

MINUTES OF THE Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 30th June, 2026, 6.30 - 6.58 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Mark Blake (Chair), Tammy Hymas, Gio Iozzi, Tehseen Khan, Georgia Twigg, Johann Beckford and Dixie-Ann Joseph

ALSO ATTENDING:

Councillors: Hannah Ward, Ibrahim Ali

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

RESOLVED:

The filming at meetings notice was noted.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Aksit, Kuper and Wolson.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

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

There were none.

6. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting, held 10 March 2026, were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the meeting, held 10 March 2026, were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

7. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

There were none.

8. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

There were none.

9. PRE-TENDER APPROVAL TO COMMENCE PROCUREMENT FOR HOUSING-RELATED SUPPORT – SINGLE ADULTS COMPLEX NEEDS SUPPORTED HOUSING

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing.

It was explained that ending homelessness was central to the mission of the administration and that the aim was for everyone in the borough to have access to a home that was safe and suitable for their needs. It was stressed that this objective could only be achieved by placing people with lived experience of homelessness at the centre of the design and delivery of local homelessness services. Like many London boroughs, Haringey experienced the effects of a number of ongoing challenges, including housing pressures, rising living costs and low pay. These factors were compounded by reductions in public spending over successive years. It was explained by the Cabinet member that the reduction in public services was associated with increased levels of mental ill-health and homelessness both locally and nationally. More than one in ten people in Haringey had been diagnosed with depression, and almost 5,000 residents were recorded as having a serious mental illness, representing 1.4% of the borough's population and a rate higher than the London and national averages.

The Cabinet Member noted that, despite these challenges, Haringey's homelessness initiatives continued to deliver positive outcomes. The Council's street homelessness hub at Mulberry Junction worked alongside a network of voluntary sector organisations, contributing to progress in reducing rough sleeping. Housing-related supported accommodation formed part of the support available to residents seeking greater stability and independence. Alongside social housing, these services provided care and support for residents with complex needs, including mental health conditions. The Council sought to build on existing services and support more residents to live independently.

It was noted that the Council held contracts with specialist organisations to provide support services for people with complex needs, with these contracts due to be retendered from summer 2026. Plans were developed to change the way supported housing was provided for residents with lower-level needs by transitioning these contracts to supported exempt accommodation and a social enterprise model. This approach enabled a greater proportion of costs to be met through housing benefit funding from central government rather than council resources. It was intended to support investment in other housing and support services across the borough. As part of this commissioning process, the council committed to retaining specialist provision

for LGBTQ+ communities and women, recognising that some residents had needs that were best met through dedicated services.

The Cabinet member for Housing stressed that there was a shared commitment to reducing homelessness. These services played an important role in supporting residents towards recovery, stability and independence, and efforts continued to strengthen provision for as many residents as possible.

Following questions from Councillors Twigg, Ward and Ali the following information was shared:

- It was explained that generalised provision didn't always reach vulnerable groups, such as LGBTQ+ and women effected by violence. It was explained that the Council was seeking to provide specific support for vulnerable groups as part of this provision. It was stressed that the Council commission "by and for" organisations to deliver both LGBTQ+ and women's supported accommodation, and stressed that it was the Council's commitment to continue providing these dedicated services.
- It was explained by the Cabinet Member that residents with complex needs would be supported through the proposed scheme and that they would be in receipt of high-quality housing. It was noted that, by not providing such support, the Council would need to rely on temporary accommodation, which would be more unstable and less optimal, as well as contribute to poor mental health.
- It was explained that the Housing Benefit Team would undertake assessment to ensure eligibility for support. Officers explained that there was a differentiation between intensive housing management and support and intensive care support and supervision. It was noted that intensive and additional support would be commissioned separately.
- It was noted that supported accommodation was a model seen across a number of local authorities, such as Birmingham, and that these had seen success seen in these authorities,
- It was explained that a commissioned contract would be an expensive model, with large numbers of vacancies, and it was noted the proposed model was a more cost-effective and higher quality service. Officers noted that the Council was following best practice across the country, and that there was market appetite for the delivery of this model.
- It was noted that the Council would continue to undertake active market management which would ensure support for the contract. It was additionally noted that the Council would work with Registered Providers and regularly meet with these to ensure best practice. It was stressed that the Council needed to focus on the quality of provision and needed to ensure that these services were adequately funded.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved, pursuant to Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 2.01(b), the commencement of a procurement process for the provision of HRS SACNP, as set out in Exempt Appendix 1, in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders and procurement legislation.
2. Approved a funding envelope of up to £8,373,666 for the initial contract term of four years, inclusive of a 4% inflationary increase. It was noted that the maximum aggregate value of the contracts could be up to £24,420,706 if all extension periods were exercised, with any extension beyond the initial term subject to separate approval in line with the Council's governance and financial regulations.
3. Approved that the service lots described in Exempt Appendix 1 formed the scope of the procurement, with contract durations and commencement dates as set out in the report.
4. Approved the development of a Supported Exempt Accommodation (SEA) and Social Enterprise model, with the Council working in partnership with supported housing providers and the voluntary and community sector to explore opportunities to deliver lower-intensity, accommodation-based support.

Reasons for decision

There was an ongoing and evidenced need for specialist housing-related support for single adults with multiple and intersecting needs, as outlined elsewhere in the report. Existing provision played an important role in preventing homelessness, supporting safe discharge from hospital and other institutions, and enabling residents to stabilise and sustain independent living. Approval to commence procurement was therefore required to ensure continuity of services and sufficient capacity to meet current and emerging need.

