

Public Document Pack

Housing Scrutiny Committee HousingCm/1 Thursday, 24 September 2020

HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

24 September 2020

5.30 - 10.36 pm

Present: Councillors Todd-Jones (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Hadley, Sheil, Thittala, McGerty, Martinelli and Porrer

Executive Councillor: Johnson (Executive Councillor for Housing)

Tenant/Leaseholder Representatives: Diana Minns (Vice Chair), Lulu Agate, Christabella Amiteye, Diane Best, Mandy Powell-Hardy and Colin Stevens

Officers:

Strategic Director (FB): Fiona Bryant

Assistant Head of Finance and Business Manager: Julia Hovells

Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets: Lynn Thomas

Head of Housing: David Greening

Senior Housing Development Manager: Jim Pollard

Asset Manager: Will Barfield

Head of Housing Development: Claire Flowers

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/25/HSC Apologies

No apologies were received.

20/26/HSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Mandy Powell-Hardy	20/37/HSC	Personal: The development was close to where she lived.

20/27/HSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

The correction on p1 regarding the attendance record under 'Tenant/Leaseholder Representatives' that Diana Minns was Vice-Chair and not Diane Best.

The correction under minute reference 20/22/HSC to refer to the Kingsway project and not the Kingswat project.

20/28/HSC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used their discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

20/29/HSC Election of Tenant or Leaseholder Vice Chair

Diana Minns was appointed as Vice Chair (Tenant / Leaseholder Representative) for 2020/21.

20/30/HSC Introduction of New Representatives

The Chair welcomed new and returning Tenant and Leaseholder representatives to the committee.

Each representative introduced themselves and gave the committee a brief summary of their background and experience.

20/31/HSC Estates & Facilities Service Review and Compliance Update

This item was Chaired by Diana Minns (Vice-Chair)

Matter for Decision

The report provided an update on the Estates & Facilities Service Review and information on compliance related work within the service, including a summary on gas servicing, electrical testing, recent audit actions and fire safety.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Noted the progress of the service review and compliance related work detailed within the officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Noted the importance of the programme in relation to fire door installation and noted that Housing Associations were also doing electrical testing, so everyone was in the same position regarding tenant works following the covid-19 lockdown.
- ii. Noted that some leaseholders had replaced their front doors themselves which may have been compliant with fire regulations at the time they were installed and queried whether these would be ok or if they would need to be replaced.
- iii. Asked whether priority was being given to those tenants who had previously been required to shield to undertake their outstanding gas servicing.
- iv. Asked if leaseholders refused to upgrade their fire doors would that adversely affect/negate their contents insurance.
- v. Asked whether the fire safety works would be completed on time given the delays incurred as a result of lockdown and asked whether a wider pool of contractors were required in order to get the works completed on time.

The Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Leaseholders had been contacted regarding fire door replacements and they had the ability to be able to order a replacement as part of the programme if they wanted. 12% of leaseholders had asked for a quote and 20% of leaseholders had said that they did not require a quotation. Once the details of the new Fire Safety Bill have been approved we will be in a better position to understand the changes to requirements and enforcement powers.
- ii. There were 87 people who required a gas service. The Council did not hold information about whether these tenants have a requirement to shield or self-isolate and officers were contacting all residents to try and work through the outstanding services and arrange an appointment. Officers were working to Government guidance and would make every

effort to be able to access properties and would keep records / risk assessments if they were unable to gain access to a property.

- iii. Officers agreed to investigate what the position would be if leaseholders refused to upgrade their fire doors and the impact on their insurance.
- iv. Confirmed that works were programmed until March 2021 and the current contractors had indicated they have capacity to undertake the fire safety work and any delays would be because of either a further lockdown or the ability to be able to access properties.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/32/HSC Tenancy, Hoarding & Rechargeable Works Policies

This item was Chaired by Diana Minns (Vice-Chair)

Matter for Decision

This report presented the following Cambridge City Council (CCC) policies which had been updated for the Housing Scrutiny Committee's approval: Tenancy Policy (2020-23), Rechargeable Works Policy (2020), Hoarding Policy (2020).

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the Tenancy Policy (2020-23), Rechargeable Works Policy (2020) and Hoarding Policy (2020) as attached to the officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Policy and Performance Officer (Housing Services).

