MINUTES OF THE Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 20th October, 2026, 6.32 - 7.47 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Mark Blake (Chair), Tammy Hymas (Vice-Chair), Gio Iozzi, Tehseen Khan, Jo Kuper, Johann Beckford, Ata Berk Aksit, Dixie-Ann Joseph and Erin Wolson

ALSO ATTENDING:

Councillors: Tony Powell, Ibrahim Ali

41. FILMING AT MEETINGS

RESOLVED:

The filming at meetings notice was noted.

42. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Twigg.

43. URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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.

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

There was none.

46. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2026 were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2026 were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

47. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

A question was received from a resident, questioning: What is the number of Council tenants who were assessed as requiring an adaptation to their home to support their disabled child, and what is the current longest waiting time to receive this adaptation?

The Cabinet Member for Housing provided a response. It was stressed that there was a need to assess need of residents. It was explained that different services worked together in the interests of residents.

It was also noted that the Council was working to improve Council housing building to meet the need of communities.

A questions was additionally received which was answered by the Cabinet Member in writing: "The Cabinet Member's introduction to the Annual Feedback and Resolutions Report says: 'For the third year in a row, we've had the highest rate of Local Government Ombudsman upheld complaints per resident of any council in England.' The report also says that, because of problems implementing the complaints system, 'validated timeliness data for Children's Statutory complaints is not available for 2025/26'. The regulations for these complaints require a Stage 2 response within 25 working days or, where that cannot be met, a written reason and a date no later than 65 working days. How many children's statutory Stage 2 investigations open today have passed 65 working days, and how many working days has the longest been open."

The written explanation noted that: Children's Statutory Complaint Stage 2 investigations are often complex and require the appointment of an Independent Investigator and Independent Person, detailed review of records, and interviews with current members of staff. The reasons for investigations remaining open beyond 65 working days vary from case to case and can include the complexity of the issues raised, the availability of participants, challenges in securing independent investigators, and the time required to ensure investigations are thorough, fair and robust.

As previously reported, validated performance reporting for Children's Statutory Complaints remains subject to system limitations. These figures have therefore been established through a manual review of all open Stage 2 investigations.

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

There were none.

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

The Cabinet Member for Housing introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member explained that secure, affordable and well-maintained housing was recognised as a key factor in supporting the health, wellbeing and stability of individuals and families. At the time of the report, Haringey had more than 2,758 families living in temporary accommodation, representing a total of 8,288 people, or approximately 3% of the borough's population.

It was explained that the report noted that reductions in the availability of council housing, combined with insufficient replacement provision, had contributed to increased pressure on housing services. As a result, local authorities had become increasingly reliant on temporary accommodation to meet their statutory homelessness duties. The Council was seeking opportunities to build and acquire homes to reduce reliance on temporary accommodation and provide more stable housing options for residents.

It was explained that, during the year, funding had been secured from several sources, including the Greater London Authority (GLA), developer contributions, Right to Buy receipts and the Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF), to support the acquisition of additional homes.

GLA funding was expected to assist 362 residents in moving out of temporary accommodation. Funding from developer contributions was expected to support around 100 additional residents, while the Local Authority Housing Fund was anticipated to assist a further 600 residents. Collectively, the funding secured during the year was expected to help just over 1,000 people move from temporary accommodation into longer-term housing.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the homes acquired through these programmes were intended to be provided at affordable rent levels for local residents. The report also highlighted the continuing financial pressures associated with temporary accommodation, with the Council spending close to £60 million per year on accommodation provided by private landlords for homeless households. The Council continued to pursue a programme of housing improvement, repair, acquisition and development across the borough, with the aim of increasing the supply and quality of housing available to residents.

Following questions from Councillors Powell the following information was shared:

- It was asked why the previous allocation of grant funding was sought unlawfully through delegated approval. The Cabinet Member explained that they would provide an answer to the question in writing following the meeting.

- It was explained that the Council was seeking good value for money through the grant funding, noting that the purchase of homes, rather than utilising temporary accommodation, would provide long term sustainability.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

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.

50. ANNUAL FEEDBACK AND RESOLUTIONS REPORT

The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member explained that the Council had faced a significant challenge in relation to complaints. For the third consecutive year, it had the highest rate of Local Government Ombudsman upheld complaints per resident of any council in England. Across all services, nearly two-thirds of Stage 1 complaints and more than half of Stage 2 complaints were upheld. This indicated that the Council had not consistently met residents' expectations in the delivery of services and support. It was explained that the issue was not the number of complaints itself; an increase in complaints could also indicate that residents felt more able to raise concerns with the Council. The key concern was that too many residents experienced delays or received responses that did not fully address their issues, and that complaints were not consistently leading to service improvements.

It was stressed by the Cabinet Member that housing remained a particular area of concern, with more than half (53%) of complaints in 2025/26 relating to services within that directorate. The Housing Ombudsman Service upheld 86% of complaints during the previous year. Although this represented an improvement from 95% in the preceding year, the figure remained high. Efforts were underway to address these issues through the Housing Complaints Improvement Sub-Plan.

It was explained that the report also included the Council's annual self-assessment submissions to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and the Housing Ombudsman Service. These documents set out how the Council's policies aligned with the standards required by the respective codes of practice. The assessments also acknowledged areas where performance had not yet met the objectives set out in those policies.

Inclusion of the assessments within the report provided a further opportunity for scrutiny and challenge by Cabinet. Any feedback received from Cabinet was to be reflected in the final submissions.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the resident experience, including the management of complaints, remained a Council priority and was reflected in the Corporate Delivery Plan. It was recognised that improvements to complaint handling needed to be considered alongside broader areas where service standards had not consistently met residents' expectations.

Work was also being undertaken to address historic underinvestment in Customer Services, with the aim of improving residents' access to information and support in a timely and effective manner. While improvements were expected to take time, it was

anticipated that strengthened front-line services and a focus on resolving issues correctly at the earliest opportunity would help reduce frustration for residents and Members.

Cabinet stressed that progress against the Complaints Improvement Plan was being monitored closely to ensure transparency and accountability. The Council aimed to demonstrate measurable improvement in the Feedback and Resolutions Report for 2026/27.

Following questions from Councillors Blake, Hymas and Powell, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the Council recognised the issues from poor communication with residents and the negative impact that this had on residents utilising services. It was identified that improving and developing clear communication was a core part of service improvement.

- It was noted that Housing complaints contributed to around 50% of complaints and stressed that the Council was seeking to improve upon the experience of residents in this area. It was noted that clear communication was an important part of this and was stressed that the Council sought general improvement in this area.

- It was noted that the work on improving the resolution of complaints was beginning, but that data was not available on the Council's improvement work since the start of the administration. It was stressed that the Council would be continuing to work to improve and would be monitoring this over time.

- It was stressed that the target for improvement was an initial one, which was aimed to be realistic, as part of a two-year plan and that the Council would seek to further improve following the completion of this plan with further ambitious targets.

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.

51. BETTER BUS PARTNERSHIP TFL FUNDING PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Transport introduced the report. The rationale for the report was outlined.

The Cabinet Member explained that the impacts of climate change were already being felt across Haringey and were affecting residents in a range of ways. Increasingly frequent heatwaves, flooding, rising living costs and growing public health pressures had created challenges across the borough. Air pollution also continued to affect the health of local communities and contributed to existing health inequalities. It was estimated that around 100 residents died each year from causes associated with poor air quality.

It was explained that, for many residents, particularly those living in the east of the borough, access to a private car was not available, and car ownership rates were below 50%. These residents relied on bus services to access employment, education, healthcare, shopping and social networks. Many of these communities also experienced higher levels of deprivation, poorer air quality and greater transport inequalities. Investment in public transport was therefore seen as an important mechanism for addressing environmental, public health and accessibility challenges. Bus services played a particularly important role for older people, disabled residents, young people and lower-income households.

The Cabinet Member noted that the Better Bus Partnership represented a significant investment in Haringey's public transport network. The programme aimed to improve bus reliability and reduce journey times on some of the borough's busiest routes. It was anticipated that these improvements would encourage greater use of public transport, reduce reliance on private vehicles, ease congestion, reduce emissions and

improve air quality. The scheme was therefore expected to deliver benefits extending beyond transport, including positive impacts on public health, environmental objectives and residents' quality of life.

It was explained that the Better Bus Partnership was intended to support the development of a cleaner, healthier and better-connected borough, while also facilitating economic activity and improving everyday journeys for residents. Improved bus services were expected to contribute to better air quality, lower carbon emissions and increased accessibility across the borough. The programme was therefore presented not only as an investment in transport infrastructure, but also as an investment in the health, opportunities and long-term wellbeing of Haringey residents.

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

- It was explained that the Council was engaging with businesses on the Green Lanes and West Green Road. It was stressed that the Council was working co-productively with residents as much as possible. It was explained that there was some expected opposition to the scheme but noted that there was understandable trepidation to the loss of parking, but stressed that there was no expected economic impact on business from the proposals. It was additionally noted that there were other members of the community who were on board with the programme.

- Officers explained that there had been engagement with businesses and that they would have the opportunity to help work to shape the proposals contained within the programme.

- It was explained that the Council was seeking to accept £10 million from TfL for the project, which would be able to be shaped by residents and the Council.

- Officers explained that there was a positive level of adoption of electric vehicles but noted that there was still pollution created from these vehicles from particulate matter from brakes. It was stressed that the Council was seeking to encourage more active and public transit.

- It was explained that the Albert Rd/Dunstall Rd scheme had been reviewed by officers and the proposals for this area would not be progressed.

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.

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

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Transport introduced the report.

It was explained that the Council had stated its aim of creating a fairer and more equitable borough, with a focus on supporting vulnerable residents and ensuring that interactions between the Council and local communities were conducted in a supportive and considerate manner. This approach was intended to apply equally in circumstances where a debt was owed. The decision increased the number of parking enforcement providers from a single provider to a panel of four providers, with a further two providers held in reserve. This approach aligned the Council's arrangements more closely with those adopted by many other London boroughs.

It was noted that four new requirements had been introduced for enforcement providers: Performance measures relating to the recovery of foreign vehicle debt; Performance measures to support enforcement involving vehicles with no registered keeper recorded by the DVLA; A robust approach to addressing persistent evasion of parking enforcement; Enhanced data analysis and earlier identification of vulnerability and financial hardship, together with increased social value delivery.

The Cabinet Member explained that the revised arrangements were intended to improve the Council's ability to address non-compliance with parking regulations, including cases involving individuals who did not reside within the borough, while also strengthening support and protections for vulnerable people and delivering wider community benefits. Providers were required to deliver community benefit and investment valued at more than £500,000, together with approximately £70,000 in skills and training initiatives and more than £20,000 in environmental commitments. Additional requirements included supporting local employment, apprenticeships and work-experience opportunities. The arrangements were designed to operate in accordance with the Council's Ethical Debt Reduction Policy. Vulnerability assessments were incorporated throughout the enforcement process, and access to specialist welfare support was to be provided where concerns regarding vulnerability or hardship were identified.

Following questions from Councillors Wolson and Powell the following information was shared:

- It was stressed that there was a statutory requirement to enforce, but that the Council would seek to protect vulnerable residents through its enhanced protections in the contract, which included protected characteristics. It was also stressed that the Council would include the need to identify vulnerable residents as part of the contract and provide support.

- It was stressed that the proposed contract was primarily aimed to collect Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) which had been issued to persistent offenders.

- It was explained by officers that the proposed model was the most efficient model available, and that this was common across other comparable authorities.

- Officers explained that there would be robust monitoring undertaken by officers on the quality of the delivery of the contract, and how the contract was managed, to ensure no undue distress for residents.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

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.

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

The Corporate Director of Adults, Housing and Health introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member explained that the Council sought to directly award contracts for the continued provision of 39 residential and nursing care beds at Autumn Gardens and Anastasia Lodge. It was explained that these services provided care for older residents, including individuals living with dementia, frailty, nursing needs and complex health conditions. The services also offered culturally responsive support for Greek, Cypriot and Turkish communities, helping residents maintain connections with their language, culture, traditions, families and wider community networks. The proposed arrangements were intended to maintain continuity of care, preserve resident choice and ensure the ongoing availability of specialist provision that met an identified need within the borough.

The Cabinet Member noted that the recommendations were supported by evidence demonstrating sustained demand for the service, strong provider performance and the absence of an equivalent alternative provider capable of delivering the same combination of residential care, nursing care and culturally responsive support. The approval of the recommendations were expected to provide stability for residents and their families while reducing the risk of service disruption or limitations in choice. It also supported the Council's commitment to delivering high-quality, person-centred adult social care that responded to individuals' care, cultural and social needs

Following questions from Councillors Powell the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the Council had a longstanding positive relationship with the proposed provider.

- It was highlighted by officers that, if the Council had any issues with the quality of the provider’s services, there was a mechanism to ensure compliance and terminate the contract if required.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

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.

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

The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality introduced the report.

This report sought approval to procure an Out of Hours (OOH) Emergency Contact Handling Service. The service was considered essential to ensuring that residents could access support outside normal operating hours, including overnight, at weekends and during public holidays. Support was provided for a range of emergency situations, including urgent housing repairs, emergency homelessness placements, flooding incidents and other emergencies.

The Council operated a number of services outside standard opening hours to help maintain the safety and wellbeing of residents and the wider community. An effective out-of-hours service was recognised as an important component of this provision, ensuring that residents could access assistance when urgent situations arose.

As the existing contract was nearing its end, the report sought approval to undertake a competitive procurement process for a replacement Out of Hours Emergency Contact Handling Service. The objective was to identify a provider offering an appropriate balance of quality, cost and social value, while ensuring residents continued to receive effective support outside standard operating hours.
It was considered that the proposed contract term would provide service stability and support value for money. The contract also included flexibility for extension or termination following the initial three-year period, for up to a further two years.
Alternative delivery models had been considered, including in-house provision, shared services with other local authorities and contracts with different types of providers.

However, the volume of calls associated with the service was not considered sufficient to make in-house delivery financially viable. A shared service arrangement with another council was identified as a potential option, but no suitable opportunity had been identified at the time of the report.

The Council intended to continue exploring opportunities for shared service arrangements in the future. However, given the importance of maintaining a reliable and effective service for residents, the report concluded that undertaking a competitive procurement exercise represented the most appropriate approach. The procurement process was intended to be conducted in an open and transparent manner.

Following questions from Councillors Powell the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the Council believed that it had enough time to undertake a competitive procurement exercise. It was explained that officers had already undertaken significant amounts of market testing, and that, while the timetable would be a challenge, that the Council expected to be able to achieve this within the timeframe in the report.

- It was explained that the Council was explained that a three plus two contact length would be optimal to be more flexible and had been informed through market testing of providers. It was explained that the Council would be undertaking market testing to identify best practice and best value for money from the market. It was additionally stressed that options had been sought to seek alternative options, such as insourcing or delivering with other partners, but that no options had been available.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

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.

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

This item has been subjected to call-in, which will be received by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 9 November 2026.

Councillor Kuper recused herself from the meeting for this item, following her declaration noted in item 4.

The Cabinet Member for Placemaking & Local Economy introduced the report.

It was explained that the Selby Urban Village development was being delivered to provide 202 new council-rent homes, alongside a community hub incorporating workspace, community facilities, parkland, sporting facilities, play areas, biodiverse spaces and a local shop. The Council continued to work in partnership with the Selby

Trust to deliver a development intended to support the wellbeing and quality of life of residents.

The Cabinet member noted that the reduction of the housing waiting list and providing high-quality community infrastructure were identified as key objectives of the Council. The Selby Urban Village development was intended to contribute towards these objectives. To support delivery of the scheme, contracts for heating and hot water supply were to be awarded to ensure that the new homes and associated community and sports facilities would be ready for occupation upon completion. The development's energy and heat strategy had been established earlier in the project's delivery and included a requirement for the scheme to connect to the Energetik District Heat Network. This requirement arose from the Greater London Authority Energy Hierarchy and the planning obligations applying to the development.

It was stressed that the Council had undertaken due diligence to review the requirement for connection to the heat network, consider alternative options, assess the proposed heat supply arrangements and seek value for future residents and community facility operators. Safeguards had been secured to ensure that the network would not remain dependent on higher-carbon energy sources over the long term and would be capable of meeting Future Homes Standards. In addition, the planned introduction of Ofgem regulation of heat networks from January 2027 was expected to provide greater oversight of pricing and consumer protections.

The Cabinet member explained that the Selby Urban Village development was intended to deliver new housing, community facilities and infrastructure within an area identified as having significant levels of deprivation. The scheme aimed to provide a sustainable, long-term development that would deliver benefits for local residents and the wider community.

Following questions from Councillors Iozzi, Wolson, Hymas, Powell and Ali the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the SUV would be delivered to ensure that residents had low energy costs, which would be energy efficient. It was additionally noted that there would be heat retention and carbon reduction built into the site, as well as environmental improvements as part of the development, including new trees, sustainable drainage and biodiverse habitats. It was also noted that the site would include methods for active travel.

- It was stressed that value for money was crucial to the development of contracts for the project and that officers had worked to undertake benchmarking and independent reviews for the project. It was additionally noted that the Council sought further price protections and welcomed regulatory support to protect these.

- It was explained that the Council had undertaken due diligence on the Council’s proposed decision to work with Energetik, and how it would price energy for residents. It was explained that Energetik was part of the Heat Trust, which set out standards for customer service.

- Officers explained that the work undertaken to investigate heat solutions on this project ensured that the provider would be required to ensure a low carbon heat supply was provided within the required time frame. It was explained that any risk for non-delivery would fall to the provider, if there were any delays.

- It was explained that the reason for the decision was to ensure that the programme would be delivered on time, which would ensure that there were no cost over-runs.

- It was explained that the utilisation of the incinerator as part of the heat source was an inherited aspect of the project, and that the Council would have preferred a more environmentally friendly option. However, it was stressed that the proposed solution was the only viable option to ensure timely delivery of the project. It was stressed that any significant changes and delays would create poor value for money outcomes. It was explained that the Council had reviewed all available options to deliver the project in a cost-effective manner.

- Officers explained that there had been due diligence undertaken on the offer of the connection to Energetik, and that the Council had examined all options of potential failure and what the risks that arose from that. would be from any of these options, which would be part of the protections within the proposed contract. The Council was confident that these protections would be sufficient to ensure that residents would still receive heat supply.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

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.

56. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

The minutes of other bodies were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of other bodies were noted.

57. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

The Significant and Delegated Actions were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The Significant and Delegated Actions were noted.

58. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

59. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 20-25 contain exempt information as defined under paragraph 3, 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).

60. EXEMPT - ACCEPTANCE OF LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND (LAHF) GRANT FUNDING.

The exempt report was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt report was noted and any exempt recommendations were agreed.

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

The exempt report was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt report was noted and any exempt recommendations were agreed.

62. EXEMPT - PROCUREMENT OF THE OUT OF HOURS (OOH) EMERGENCY CONTACT HANDLING SERVICE

The exempt report was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt report was noted and any exempt recommendations were agreed.

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

The exempt report was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt report was noted and any exempt recommendations were agreed.

64. EXEMPT- MINUTES

The exempt minutes of the Cabinet member Signing were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The exempt minutes of the Cabinet Member Signing were noted.

65. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

CHAIR: Councillor Mark Blake

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……