The procurement of these services supported the Council in meeting its statutory duties. The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 set out statutory prevention duties, requiring earlier intervention and partnership working across public authorities to prevent homelessness. Section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983 placed a joint duty on the Council and health bodies to provide appropriate aftercare for individuals discharged from mental health detention, supporting complex needs and reducing the risk of avoidable readmissions.

Commissioning sufficient supported accommodation enabled the Council to meet its statutory responsibilities in a planned and preventative way, reducing reliance on higher-cost Adult Social Care and Temporary Accommodation. Evidence indicated that this represented a more cost-effective approach, with Haringey's pricing at the lower end of regional benchmarks. Approval of the proposed funding envelope therefore supported statutory delivery while achieving value for money.

A long-term block contract model supported service stability and continuity. Longer contract durations enabled providers to take a more strategic approach to delivery, invest in workforce development, and embed consistent practice. This approach also

supported stronger relationships between residents and staff. Approval of the proposed service lots and contract structure enabled delivery of a consistent and cost-effective supported accommodation pathway.

The proposed transition of lower-level provision to a SEA and Social Enterprise model supported the development of a diverse and locally responsive offer, including specialist provision for groups requiring culturally competent support. The Council worked with partners to ensure that this provision was maintained and strengthened. The introduction of this model was not intended to reduce overall capacity but to maintain, and where possible expand, lower-support accommodation while improving outcomes and value for money.

The proposals aligned with the Council's Corporate Delivery Plan 2024–26, particularly the priorities relating to adults, health and welfare and homes for the future, supporting wellbeing, reducing inequalities and promoting safe and secure housing through partnership working.

Alternative options considered

Extending existing contracts was not considered viable, as one provider had formally notified the Council of its intention to withdraw from care and support services, with an agreed early termination date. The contract could not be extended beyond this point, and proceeding without procurement would have risked service disruption and displacement of residents.

Temporarily transferring contracts to alternative providers was considered but discounted due to operational and continuity risks. Short-term contracts were unlikely to attract sufficient market interest and would have increased the risk of service disruption, safeguarding concerns and inconsistent quality, while still requiring a full re-tender within a short timeframe.

Recommissioning all existing services without transitioning lower-level provision to the SEA model was also considered. While this would have maintained continuity, it was not regarded as the most effective or sustainable option, as it limited the Council's ability to prioritise higher-intensity support and develop a more flexible and outcomes-focused approach.

Not recommissioning the higher-support services was rejected due to the statutory, operational and financial risks involved. This option would have increased the risk of homelessness among vulnerable residents, placing additional pressure on Temporary Accommodation and Adult Social Care and undermining the Council's statutory duties.

Delivering the services in-house was not considered viable due to limited Council property assets and the scale of investment and specialist capacity required. While smaller services may be suitable for in-house delivery in some circumstances, this was not considered a practical or cost-effective model for the wider pathway.

10. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT OF CABINET MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES AND PARTNERSHIPS 2026/27 & CONFIRMATION OF THEIR TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee was responsible for overseeing the Council's role as corporate parent for children and young people in care. This responsibility was carried out by elected members and officers and was not widely understood by all residents.

It was explained that its purpose was to ensure that children in care received appropriate support to maximise their health, educational and employment outcomes, to monitor the quality of care provided, and to help ensure that young people leaving care had sustainable arrangements in place for adulthood. The Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee was re-established, and I looked forward to taking an active role as Chair.

The leader explained that the Community Safety Partnership played a key role in bringing together local agencies to improve outcomes for residents across a range of service areas. It also had an important role in supporting relationships between the police and the community and identifying learning to promote community cohesion.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Agreed to re-establish the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee and noted the terms of reference for the advisory sub-committee, as set out in Appendix A.
2. Noted the Community Safety Partnership terms of reference, as set out in Appendix B.
3. Noted that the appointment of Members to the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee and the Community Safety Partnership would be agreed by the Leader of the Council as a non-key decision.

Reasons for decision

The establishment of a Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee provided oversight of councillors' statutory role as corporate parents and supported the Council in meeting its duties to children in care and care leavers.

Appointments from Cabinet to the Community Safety Partnership were required to meet statutory obligations and to ensure appropriate strategic oversight and accountability for community safety matters.

Alternative options considered

The option of discontinuing the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee was considered. This would have removed a formal forum for members and officers to meet regularly to consider the wellbeing of children in care and to monitor the Council's corporate parenting responsibilities. The Committee was distinct from the

Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel, as it focused specifically on looked-after children and care leavers and reported directly to Cabinet.
The Community Safety Partnership was a statutory partnership body, and therefore the option of not appointing Cabinet Members to the Partnership was not available.

11. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

The minutes of other bodies were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of other bodies were noted.

12. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

The significant and delegated actions were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The significant and delegated actions were noted.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

15. EXEMPT - PRE-TENDER APPROVAL TO COMMENCE PROCUREMENT FOR HOUSING-RELATED SUPPORT – SINGLE ADULTS COMPLEX NEEDS SUPPORTED HOUSING

The exempt information was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt information was noted.

16. EXEMPT - MINUTES

The exempt minutes of the meeting, held 10 March 2026, were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt minutes of the meeting, held 10 March 2026, were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

17. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

CHAIR: Councillor Mark Blake

Signed by Chair

Date