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The Committee welcomed the clear policy on Hoarding, and noted the involvement and advice received from Lulu Agate (Tenant rep) in compiling this report.
- ii. Asked when an enforced clearance would arise under the Hoarding Policy and whether this was few and far between.
- iii. Asked what training an officer who made assessments under the Hoarding Policy had and if referrals were done with the individual's consent.
- iv. Tenant representatives confirmed that there was training available regarding hoarding as they had attended some training on hoarding.
- v. Asked whether there was any discretion regarding the rechargeable works policy as tenants might consider some works to be urgent and request an urgent call out and incur costs but the council may not consider the works to be urgent.
- vi. Asked whether the policies would be publicised if they were approved.

The Policy and Performance Officer (Housing Services) and the Head of Housing said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Under the Hoarding Policy if the tenant was not high risk then officers would work with the tenant for a 6-month period. There was a level of officer discretion before enforcement action was undertaken. If however there were health and safety concerns then there would be a multi-agency intervention and officers would then start enforcement.
- ii. A referral under the Hoarding Policy was usually done at the same time as a safeguarding referral. Criteria for assessments were set out in a County Council protocol and this protocol was widely used by other local authorities.
- iii. There would be screening / triaging of emergency works before works were undertaken.
- iv. Confirmed that if the policies were approved then these would be publicised including in the 'Open Door' magazine.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/33/HSC Procurement of Energy Efficiency Works to Council Houses 2020

This item was Chaired by Diana Minns (Vice-Chair)

Matter for Decision

As part of a programme of energy efficiency improvements to the Council's housing stock it is planned to install external wall insulation and solar panels to Council properties in the Arbury ward.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the use of the EEM solid wall insulation framework to directly call off and award contract(s) to Cornerstone (East Anglia) Limited to carry out energy efficiency improvements to Council dwellings. Phase 1 - Seventy properties in 20/21. Phase 2 - Seventy properties in 21/22

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets and the Asset Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Asked whether the energy rating of the properties could be improved further and what percentage of the energy ratings data was estimated and what percentage came from actual data.
- ii. Noted that due to the fabric of the buildings, it was not easy to improve the energy efficiency of the buildings but it was a challenge that could be met.
- iii. Similar works had been undertaken in East Chesterton and residents were pleased with those works.

The Asset Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was hoped that the energy ratings of the properties could be improved from a D rating to a B rating however this would depend on the orientation of the properties and whether solar panels were suitable to be installed. The Council had approximately 3000 energy performance certificates (EPC ratings) which was just under 50% of the housing stock.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/34/HSC Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Medium Term Financial Strategy

Recommendations (part 1) were chaired by Diana Minns (Vice Chair /Tenant Representative) and recommendations (part 2) were chaired by Councillor Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) provided an opportunity to review the assumptions incorporated as part of the longer-term financial planning process, recommending any changes in response to new legislative requirements, variations in external economic factors and amendments to service delivery methods, allowing incorporation into budgets and financial forecasts at the earliest opportunity.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing (part 1):

- i. Approved the Housing Revenue Account Medium Term Financial Strategy attached, to include all proposals for change in:
 - a) Financial assumptions as detailed in Appendix B of the document.
 - b) 2020/21 revenue budgets and future year forecasts as introduced in Section 5, resulting from changes in financial assumptions and the financial consequences of change and the need to respond to unavoidable pressures, including the impact of the coronavirus pandemic, as introduced in Section 5, detailed in Appendix D and D (1) of the document and summarised in Appendices G (1) and G (2).
- ii. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director to be in a position to confirm that the authority can renew its investment partner status with Homes England.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing (part 2) to recommend to Council to:

- iii. Approve proposals for changes in existing housing capital budgets, as introduced in Sections 6 and 7 and detailed in Appendix E of the document, with the resulting position summarised in Appendix H, for decision at Council on 22 October 2020.
- iv. Approve the revised funding mix for the delivery of the Housing Capital Programme, recognising the latest assumptions for the use of Devolution Grant, Right to Buy Receipts, HRA Resources, Major Repairs Allowance, Section 106 Funding and HRA borrowing.
- v. Extend the existing delegated authority to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Housing to approve use of Council land as sites for rough sleeper next steps POD's on an individual basis based on the criteria as set out in the Housing Development Options for Homeless People report to Housing Scrutiny Committee in January 2020.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Head of Finance and Business Manager.

The Assistant Head of Finance and Business Manager:

- i. Corrected an error in the report on pages 87 and 126 where the void assumption had been increased from 1% to 1.2% in the earlier modelling but this had been returned to the previous 1% but had not been corrected within the text in the report.
- ii. Referred to p133 of the agenda and appendix E which showed that extra resource had been allocated for fire door investment in relation to the committee's discussion regarding the estates and facilities service review and compliance update. (See minute reference 20/31/HSC).

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Noted that the white paper on planning may have an impact on affordable housing in the future.

- ii. Queried the use of the consumer price index (CPI) within the report and noted that the implications of the covid-19 pandemic could impact assumptions for future years.
- iii. Noted that reserves had been used to fill the gap where there were rent arrears to avoid the council having to consider cutting services to tenants. Asked whether rent arrears had increased over the last 6 months.
- iv. Queried what a budget virement was and asked if a list of definitions for acronyms could be provided to assist in understanding details in financial reports.

The Assistant Head of Finance and Business Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Rent arrears had been extrapolated up until the end of the year, if any assumptions were needed in respect for future years impact, this would be picked up in the January 2021 Housing Revenue Account Budget Setting Report.
- ii. The Council was governed by a rent standard and were only allowed to increase rent up to CPI plus 1% measured using CPI at the preceding September. If the rate of the CPI in September 2020 was different to that assumed then this would have a direct impact on the income assumptions made within the MTFs. The impact of the covid-19 pandemic had meant that more people had been forced to claim benefits however she felt that prudent assumptions had been made in respect of income for the current year. Officers were actively working with tenants to ensure that they claimed the benefits that they were entitled to. The sums incorporated into the MTFs assume that the council build houses in the new programme to Passivhaus standards, but the ability to do this would be dependent upon the constraints of each site as it is identified and brought forward for decision. If the Council were to build to higher standards initially then the council would not be able to deliver the number of affordable houses that they hoped to build. There is however, a clear aspiration to move to build to net zero carbon over the life of the programme, again dependent on site constraints.
- iii. Rent arrears had increased by £500,000 over the past 6 months however the rate of increase had stabilised recently. The adjustment made to the MTFs was prudent, but a further full lockdown could have an additional impact.
- iv. A budget virement was when money was moved or reallocated from one budget to another within the same financial year, with officers having delegated authority to do this in some cases. Any capital budget virements are shown in the MTFs for transparency. Agreed an

acronyms definition section would be included within the January Budget Setting Report.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse recommendations 2.1 and 2.2.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse recommendations 2.3 - 2.5.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/35/HSC New Council Housing Programme

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The report set out key issues for the committee to consider in formulating a new Housing Programme. The report outlined the strategic objectives of the programme, the key assumptions that had been used as a starting point and steps to investigate potential opportunities to move the programme forward. The report is in line with the provisions and assumptions in the HRA MTFS report.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the bringing forward of a development programme to provide new housing in 2022-32 by the Council.
- ii. Approve the strategic guidance for the aims of the programme set out in Section 4 of this report.
- iii. Approve the allocation of £1m to the 2020/21 budget and £2m to the 2021/22 budget to allow early investment in feasibility, site investigation and land assembly from the overall resource incorporated in the MTFS for the delivery of this programme.
- iv. Approve the proposal to report progress on development of the new programme to Housing Scrutiny Committee in January 2021.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategic Director (FB).

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The delivery of 10 x 1 bed flats to accommodate rough sleepers was good and was looking forward to the pods being located in East Chesterton.
- ii. Noted the need for decent housing and queried the council's different investments.
- iii. Questioned what plans were going to be put in place for tenants when existing sites were redeveloped.
- iv. Noted that some market housing may need to be built on sites to enable the development of affordable housing. Also asked whether affordable housing would be pepper potted across the development to build a mixed sustainable community.
- v. Referred to paragraph 5.2 of the officer's report on page 158 of the agenda which said that building zero carbon homes could add an extra 40% to build costs and noted that the cost implications of such development could mean a reduction in the number of houses which could be built.

The Strategic Director (FB) and the Head of Housing said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Council had been prudent with its investments, there were different reasons for investing in the commercial sector and in housing. Commercial investments ensured that facilities in retail were still available and could attract returns which could be used to support other council services. Investment in housing could be used to support more investment in affordable housing.
- ii. When existing sites were considered for redevelopment a detailed options analysis would be undertaken. This would consider the current status of the site, past and current maintenance costs, the EPC ratings and whether renovation was a better option.
- iii. All homes would be built as sustainably as the site constraints would allow. Building mixed and balanced communities was at the forefront of officer's minds.
- iv. Each site would be assessed on an individual basis, there may be some sites which could not support net zero carbon development.

The Executive Councillor commented:

- i. That when existing sites were considered for redevelopment tenants would be consulted to ensure that they were fully involved, the council had gained valuable experience in this area over the last couple of years.

Councillor Martinelli proposed and Councillor McGerty seconded the following amendment to recommendation 2.1 (additional text underlined):

- 2.1 Approved the bringing forward of a development programme to provide new housing 2022-32 by the Council, on a net zero carbon basis.

Councillor Martinelli stated that they did not want housing development to add to the carbon footprint, the council should be a nationwide leader on this issue. He also supported the pod housing scheme.

Lulu Agate commented that a lot of people worried about climate change and expensive heating bills. She knew a lot of tenants who would be in support of the amendment to recommendation 2.1.

The Executive Councillor commented that any proposal now to go to net zero carbon would require additional financing and could result in fewer homes being built. The increasing costs would call into question the ability of the council to be able to deliver the number of homes that they wanted to. There could be technical or geographical limits to deliver sustainable housing on a particular site.

Councillor Ashton queried the financial impact of the proposed amendment.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 3 votes to 5.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/36/HSC Update on the Programme to Build new Council Homes Funded Through the Combined Authority

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

This report provides an update on the programme to deliver 500 Council homes with funding from the Combined Authority.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Noted the continued progress on the delivery of the Combined Authority programme.
- ii. Noted the funding structure for the Combined Authority programme.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Development.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. There was usually a shortage of accessible homes so they were pleased that 5% of houses would be accessible homes.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/37/HSC East Barnwell (One Public Estate)

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

This report sets out work that has been carried out towards developing a masterplan for the East Barnwell area within Abbey Ward. This work has been supported by the One Public Estate programme.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Noted the progress on developing a masterplan for East Barnwell and the Interim report.
- ii. Approved the development of further engagement with stakeholders and the second stage consultation process.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Development.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. This was a positive change in East Barnwell and was well overdue, noted that there had been one round of consultation and would encourage further consultation.
- ii. Noted that this development seemed to be looking towards a different source of funding for regeneration compared to the Marleigh development (which would develop 1300 new houses close by). Questioned what redevelopment the East Barnwell community might see as a result of the Marleigh development through s106 agreement funding. Also noted that the McDonalds site would be difficult to acquire and regenerate on Newmarket Road but asked officers to liaise with McDonalds.
- iii. Referred to p251 and p276 of the agenda which contained an exert of the local plan detailing the area which would be regenerated at the intersection of Newmarket Road and Barnwell Road. Questioned whether some of the open space (bowling green, tennis court) was protected open space as it appeared to be shown as brownfield land on one of the plans.
- iv. Queried whether the Marleigh development was within the city council boundary.
- v. Questioned what parking provision would be put on the site if garages were removed.
- vi. Asked for the open space to be fairly distributed across the site and a commitment that the open space would be accessible and close to the new development.

The Senior Housing Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. He had had some meetings with the developers of the Marleigh development to try and ensure that the sites would be integrated but a lot of the s106 provisions arising from the Marleigh development would be delivered within the Marleigh development. There was some scope for additional open space and how this was used. Further discussions with the developer, residents and stakeholders could be held to discuss how this could come together. He was aware of the transport issues concerning McDonalds on Newmarket Road as these had arisen through discussions with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and their Eastern Access Project. Further discussion with stakeholders was required.
- ii. Part of the open space area referred to was protected open space. Access to the open space was limited at the moment. The policy provided for the re-provision of open space, but consideration needed to be given to how the open space could be re-configured to make better use of it. Feedback from residents about the accessibility of the open space was important and would need further consultation.
- iii. Confirmed that a small part of the Marleigh development was within the city council boundary.
- iv. This was the starting point of the project for change and regeneration. When the consultation was carried out there were strong views about accessibility and the cost of public transport and concerns about parking. These issues would have to be addressed when a formal proposal was brought forward.

The Executive Councillor responded that this was the start of the process and it was important that residents were involved within the process. He asked the Senior Housing Development Manager to provide the Committee with an update on the County Council's proposals regarding the community centre.

The Senior Housing Development Manager said that they wanted to ensure that the community centre was delivered, they were not looking to create a hurdle to slow down the provision of the community centre. There were a number of challenges, but they had been working with the Local Planning Authority and the County Council to develop a Statement of Principles, which was a framework for development in the area.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/38/HSC Colville Road Phase 3

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The report seeks approval of a capital budget for the scheme, based on the indicative capacity study which has been undertaken for the site and the outline appraisals referenced in this report, and for the delivery route to be adopted

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved that the scheme be brought forward with an indicative capital budget of £11,103,200 to cover all site assembly, construction costs, professional fees and further associated fees, to deliver a scheme which meets the identified housing need in Cambridge City.
- ii. Authorised the Strategic Director in consultation with the Executive Councillor for housing to approve variations to the scheme including the number of units and mix of property types and sizes outlined in this report.
- iii. Approved that, subject to Council approval of the budget, delegated authority be given to the Executive Cllr for Housing in conjunction with the Strategic Director to enable the site to be developed through Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) subject to a value for money assessment to be carried out on behalf of the Council.
- iv. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director to commence Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) proceedings on Leasehold properties to be demolished to enable the development, should these be required.
- v. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director to serve initial Demolition Notices under the Housing Act 1985.
- vi. Approved a delegation to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Strategy and Resources and the Executive Councillor for Housing, to approve the most appropriate valuation basis, funding route and accounting treatment for the value of the commercial units being provided as part of the development of Colville 3.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Development Agency.

Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor Dryden commented:

- i. Supported the scheme and asked for a meeting to be held with residents, particularly those whose homes were set to be demolished if the recommendations were approved. Noted that officers had held meetings with some of the businesses.

Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor Ashton commented:

- i. Thanked officers for their work on the project. Was pleased that the development was solely for council housing and was not going to be sold off for private development. Expressed concerns on behalf of existing tenants about where they would be moved to during the construction phase.
- ii. Shops were used in Cherry Hinton, there were no vacant shop units on the High Street. Residents had expressed their concerns about what would happen to them and he noted there were opportunities for the shops to be relocated within Cherry Hinton. Asked for consideration to be given to locating temporary portacabins on open space to keep local businesses in Cherry Hinton.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Referred to page 290 of the agenda and noted that the council was still not aiming for net zero carbon development.

The Head of Housing Development Agency said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Subject to the decision of the committee and Executive Councillor, meetings could be arranged with residents and consideration would be given to the most appropriate way to re-house residents affected by the development.

- ii. Officers had been working with colleagues in Property Services and consideration would be given to temporary facilities for businesses to use.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/39/HSC Purchase of Affordable Housing at Histon Road

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The report seeks approval for a capital budget to purchase 7 affordable units from Laragh Homes, for rent as Council homes. These will consist of the following: 6 x 2 bed, 4 person Flats and 1 x 2 bed, 4 person House

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the purchase of 7 new Council homes at the Mews, Histon Road and delegated authority to the Strategic Director to approve contract terms with Laragh Homes/LLP in respect of this transaction.
- ii. Approve a total budget of £1,513,000 to enable the development of 7 homes at the Mews, Histon Road.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Development.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/40/HSC Orchard Park L2

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The report sought approval for a capital budget to purchase 30 affordable units from Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP), to be let as Council rented homes. The report also set out the general fund investment and potential returns on this investment and the key elements of the CIP development proposal including a summary of the investment plan

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the purchase of 30 new Council homes on the site at the cost of £5,850,000 and include an overall budget in the HRA for the scheme Orchard Park L2 of **£6,207,000**.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing and the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the indicative proposed investment plan for L2 outlined in confidential Appendix 3, with the high-level commitments associated with the General Fund and HRA. The investment plan will be refined in line with final project plans post planning permission determined and approved by the CIP Board with the Councils funding built into the relevant budget setting report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Housing Development Agency.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Asked that sufficient space was provided for cargo bike parking and also to ensure there were car club spaces. Also questioned biodiversity provision on the site.
- ii. Questioned the housing mix which included 5 x 1 bed studio flats.
- iii. Asked if people with a Cambridge connection would be able to live in the properties.

The Head of Housing Development Agency said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The bike stores were designed with some provision for cargo bikes but she would need to check exactly how many spaces were provided. Biodiversity had been considered and they were looking to have sedum (green) roofs and to improve the biodiversity provision of the open space. Two car club spaces were included but if there was a higher demand then more could be put in.
- ii. There weren't any studio flats in the current programme but after consultation with the Head of Housing it was agreed that some 1 bed studio flats might be appropriate here.
- iii. As the development was within the South Cambridgeshire District Council boundary there would need to be an agreement with them about nomination rights to the houses.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Housing approved the recommendation 2.1.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendation 2.2.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

20/41/HSC Disposal of HRA Land

This item was chaired by Councillor Mike Todd-Jones

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out a proposal regarding the disposal of HRA land.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved Officer's recommendation

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Scrutiny Committee resolved to exclude members of the public from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 10.36 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank