

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 21st January, 2025, 6.30 - 7.32 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Ajda Ovat, Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, Emily Arkell, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Seema Chandwani, Lucia das Neves, Ruth Gordon and Sarah Williams**

## **ALSO ATTENDING:**

### **102. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred to the filming at meetings notice, and attendees noted this information.

#### **RESOLVED:**

To note the filming procedure

### **103. APOLOGIES**

There were none.

### **104. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee decided at its meeting of the 14 January 2025 referred the decision, taken by Cabinet, on 10 December 2024, on the Implementation of a Borough Wide PSPO back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

According to the Call-in Procedure in the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section H), Cabinet has five working days to reconsider the key decision before taking a final decision. It was advised that Cabinet consider this as late urgent business to be considered with item 8 on the agenda.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Leader of the Council accepted this item of late business for the reasons outlined in the cover page tabled at the meeting with the report.

### **105. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

**106. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS**

**107. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting, dated 10 December 2024, were discussed

**RESOLVED:**

The minutes of the previous meeting, dated 10 December 2024, were approved as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

**108. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

There were none.

**109. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee introduced the Scrutiny Call-In of the decision made by Cabinet, on 10 December 2024, on the Implementation of a Borough Wide PSPO back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee outlined receipt of deputations and the concerns of homelessness and the impact of the proposal on that cohort. It was suggested that there would be a lower likelihood of homelessness engagement because of the decision of Cabinet, which were linked to the recommendations of scrutiny one and two.

He raised concerns regarding penalising public urination due to severe shortage of toilet facilities and the lack of borough toilet strategy.

It was stressed by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that not all Committee Members of Scrutiny felt that the report warranted referral to Cabinet, but explained that the Committee did present a majority to refer the decision to Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Communities gave a response. It was explained that there were approximately 780 reports per month received of the misuse of public spaces. It was stressed that Cabinet could not ignore these concerns and that the implementation of the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) was important to the enhancement of public safety and reduce anti-social behaviour. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council gave an additional explanation about the needs of homeless people. It was explained what services were available to demonstrate the work that was undertaken to outreach to homeless people within the borough. It was explained that homeless people were exempt from

public urination rules, when there was no other alternative, and that the Council would not prosecute those with no other option.

It was explained that the Council was developing a Toilet Strategy, but stressed that the current lack of a strategy should not delay the implementation of the PSPO.

It was noted that the Council was working to outreach to homeless people in the borough through partnership work, which addressed the third recommendation.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Arkell, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that there had been a detailed consultation undertaken and that engagement had impacted the implementation of the PSPO. It was noted that the Council had gathered a broad range of feedback and co-designed the priority areas as a result. Feedback gathered from over 200 groups, 1700 questionnaire responses were given. As a result of these responses, the policy was amended to reflect the suggestions proposed.

The Cabinet Member for Communities suggested the rejection of the recommendations given by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and that the Cabinet adopt the original recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Confirmed original decision of 10 December 2024 and rejected the recommendations suggested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 14 January 2025.

**110. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOLLOWING TENDER OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND GOVERNOR SUPPORT SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families introduced the report. It was explained that school improvement and governance were vital to ensure high performing schools. It was explained that, in Haringey, the current service delivered school improvement related statutory functions on behalf of the Council in accordance with the Education Act 1996, but that the contract was due to expire in March 2025. It was explained that, in June 2024, the Cabinet agreed an option to proceed to open tender for a new school improvement and governor services contract. An open tender process had concluded approval was sought from Cabinet to award the contract to the successful bidder. The key elements of the tender were outlined and proposed the contract which included a series of key performance indicators to ensure the schools were supported, and also challenged in their work to raise pupil attainment and ensure they are delivering the best outcomes for children and young people was put forward.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Emery, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the provisions of the contract, school improvement, was within a niche market, and while it was an open tender, there was only one bidder for the contract.
- The Director for Children's Services explained that they would provide a written response to the quantification of the final scores for Price, Quality and Social Value that were within the contract.
- The Director for Children's Services explained that they would write to Members regarding the report's definition of a Global Majority.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the award of a contract for the delivery of School Improvement and Governor Services contract to Supplier A for a 4-year period at a cost of £1,873,654
2. Agreed that the contract will commence from 1 April 2025 until 31 March 2029.

## **Reasons for decision**

The current contract for the delivery of School Improvement and Governor Services expires on 31 March 2025 with no further options to extend.

In order to ensure that the service can continue to deliver local authority statutory and strategic functions for the whole period of the contract, the service will continue to be funded via the Dedicated School Grant: Central School Services Block (CSSB). The CSSB budget has pressures due to a forecast decrease in the allocation of CSSB of 2.5% per annum. Due to the forecast decrease in CSSB, no inflationary uplift can be made during the contract period.

## **Alternative options considered.**

Option 1: Renew the existing contract with the current provider

Renewal of the contract to the existing provider following the expiry of the current contract without proceeding with an open competitive tender was an option considered and rejected for the reasons set out in the report dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2024.

Following a rigorous legal and procurement assessment of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (PCR 2015) the conclusion reached was that renewal of the existing contract without competition would not be compliant with the PCR's 2015 and this option is therefore not recommended. To renew the contract without an open tender opportunity would have been in breach of PCR's 2015.

Option 2: Insource the service.

This was considered and not recommended in accordance with the details within the June 2024 report. Following an assessment of this option it is not recommended, due to the cost of an in-house model.

## **111. TO INCREASE PARKING PERMIT CHARGES FOR CAR CLUB SCHEMES**

The Cabinet Member introduced the report and explained that the way that vehicles are used should fundamentally change. It was explained that the vision was for residents to access vehicles when needed rather than defaulting to private ownership. This shift was explained as being essential for creating a more sustainable and equitable transport system. It was noted that car clubs represented a vital component of this transformation. It was stressed that the Council prioritised and promoted sustainable travel modes like walking, cycling and public transport, it was recognised that some journeys will always require a car. It was explained that, by providing an environmentally friendly option for these essential trips, car clubs help break the link between car use and car ownership.

It was noted that the ambition of the Council was to have shared vehicles available on every street, integrated with other sustainable transport options. It was explained that there was a vision of the creation of mobility hubs that combined car club spaces with electric vehicle charging, cycle parking, and enhanced public spaces to transform streets into places that better serve our communities while advancing our climate goals. It was explained that, by opening up the market to more providers, we aim to significantly expand car club provision across the borough. Greater choice and availability will make it easier for residents to access shared vehicles when they need them, helping more people move away from private car ownership.

It was explained that this expansion would support the goal of reducing the total number of vehicles on our streets while ensuring residents retain access to cars for essential journeys. It was highlighted that the strategy aligns with the Council's broader goals around improving air quality, reducing emissions, and creating more liveable neighbourhoods.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr das Neves, Chandwani and Emery, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the main purpose of the raising of prices was to bring prices closer to the median of London Boroughs, where Haringey had a low rate currently
- It was noted that there was a current dominance of providers who were already present. Officers explained that the changes proposed would encourage smaller providers to enter the market more effectively.
- It was explained that the current profits made by current car clubs was projected to be £1.4million; an increase in charges would be projected to

- reduce profits by approximately £50,000, which was not projected to make a significant impact on the profitability of the service.
- It was explained that the proposal would be rationalising charges into one package, which would simplify charges for companies. It was noted that benchmarking with other comparable local authorities put the proposal at the median cost.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the following changes to car club permit fee subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.
  - a) Increase in the fixed bay (back-to-bay) permit fee from £240 per bay per year to £800 per bay per year:
  - b) Increase in the floating car club permit fees
    - (i) from £1,400 per year to £1,540 per year for internal combustion engine vehicles; and
    - (ii) from £753.20 per year to £1,342 per year for electric vehicles.
2. Delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking to:
  - a) carry out all required statutory consultations regarding the proposed changes to car club permit fees; and
  - b) make all necessary traffic management orders, having considered any objections received in response to the statutory consultation, to implement the proposed changes, subject to key decisions being considered by Cabinet.
3. Noted that future price increases will be considered as part of the annual corporate fees and charges report.
4. Noted that the additional revenue generated will be retained for monitoring and traffic management order purposes.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The proposed adjustments to car club permit fees are driven by several key considerations, aimed at aligning Haringey Council's fees with market values, ensuring financial sustainability, and supporting environmental goals. The rationale behind the proposed changes is as follows:

Fixed Bay Permit Fee: The proposal to increase the fixed bay fee from £240 to £800 per bay per year is intended to reposition Haringey above at least half of the other boroughs in terms of fee levels, yet still remain competitive. For floating bays, the proposed fee increase is from £753.20 to £1,342.00 for EVs and from £1,400 to £1,540. This increase is necessary to better reflect the market value of these services and to address the financial pressures associated with monitoring and managing the car club operations. By aligning the fee with market rates, the Council can ensure that it recoups the costs associated with managing and monitoring the service.

Financial Sustainability and Service Improvement: The increase in permit fees generally is not only aimed at aligning with market values but also at ensuring full cost recovery. In the absence of external funding for those schemes, the Council cannot continue to subsidise the operators and must use its resources wisely to deliver expand the number of car club bays within the borough, which is a key objective outlined in the Corporate Delivery Plan 2024-26. By implementing these fee adjustments, the Council can ensure that the car club service remains financially viable and continues to meet the needs of residents.

These recommendations are designed to balance the need for fair pricing with the financial requirements of managing and expanding the car club service. They reflect a strategic approach to promoting sustainable transport options.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Alternative options were considered before arriving at the recommended fee adjustments. One significant alternative involved maintaining the current fee structure for both fixed and floating bays.

a) Failed Tender

Earlier in 2024, the Council issued a tender for the provision of fixed bay car club services. The terms of the tender required operators to cover both a 'monitoring fee' to fund the Council's oversight of the scheme, as well as the full costs associated with the installation of new car club bays. Unfortunately, these financial requirements were deemed too onerous by potential operators, leading to no submissions for the tender. This highlighted the challenge of covering those costs, necessitating a reconsideration of parking permits fees.

b) Maintaining the Current Fee Structure

An alternative option was to retain the existing fee of £240 per year for fixed bays, and £753.20 and £1,400 for EV and ICE floating bays respectively. However, maintaining the existing fees would require the Council to continue to subsidise the scheme, and this is not sustainable.

In conclusion, while maintaining the current fee structure would avoid imposing higher costs on operators, it would compromise the Council's ability to achieve long-term objectives related to sustainable transport and car club service expansion. The recommended fee increases strike a necessary balance between ensuring the financial sustainability of the scheme and aligning with the Council's wider environmental and mobility goals.

## **112. APPROVAL TO PROCURE HOME CARE, FAMILY SUPPORT AND FAMILY THERAPEUTIC SUPPORT SERVICES VIA DYNAMIC PURCHASING SERVICE FOR CHILDRENS SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families introduced the report. It was explained that the Council was committed to supporting families to care for vulnerable children and young people with complex health needs within the family home and to

help them to take breaks from caring where the need arises. It was explained that the commissioning of this service would provide early therapeutic intervention to support children to remain with their families or return to their care safely and as quickly as possible. It was highlighted that there was a focus on accountability and quality standards through robust negotiation and monitoring of contracts is an essential element of commissioning and is vital for ensuring families receive high quality services.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Emery, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the DPS functioned effectively as an individual competition for provision of individual needs, which ensures best value for money.
- That rates within the Children's Services market remained stable and were not majorly impacted by inflation, however, officers stressed that they would consider inflation and ask for justification for increases.
- Officers explained that feedback from the services as they were running which included social workers and those experiencing services as commissioned. It was explained that the development of the DPS allowed for better meeting of needs and created an approved framework.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the estimated, spend of up to £7.2 million on Home Care, Family Support and Family Therapeutic Support Services over the period of up to 4 years.
2. Approved the commissioning of Home Care, Family Support and Family Therapeutic Support for 0-18 children and young people, via the corporate DPS pursuant to Regulation 34 of the Public Contract Regulations.
3. Where contracts were £500,000 and above that require approval by Cabinet as per Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 d) or modified as per CSO 10.02.1 b) (variations and extensions to contracts of £500,000 and above); Cabinet delegated authority to the Director of Children's Services in consultation with the Lead member for Children's, Schools and families to award, vary or extend any individual call offs or block contract arrangements under the DPS to successful providers up to £800,000 per award or any individual variation and extension.



## REASON FOR DECISION

Commissioning home care and family support services will support the council to meet our priorities for children and young people. Providers commissioned will work with the council to ensure that families receive timely services that can meet their needs, to strengthen families' resilience, support more effective parenting and behaviour management. In addition, to ensure that adults within the family have the practical skills to keep the home safe and reduce the harm posed to children and young people.

Haringey's looked after children's strategy recognises that delivering transformational change requires a strong focus on prevention and early intervention. It outlines the importance of reducing the number of children and young people needing to be looked after by the local authority which is a key feature of our policies and plans. The continuation of high-quality home care, family support and family therapeutic support services will support this agenda.

Approval to procure home care, family support and family therapeutic support services via the DPS will ensure the council is compliant with Procurement Regulations.

The council intends to commission the following block arrangements:

- Block arrangement with two specialist family therapeutic support services where the need arises at a lower unit cost. The estimated value would be circa £200,000 (based on 12 cases) per financial year, over 4 years would be circa £800,000.
- Bundled hours with up to 4 home care and family support providers, establishing a minimum number of guaranteed hours with a reduction of up to 5% of the hourly rate.
- This initiative will support improved collaborative working between the council and providers.

## ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

**Do nothing:** There is a continued demand for this service to support families to continue to care for children and young people with complex health needs and intervention to families and carers of children displaying violent behaviours, misusing substances, and other challenges that families and carers may face. To meet the needs of the children, young people and their families, the Council would be needed to commission the Home Care and family support provisions on spot purchasing basis. This approach is not permitted under the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and would be likely be more costly and resource intensive.

**Deliver the service in house** -This option was discounted based on the scale of the infrastructure required to deliver home care, family support and family therapeutic support services in-house. In house services can give councils greater control over the care that is provided although quality is not guaranteed through an in – house

delivery model. Additionally, in-house models tend to be more expensive than external provisions, often due to inefficiencies.

**113. APPROVAL TO PROCURE SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION VIA A DYNAMIC PURCHASING SYSTEM (DPS) FOR CHILDREN IN CARE AND CARE LEAVERS**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families introduced the report. It was explained that, as a Corporate Parent, the Council had a statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of accommodation the most vulnerable children and young people. It was explained that the Commissioning this accommodation would ensure the Council is meeting its duties. It was noted that the service would continue to be monitoring and quality assuring providers to ensure the accommodation is of a high standard where children and young people can be supported to prepare for independence. It was stressed that children and young people needed to be supported to maintain relationships and local connections within the Haringey community and ensuring accommodation is within 20-mile radius of the Borough where possible.

- It was explained that there were higher numbers of more complex cases which were being reported, as well as an increased demand from providers, which increased the costs.
- It was explained that authority to sign off individual call-offs had been delegated to Director of Children's Services as a result of financial regulations and that the authority, below a certain threshold, would be delegated to officers.
- Officers noted that, on some occasions, young people may consider that their accommodation was not acceptable, but that it did meet with the statutory requirements. However, Cabinet Members stressed that it was important that young people were consulted to ensure that they had the best experience. It was additionally noted that young people were involved in quality assurance checks.

**RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the estimated spend of up to £27.2 million over a period of 4 years via the corporate Dynamic Purchasing System
2. Approved the commencement to procure supported accommodation for 16 and 17 years and 18 plus Pursuant to Regulation 34 of the Public Contract Regulation.
3. That, where contracts value £500,000 and above require approval by Cabinet as per Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 d) or modified as per CSO 10.02.1 b) (variations and extensions to contracts with value of £500,000 and above, that Cabinet agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Children Services in consultation with the Lead Member for Children's, Schools and families to award, vary or extend any individual call offs or block contract arrangements under the DPS to successful providers up to £2 million per award or any individual variation and extension.

### **REASON FOR DECISION**

The Children Acts 1989 and 2004 and the Children Leaving Care Act 2000, local authorities have a duty to assess and meet the needs of young people aged 16+ and 18+ who are in care or care leavers. Wherever the young person lives, the duty will rest with the parent local authority to stay connected with care leavers until they are at least 21 (in some instances this is extended to age 25). The local authority has a statutory duty to ensure that every looked after child and care leaver is properly prepared in making the transition to adulthood in a planned and effective way to achieve the best possible outcomes for the individual young person.

Haringey's Looked After Children's Sufficiency Strategy identified the need to improve the range and depth of our placements offer, strengthen legal permanency options, and build pathways to adulthood in semi-independent and supported living with a focus on increasing the availability of local placements. Supported accommodation services enable the Council to meet its duty to provide sufficient accommodation for children and young people in care in their local area.

Supported accommodation services will enable young people to become more independent whilst living in the service, through developing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours required to sustain independent living and make a smooth and successful transition to adulthood. The service is required to build resilience and strength in young people's skills to live in the community whilst ensuring young people are fully involved in the development and delivery of their support plans. The service providers will also support young people in care to engage in Education, Employment and Training opportunities.

Approval to procure supported accommodation via the DPS will ensure the council is compliant with Procurement Regulations.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Do nothing: This option was discounted: The Council has a statutory duty to assess and meet the needs of young people aged 16+ and 18+ who are in care or care leavers under the Children Acts 1989 and 2004 and the Children Leaving Care Act 2000. To fulfill this requirement, the Council would need to engage in spot purchasing of the service. This approach is not permitted under the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and would be likely be more costly and resource intensive.

Deliver in house: This option was discounted; The Council does not have the capacity to deliver these services in-house.

### **114. AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR PLANNED INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (LIFTS)**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report. It was explained that the current lifts had reached the end of their useful life and that replacement parts were becoming obsolete. It was explained that the modernisation of the lifts would ensure compliance with current lift standards and will provide residents and visitors with a reliable and efficient service when travelling the building.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Emery, the following information was shared:

- The Cabinet Member stressed that all contracts provide social value, and that any contracted service provide services such as apprenticeships, work with local community centres and provide other social value.
- Officers explained that the work was at a fixed price but that failure to deliver within the specifics of the contract would result in the forfeit of payment for the contract, and that the Council also held a retention element in case of any defects.
- It was explained by officers that the apportionment of costs would be a standard apportionment spread equally across the number of leaseholders.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the award of the Lift Modernisation Works to 1-40 Bounds Green Court, N11 and 1-24 Woodmead, N17 contract to the company identified in the exempt part of this report for the maximum sum of £544,684 for a period of 33 weeks.
2. Approved the issuance of a letter of intent for an amount up to 10% of the winning bid value (£544,684) totalling £54,468.

3. Approved the professional fees and project management costs of £44,714 that represents 7.91839% of the contract sum.
4. Agreed the total project costs.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The four lifts within this scheme were last modernised in 2004 and are at the age where major improvements are required. The project will allow works to modernise the facilities whilst also alleviating the risk of breakdowns and delays waiting for replacement parts.

The recommendation is based on a robust evaluation process following a competitive procurement process conducted on Adam Procure Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS).

The evaluation process was carried out in accordance with the Invitation to Tender requirements and was based on 60% price and 40% quality. The outcome of the evaluation was as follows:

<b>Contractor</b>	<b>Price 60%</b>	<b>Quality 40%</b>	<b>Total %</b>	<b>Rank</b>
A	60%	32%	92%	1
B	56%	32%	88%	2

Further details of the tender and evaluation process are outlined in Appendix A, the exempt part of this report.

The recommended contractor A's submitted tender was comprehensive and included well-chosen comparable examples, a good understanding of the contract's risks and challenges and a good understanding how to add social value for residents.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

An alternative option would be the use of the London Construction Programme Major Works framework. However, Haringey Council's Strategic Procurement advised that the DPS Framework would offer greater competition and would be the optimum route to market. This considered aspects such as the speed of access to pre-approved contractors and focus on companies that concentrate their resources in the local area.

The option of not undertaking this work was also considered. However, if the works were delayed it would result in lift breakdowns waiting for replacement parts which are largely no longer available, increased repair costs and resident dissatisfaction.

## **115. AGENCY STAFF - CONTRACT AWARD**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services introduced the report. It was explained that the Council was committed to building a motivated, collaborative, and community-focused workforce. However, it was explained that there would be circumstances that necessitate the employment of agency workers, but stressed that this was not the Council's preferred mode of employment. It was explained that the Council should employ agency workers where there was a strong business need, which would primarily be to help facilitate shorter-term or finite projects, and to address unavoidable skill shortages in order to maintain services to residents.

It was explained that all directorates were working to ensure that there is a solid reason for every agency assignment and that no new workers were recruited without prior consideration of all alternative options. It was explained that the measures taken over the last year decreased the numbers and level of expenditure on agency workers and this effort would continue to be a strong focus for senior managers.

It was explained that the contract represented the best value way to engage agency workers, and that it was important to note that there was no minimum spend and no penalties or increased costs if the Council did not spend up to the authorised contract value.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Emery, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the recruitment of all agency staff was resultant of difficulties to recruit permanently. Discussions had been had with agency staff to encourage take up of permanent roles, but that this was not always taken up in key areas.
- Reduced spend of contract significantly, and that the service was working to drive these costs lower. While it was stressed that this may suffer from variation, it was stressed that work was being undertaken to reduce the number of agency staff and the costs resultant wherever possible.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the award of a contract for temporary agency provision and permanent agency recruitment support to Matrix on a neutral vendor basis, under Lot 1a – Neutral Vendor of ESPO'S Managed Services for Temporary Agency Resources Framework to appoint a single service provider under the MSTAR4 Framework.

2. Approved the contract award for 2 years with the option to extend for 2 further periods each of 2 years up to a maximum term of 6 years. Cabinet is being requested to approve the contract spend for the first two-year period of this contract. A further report will be brought to Cabinet prior to the end of this initial period, to authorise the extension period and further contractual spend if required.
3. Approved the contract spend of £88,636,000 to cover the initial 2-year contract period

<b>Year</b>	<b>Value with 3% cost of living added</b>
Year 1, 2025/26	£41,200,000
Year 2, 2026/27	£42,436,000
Contingency (5%)	£5,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£88,636,000</b>

The estimated value is based on current spend and considering future market rates, insourcing and pay increases. As this contract is demand led, if agency demand reduces then the value of the contract then reduces.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Council's current contract expires in July 2025; however, the current contract value will be exhausted earlier than that and there is no possibility of a further value extension. A procurement process in collaboration with the London Collaboration has been undertaken to ensure a new contract can be placed to continue to meet the Council's current requirements.

The new contract will allow the Council to continue to make savings and offer the Council the best value over the period of the contract based on current agency worker usage. Working as part of the London Collaboration, the 2 year + contracts are the best value option available. The new contract will commence upon reaching the maximum value on the existing contract, or July 2025, whichever is the earlier.

The new contract will enable Haringey Works to continue to support residents into work. This team is the "first line" supplier for vacancies and are given a short exclusive period in which to field candidates for any temporary roles before the roles go out to the wider supply chain. Any successful candidates supplied by the Council are processed by the neutral vendor as a referral from the Council and we do not pay a margin to the supplier, simply a small payroll fee.

As permanent roles come up within the Council, the increasing number of local workers

in temporary roles will be in a better position to successfully apply for them as they will already work in a Council service and have knowledge of the organisation.

To date Haringey Works have engaged the following number of local residents into work with the Council:

**2022/2023** - 100 job starts of which eight progressed to fixed term / permanent work with the Council.

**2023/2024** - 90 job starts of which twelve progressed to fixed term / permanent work with the Council.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Not to have any contract. This would mean the Council would not have a centralised corporate provision to engage agency workers. Therefore each service will have to engage each worker on the open market. This would substantially increase costs and reduce corporate control and monitoring. This option was discounted on this basis.

Procure a different contract / supplier via the London Collaboration. This would result in unnecessary work, particularly during the SAP ERP review which is currently in progress and would be unwise to select a different provider until the outcome of the SAP review / options and appraisal. Currently Matrix has a data flow from SAP and our Learning Management System solution. Procuring a new provider would create considerable disruption to Council services incurring very considerable set up costs. There is no other neutral vendor option as part of the London Collaboration. This option was discounted on this basis.

Carry out our own open tender process for a Neutral Vendor– We could not achieve the same value based on our own buying power as opposed to the buying power of the London Collaboration which we have been involved in detail. The London Collaboration opportunity was completed based on a cumulative annual spend of 18 boroughs of £453,000,000. To procure Matrix via a direct award outside of the London Collaboration would cost 15.17% more than the recommended option. This option was discounted on this basis.

Carry out our own open tender process for a Master Vendor or procure a Master Vendor solution via the London Collaboration. The Council moved from a Master Vendor model in 2021. Whilst our agency spend is higher based on usage based on the factors mentioned the Council has to date made £2,729,810 savings in comparison to the Master Vendor model which offers the service through the provision of agency workers from their own pool of temporary staff in the first instance. Only where this is not possible does the Master Vendor use their resources to source workers from alternative agencies on their framework of suppliers. This would reduce the options services have to select agency workers and reduce the option for Haringey Works to provide workers. A master vendor would be an additional 27.73% cost to the Council.



This option was discounted on this basis.

Insource the current agency provision – this option is not viable as there would be a considerable cost implication in addition to not having the expertise, set up, or resources to do so. This option was discounted on this basis.

#### **116. APPROVAL TO CONSULT ON A NEW HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report. It was explained that the Council was working to develop fairer housing in Haringey. It was stressed that the housing crisis had pushed thousands of families into homelessness and more than 13,000 are on the waiting list for a Council home. It was explained that Haringey had one of the biggest Council housebuilding efforts in London, building hundreds of new social homes for local people every year. It was explained that the Council was seeking to ensure that the allocation of these homes was as fair as possible and that that homes go to those in the greatest need. The Cabinet Member explained that the Council had engaged with residents over the last year on some changes to the current allocation rules and that the proposal was to go out to a formal public consultation.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Emery, the following information was shared:

- Cabinet Members stressed that those in priority Bands would be contact by multiple means in order to ensure the maximum chance of contact. It was explained that the suggestion to contact everyone by letter would be expensive and given the current financial climate was not deemed the best use of council resources, and that the service would target those who were most likely to be affected by the policy.
- Officers explained that the age differential for the sharing of rooms was part of the consultation of the policy.
- It was explained that the changes to income and savings thresholds would have an impact on the numbers of people on the housing register, but that the changes would prioritise those in most need, and does bring this in line with government guidelines.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Note the proposed Consultation Plan
2. Note the Equality Impact Assessment.
3. Approve consultation on the draft Housing Allocations Policy (Appendix 1)

4. Delegate the following to the Director of Placemaking and Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing:
  - a. Minor changes to the policy prior to consultation
  - b. The timing and arrangements for the consultation including options to combine with the consultation on a Local Lettings Plan for new homes in Ashley Road.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The new policy is needed to update the Housing Allocations Policy and to ensure the policy is legally compliant and remains in line with the Council's priorities.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED.**

Not updating the policy

This option was rejected as the policy has not been updated since 2015 and needs updating to address new priorities and the legal framework.

## **117. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

The minutes of other bodies were discussed.

### **RESOLVED:**

The minutes of other meetings were noted.

## **118. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

The significant and delegated actions reports were discussed.

### **RESOLVED:**

That significant and delegated actions were noted.

## **119. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were none,

## **120. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **RESOLVED:**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 9 and 13 contains exempt information as defined under paragraphs 3 and 5, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972: Information relating to the financial

or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

**121. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND GOVERNOR SERVICES - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

These minutes are exempt.

**122. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PLANNED INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (LIFTS) - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

These minutes are exempt.

**123. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank