demand simultaneously.

Option 4: Continue with Short-Term Extensions

This option was not recommended.

Continuing the current arrangements through further contract extensions or interim measures would not have been compliant with procurement regulations. As a result, this option was discounted.

Option 5: Procure a New Outsourced Out of Hours Service (Preferred Option)

This option was recommended.

The Council proceeded with a competitive procurement for a new outsourced Out of Hours service, operating within the strongest possible ethical and social value framework, for an initial three-year term commencing on 1 June 2027, with an option to extend for a further two years.

This approach provided the best balance of compliance, value for money, resilience, service quality, transparency and deliverability.

15. SELBY URBAN VILLAGE - AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR HEAT SUPPLY ARRANGEMENTS

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

Cllr Beckford noted that they were appointed by the Council to the membership of the North London Waste Authority in May 2026 by virtue of my Cabinet responsibilities. The North London Waste Authority have a working relationship with the Lee Valley Heat Network referred to in the report and recommendations. It was noted that

Councillor Beckford was granted dispensation to vote on matters relating to North London Waste Authority by the Standards Committee in June.

Councillor Kuper noted that they were appointed by the Council to the membership of the North London Waste Authority the North London Waste Authority agreed by full Council in July. The North London Waste Authority have a working relationship with the Lee Valley Heat Network .Due to Committee meeting scheduling, the Standards Committee are due to consider a dispensation in relation to my council membership role of North London Waste Association at their November meeting and therefore recused themselves from the meeting at items 15 and 23.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, following consideration of exempt information:

1. Approved the award of Heat Connection Agreements, for a term of 40 years, to Lee Valley Heat Network Operating Company Limited (Company No. 09763702) for: Selby Village (residential); Commercial Unit Space within the residential development; Commercial Connection – Selby Centre; and Commercial Connection – Sports Pavilion. The total contract value was as set out in the exempt recommendations.
2. Approved the award of the Selby Urban Village Framework Supply Agreement, for a term of 40 years, to Lee Valley Heat Network Operating Company Limited (Company No. 09763702). This committed the Council to the relevant supply costs contained within the subsidiary supply agreements over the 40-year contract term, including those identified within the exempt recommendations.
3. Noted that, through the subsidiary Construction Supply Agreement, the Council would meet the cost of heat supply during the construction period, including commissioning activities, with these costs already accounted for within the project's capital budget.
4. Noted that, through the subsidiary Residential Customer Supply Agreements, the Council would contribute the landlord's availability charge applied by Energetik for the residential heat network at Selby Urban Village. The proportion of the total availability charge and the estimated cost to the Council over the 40-year contract term were set out in the exempt recommendations.
5. Noted that, through the subsidiary Residential Customer Supply Agreements, social housing tenants would contribute the tenant availability charge applied by Energetik for residential heat supply at Selby Urban Village. The proportion of the total availability charge was set out in the exempt recommendations.
6. Noted that, through the subsidiary Residential Customer Supply Agreements, social housing tenants would be responsible for their variable heat usage charges during their tenancy.
7. Noted that, through the subsidiary Commercial Customer Supply Agreements, commercial tenants occupying the Community Centre, Sports Pavilion and

Commercial Unit would be responsible for their availability charges and variable usage charges during their occupation.

8. Noted that, through the subsidiary Void Supply Agreements, the Council would be responsible for the availability and usage charges for heat supplied to residential and commercial void properties for a term of 40 years with Lee Valley Heat Network Operating Company Limited. The estimated cost to the Council over the contract term was set out in the exempt recommendations.
9. Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources, following consultation with the Head of Legal and the Lead Member for Placemaking, to finalise the terms of the contracts, ensure that they remained fair and reasonable, agree the final legal documentation and complete execution of the agreements.

Reasons for the Decision

The overall design concept and sustainability objectives for the Selby Urban Village project had previously been approved by Cabinet in September 2023 and subsequently through the *Gateway 0 Report - Phase 2, Selby Urban Village* in June 2024. The energy strategy was developed in accordance with the energy policies of the London Plan and the policies of both Haringey and Enfield Councils, with the aim of achieving low-carbon development in line with the London Plan energy hierarchy. These policies, together with the project's planning approvals, required connection to a district heat network on fair and reasonable commercial terms, unless such a connection was not possible, practical or viable.

Energetik was identified as the only viable district heat network provider serving the area. As a result, the Council undertook a review of the proposed agreements and entered into direct negotiations with Energetik regarding the connection to the network, the supply of heat to residential and non-residential buildings, and the management and maintenance of residential heat supply systems. This approach was consistent with the direct procurement strategy approved by Cabinet on 7 January 2026.

The Heat Connection Agreement and Framework Supply Agreement were long-term contracts covering different aspects of the district heat network. Together, they established the framework for both operation of the network infrastructure and the supply of heat to customers.

Under Section 11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, the Council was required to provide and maintain a functioning heating system for secure tenants. The Council therefore needed to implement heat supply arrangements for the 202 new council homes being delivered through the development. It also needed to ensure reliable heating provision for the new Community Centre, Sports Pavilion and Commercial Unit so that these facilities could be occupied and operated as intended. The proposed allocation of residential availability charges between the landlord and social tenants had been reviewed and was considered to accurately reflect the responsibilities established under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

Work had been undertaken to mitigate the risks associated with connecting to the Energetik district heat network and with the proposed contractual arrangements. Further details of these risks and mitigations were contained within the exempt report. Delegated authority was recommended to allow final contract terms to be negotiated and refined, ensuring that the final agreements remained fair and reasonable to the Council before execution.

Alternative Options Considered

Option 1: Do Not Connect to the Energetik District Heat Network

This option was considered but discounted.

Planning policies and planning approvals required the development to connect to the nearest district heat network, namely Energetik, unless fair and reasonable contractual terms could not be secured. To mitigate against the possibility that acceptable terms could not be agreed, the Council explored alternative technical solutions, including the construction of an on-site energy centre using low-carbon heating technologies. However, as the principal contract terms were considered fair and reasonable, subject to final negotiation, this alternative option was not pursued. Further details, including cost implications, were contained within the exempt report.

Option 2: Connect to an Alternative District Heat Network Supplier

This option was considered but rejected.

Although other district heat network operators existed elsewhere in London, the capital costs and practical challenges associated with installing pipework over the distances required to connect the Selby Urban Village development to networks in locations such as Stratford or Brent rendered this option unviable.

Option 3: Procure Heat Supply from Energetik but Manage the Network Separately

This option was considered but rejected.

The Council considered procuring heat supply from Energetik while separately managing and maintaining the residential secondary heat network, either directly or through another provider. Technical advice indicated that this approach would have significant ongoing financial, resource and capacity implications. Procuring both the heat supply and the associated management and maintenance services from Energetik was considered more cost-effective and operationally efficient than establishing separate management arrangements.