

# Public Document Pack

Housing Scrutiny Committee HousingCm/1 Thursday, 23 September 2021

## HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

23 September 2021  
5.30 - 8.24 pm

**Present:** Councillors Bird (Chair), Sheil (Vice-Chair), Dalzell, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Lee, Pounds, Robertson and S. Davies

**Executive Councillor:** Todd-Jones

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

### Officers:

Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities: Jane Wilson

Assistant Head of Finance and Business Manager: Julia Hovells

Head of Housing: David Greening

Head of Housing Development Agency: Claire Flowers

Asset Manager: Will Barfield

Interim Risk and Compliance Manager: Gareth Basterfield

Empty Homes Officer: Simonetta Macellari

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 21/37/HSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Bennett, Lulu Agate and Christabella Amiteye. Councillor S.Davies attended as alternate.

### 21/38/HSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Diana Minns	21/48/HSC	Personal: Is Tenant Representative and could be affected by proposed redevelopments.

### 21/39/HSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 21/40/HSC Public Questions

A member of the public asked a question, as set out below.

Question 1:

- i. Had received a letter from the City Council in August 2021 advising that a new maintenance contract was in place for 5-8 years. It also advised that asbestos would be removed.
- ii. Received another letter dated 16 September, which advised that Hanover Court may be demolished.
- iii. Asked that there was a pause on any works being carried out to Hanover Court if the buildings were going to be demolished. Felt it was not a good use of money to pay for repairs if the building was going to be demolished.
- iv. Questioned if there were any risks if repair works were not carried out.
- v. Confirmed he had spoken with officers.
- vi. Felt that the Council felt obligated to keep the building in as new a state as possible.
- vii. Felt that no amount of money could change the layout of the buildings.
- viii. Raised concerns about anti-social behaviour at Hanover Court.
- ix. Noted CCTV was used as a deterrent.
- x. Stated they did not feel safe at Hanover Court.
- xi. Stated that the building had a strange vibe.

The Head of Housing responded:

- i. Noted that the August letter was about works to the estate and that the letter dated 26 September was regarding agenda item 12.
- ii. Following a discussion with tenant and leaseholder representatives' about agenda item 12, it had been agreed that a letter would be sent prior to the Housing Scrutiny Committee meeting to tenants and leaseholders whose estates were highlighted in the report. No decisions were being taken at the meeting. Officers wanted to engage with tenants and leaseholders as they were vital stakeholders.

The Asset Manager responded:

- i. The Council had entered into a new planned maintenance contract and a letter was sent out to all leaseholders to advise them about this.
- ii. A further letter would be sent to residents at Hanover Court advising them about structural works which needed to be carried out.
- iii. A consultation would be carried out.
- iv. There were concerns about structural concrete and lintels.
- v. Advised that only necessary works would be undertaken and this would be reflected in the works specification.

Question 2.

- i. The gas had been disconnected to Hanover Court.
- ii. The Council had advised that if there was a gas explosion the site might not withstand it.
- iii. Felt the Council was not appropriately assessing risks and consequences when deciding when to undertake works.
- iv. Felt that the Council had lost sight of the main issues which was to provide affordable housing.
- v. If the Council wanted to do works then the Council should pay for them.
- vi. Did not feel that the Council should dictate to residents that their gas should be disconnected.
- vii. Felt that the Council was trying to eradicate risk beyond a normal level.
- viii. Felt that the Council needed to stop drug taking, violence and deaths in the area. They did not know of a worse place to live in the city. The site should be demolished.

The Tenant and Leaseholder Vice-Chair asked the member of the public to discuss the issues raised with them.

During the discussion of agenda item 12, Councillors noted that the council had a responsibility to their tenants and could not ignore potential safety problems. The gas safety issue, was an immediate concern and needed to be addressed.

The Executive Councillor noted the comments the public speaker made but following receipt of the structural report, it was clear that the Council had to act to comply with statutory requirements.

**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.**

### **21/41/HSC Estates & Facilities Compliance Data**

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

#### **Matter for Decision**

The report provided an update on the compliance related activities delivered within the Estates & Facilities Team, including a summary on gas servicing, electrical testing and fire safety work.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Noted current position of the Council regarding Compliance, and the progress of ongoing associated works.

**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 Interim Risk and Compliance Manager.

The Interim Risk and Compliance Manager and Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The asbestos register included garages as it covered solid structures.
- ii. Would follow up whether the emergency lighting had been fixed.
- iii. Had requested the Internal Audit Team considered potential for learning in relation to the gas safety issues, with a report coming back to this committee when that work is completed.
- iv. Future reports would include an update on Hanover and Princess Courts and Kingsway until works had been completed.
- v. Nobody would be left without heating for their home. If tenants had gas central heating, the proposal was to change them to electric central heating. 19 homes to date had been capped off.

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.

**21/42/HSC Complaint Upheld by the Housing Ombudsman Service relating to housing repairs**

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

**Matter for Decision**

This report summarises a complaint upheld by the Housing Ombudsman Service relating to a housing repair, acknowledges that there were shortcomings in relation to working practices and sets out the action taken in response.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Noted the findings of the Housing Ombudsman Services in respect of this case and the actions taken by the Council in response to these findings.

**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.

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.

**21/43/HSC Management of Residents Car Parking Spaces Provided on Housing Land Within Neighbourhoods and on Future New Builds Across the City**

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

**Matter for Decision**

This report sets out a car parking strategy for both existing residents' car parking and future new build sites. Its aim is to provide a template for parking management at new and existing City Homes neighbourhood car parking areas across the City.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Agreed to the approach to parking as set out in Figure 1 of the officer's report and utilise this approach across new build sites, except for those that are managed by third parties (e.g. Management Company).
- ii. Agreed to use Cambridgeshire County Council's Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) enforcement on the existing resident car parking areas identified by City Homes in the future.

### **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.

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

- i. Noted the system for issuing permits was poor and the proposals should improve services.
- ii. Queried provision for active travel and access for the deliveries.
- iii. Queried car club provision and expressed concern with the equality implication that 'the issue of carers will be looked at' and noted that informal carers would have no-where to park. Noted that tension could arise if there were no spaces for workmen or contractors to park.
- iv. Noted there were no EV charging points and queried the council's strategy taking into consideration that the deadline for when diesel and petrol cars would no longer be produced would be 2030.

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

- i. Noted the report was the start of the process and hoped it would make the process easier.
- ii. Officers were working with the County Council regarding access and an area had been identified for e-cargo bikes. Access for deliveries and contractors where a barrier existed typically worked on a fob system with the ability to ring a flat for deliveries. In terms of e-cargo bikes, they wouldn't expect them to use the barrier as there would usually be a cycle lane out. If not, a fob system would allow them entry and exit.
- vi. Car Clubs were part of the Council's Design Guide and would become increasingly important as car park ratios declined. The amount of car club spaces would also depend on how close and how many bays there were to the development.

- vii. Noted that Environmental Health Officers were working with County Council Officers on a pilot on-street EV charging scheme.
- viii. Noted that new build sites would be well served for EV charging provision but that further consideration needed to be given to existing sites.

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.

### **21/44/HSC Changes to Under Occupation Assistance Scheme**

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

#### **Matter for Decision**

The report presented the revised Under Occupation Scheme Policy. The proposed changes reflected the Council's intention to provide help to more tenants who wished to move but lacked the financial resources to do so.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Approved the revised Under Occupation Scheme Policy as set out in appendix 2 of the officer's report.
- ii. Approved the implementation of the revised Under Occupation Scheme Policy from 1st April 2022.
- iii. Extend the spending limit under this scheme in Financial Year 2021/22 by £10,000 to a total £31,900 through virements from underspent budget areas, with BSR adjustments applied if necessary through the next budget cycle

#### **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.

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

- i. The fundamental driver is that no-one suffers financial hardship.

Councillor Dalzell proposed the following amendment, additional text underlined and deleted text ~~struckthrough~~.

Under '2. Recommendations' add an additional recommendation:

'2.3 To extend the spending limit under this scheme in Financial Year 2021/22 by £10,000 to a total £31,900 through virements from underspent budget areas, with BSR adjustments applied if necessary through the next budget cycle.'

Under '3. Background', amend:

3.7 To address the issues outlined, the council seeks to introduce the following:

- In the current financial year, raise the financial cap on this scheme by £10,000 now through virements from underspend budgets, or through adjustments in the 2022/23 HRA Budget Report if required.
- From 1 April 2022, reduce the under-occupation payment so that more tenants can benefit from the scheme
- Introduce a Financial Statement assessment so that those who may be experiencing financial hardship are prioritised and the burden of debt is minimised or avoided.

Under '6. a Financial implications'

Approval would be given for overspends on the current budget for 2021/22 by up to £10,000 funded through virements from other budgets, which can be further supported by additional funding in 2022/23 HRA Budget Setting Report if required.

The budget of £21,900 for 2022/23 will remain unchanged and a mid-year review of the impacts of the new policy will take place in September 2022. To help inform the mid-year review, additional performance monitoring will be implemented to assess if the aims set out in this report have been achieved and financial adjustments considered within the MTFS.

The Committee unanimously resolved to accept the amendments.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations.



The Executive Councillor approved the amended recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### **21/45/HSC Shared Ownership Policy**

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

#### **Matter for Decision**

A Shared Ownership Policy has been produced to outline the Council's approach to the management of the current units of shared ownership within the Housing Revenue Account, as well as the approach the Council will take to support current shared owners in working towards or achieving 100% ownership.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Approved the Shared Ownership Policy for current stock.
- ii. Agreed that the Council promotes staircasing, to 100% ownership where financially feasible, with current Shared Ownership Leaseholders.
- iii. Agreed the revised approach for deciding on the repurchase of shared ownership units

#### **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.

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

- i. Noted that flexible tenure allowed leaseholders to sell back shares to the Council in times of hardship and expressed concerns about the removal of an option for people who were struggling financially. Asked if there were any current examples and the costs involved of offering flexible alternatives.
- ii. Queried who set the cost of re-buying shares in a property.

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

- i. Short of repurchasing shares in a property (which as the report outlines the Council would only do if it made strategic sense for the Council to do so) the Council does not directly offer any intermediate housing options. With regard to social/affordable housing, there is a paragraph in the Council Lettings Policy which states:

*4.12.1 In line with the 'Allocation of accommodation: guidance for local housing authorities in England', Cambridge City Council will usually only allocate social housing to homeowners in exceptional circumstances. However, the City Council may allocate housing that is in low demand. Applicants who are homeowners will usually be allocated a Band D status. In exceptional circumstances Cambridge City Council may consider a homeowner's status. For example, Cambridge City Council may allocate housing to applicants who require support and whose age qualifies them for housing for older people, but who have insufficient financial resources to access housing for older people in the private sector.*

If, like any other potentially homeless applicant, a shared owner has to sell their shares or defaults on the mortgage, is facing repossession and does not have the financial means to secure an alternative housing option the Council, through its homelessness prevention services, can assist an applicant to access the private rented sector through rent in advance and a rent deposit or via our Housing Benefit Plus scheme which offers a one or two year rent subsidy and employment support to help a household get back on its feet.

- iii. The Council used a valuer to calculate the buy-back value of shares in a property. This was based on market value and depended on the percentage of the share.

The Committee resolved:

- unanimously to endorse the recommendation 2.11
- unanimously to endorse the recommendation 2.12.
- by 10 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation 2.13.

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.

## **21/46/HSC Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Medium Term Financial Strategy**

Recommendations 2.1 to 2.2 (part 1) were chaired by Diana Minns (Vice Chair /Tenant Representative) and recommendations 2.3 to 2.5 (part 2) were chaired by Councillor Bird

### **Matter for Decision**

The HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy 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 national and local 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 the officer's report, to include all proposals for change in:
  - Financial assumptions as detailed in Appendix B of the document.
  - 2021/22 and future year revenue budgets, resulting from changes in financial assumptions and the financial consequences of changes in these and the need to respond to unavoidable pressures and meet new service demands, as introduced in Section 5, detailed in Appendix D and summarised in Appendices G (1) and G (2) of the document.
- ii. Approved delegated authority be given 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 to recommend to Council (Part 2) to:**

- iii. Approved 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 21 October 2021.
- iv. Approved proposals for new 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 21 October 2021.

- v. Approved the revised funding mix for the delivery of the Housing Capital Programme, recognising the latest assumptions for the use of Grant, Right to Buy Receipts, HRA Resources, Major Repairs Allowance and HRA borrowing.

### **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 Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Queried the cost of building new homes versus the cost of retrofitting older properties.
- ii. Asked to see the greenhouse gas impact of the development proposals (ie: the effect on emissions if the council didn't do anything).

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

- i. No councils had been successful in gaining partnership status with Homes England, officers had a meeting with them the following day for feedback on their application. The benefit of having strategic partnership status was that it would have guaranteed a grant for the whole of the development process.
- ii. Some registered providers had been successful in gaining strategic partnership status and these were generally larger organisations than the City Council.
- iii. Ditchburn Place had some issues with void properties whilst refurbishments were being carried out but this was necessary to enable the refurbishment to be undertaken. The Covid pandemic also had an impact as the vulnerable nature of residents and the number of communal areas meant that they weren't able to re-let the properties. They were now able to re-let and were down to the last few properties.

The Committee resolved:

- by 10 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations 2.1 – 2.2.
- by 6 votes to 0 to endorse the 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.

### **21/47/HSC Review of the Council's Empty Homes Policy**

This item was chaired by Councillor Bird

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Empty Homes Policy is due for review every three years. The review of the Empty Homes Policy 2017 was delayed due to the Covid19 pandemic. The revised Policy reflects operational changes at Cambridge City Council, mainly the removal of the Empty Homes Loan and the inclusion of partnership working with Town Hall Lettings, the Council's social lettings agency.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Approved and adopted the revised Empty Homes Policy 2021 attached as Appendix 1 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 Empty Homes Officer.

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

- i. Asked to see a table showing the number of empty properties and length of time empty. Also for a link to the Empty Home Officer's list of empty properties to the Council tax list of empty properties.
- ii. Said it would be interesting to see if there were clusters of empty properties.
- iii. Asked how many properties were empty due to probate delays.
- iv. Queried if more information could be included on the Council's website to explain why properties may remain empty for some time.

The Empty Homes Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There were 2 long term empty properties, over 10 years on their list due to probate delays. There was not a list of which properties were empty solely due to probate.
- ii. Asked to be sent details of empty properties that the committee were aware of.

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.

### **21/48/HSC Report on progress toward HRA Estate Regeneration programme Including a report on a proposed scheme at Aylesborough Close**

This item was chaired by Councillor Bird

### **Matter for Decision**

The Council committed to a proposed new delivery programme of 1,000 new Council homes at the Housing Scrutiny Committee on 24th September 2020.

The city's constrained boundaries as well as emerging differences in quality standards across new and old council housing stock has led to a proactive approach by council officers to reviewing the potential for estate regeneration as part of the programme.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Noted the progress made to date towards identifying possible suitable candidate sites to be considered for regeneration as part of the new housing programme and the estates that have already been identified.
- ii. Noted that the programme of review of estates will be carried forward including survey work and consultation with residents. Ward Members will be consulted prior to the commencement of survey work and prior to the commencement of consultation with residents on particular estates.

- iii. Approved the revisions to the Council regeneration policy as set out in Appendix 2 and discussed in Part 5 of the officer's report and to add the policy to the council's lettings policy.
- iv. Approved that the scheme be brought forward at Aylesborough Close with an indicative capital budget of £19,030,000 to cover all site assembly, construction costs, professional fees and further associated fees.
- v. Authorised the Strategic Director in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Housing to approve variations to the scheme at Aylesborough Close including the number of units and mix of property types and sizes outlined in this report.
- vi. Approved that, subject to Council approval of the budget, delegated authority be given to the Executive Councillor for Housing in conjunction with the Strategic Director to enable the Aylesborough Close 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.
- vii. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director to commence Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) proceedings on Leasehold properties to be demolished to enable the development at Aylesborough Close, should these be required.
- viii. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director to serve initial Demolition Notices under the Housing Act 1985.
- ix. Noted the work done to date toward investigating the potential for modular rooftop and infill development across the Council's holdings as outlined in Part 7 of the officer's report.
- x. Approved the inclusion of airspace developments in the programme of new housing development for which finance has already been made available.
- xi. Approved the outline approach of proceeding with a Joint Venture partnership as the preferred method for implementation of modular rooftop (airspace) development, subject to further investigation and a further report.
- xii. Authorised the Head of the Housing Development Agency to approve a site for a pilot project subject to consultation with the Executive Councillor for Housing, the Head of Housing, the Head of Finance and the Ward Members.

**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 the Housing Development Agency.

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

- i. Tenant and Leaseholder representatives had insisted that a letter was sent to tenants and leaseholders if their estate was being considered as part of the regeneration programme.
- ii. Noted that a rigorous examination of sites proposed for regeneration would be undertaken and that this would include what further works were needed and any alternative options.
- iii. Noted the proposal to use a joint venture to deliver the air space programme and queried if local people would be trained to retain specialist knowledge and skills in Cambridge.
- iv. Questioned why a tenant in rent arrears might not be offered alternative housing. Referred to page 284 of the agenda.
- v. Noted reference to compulsory purchase powers and demolition notices in relation to Aylesborough Close and queried what steps were taken to inform the community about these processes.
- vi. Noted reference to roof top developments and queried if this could happen on existing homes. Asked what steps would be taken to support existing residents. Did not want the living standards of existing residents lowered as a result of these proposals.
- vii. Noted that the number of units on site was doubled and asked if the density on all sites would be increased.

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

- ii. Confirmed that they were only in the early stages of the joint venture air space project and that local labour and supply chains would be encouraged.
- iii. Most tenants were on social rent, new homes would be built for affordable rent. There were clear provisions in the Council's Lettings policy; tenants who were affected by redevelopment would be awarded emergency housing status and would therefore get top priority for rehousing.



- iv. Confirmed that modular roof top developments would involve building on top of existing houses. There were benefits to this type of development as it was a good way to get improvements to existing housing stock for example adding a lift to the development.
- v. The recommendations proposed in the officer report were the same as those used on previous reports in relation to formal notices. Compulsory purchase powers had not had to be used before as they had been able to work with existing tenants. If it got to the point where there was only one tenant preventing the development going ahead then more serious options may need to be considered.
- vi. Noted that each site needed to be assessed on its own merits. Development was a planning led process, they were not working to a fixed density on sites.

The Executive Councillor commented:

- i. That the council was only at the initial stages of exploring potential sites for redevelopment, no decisions had been made, they were only at the start of the process.

The Committee resolved:

- unanimously to endorse recommendations 2.1 and 2.2.
- unanimously to endorse recommendation 2.3.
- unanimously to endorse recommendations 2.4 to 2.8.
- by 7 votes to 0 to endorse recommendations 2.9 to 2.12.

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.

### **21/49/HSC Report on Net Zero Carbon Pilot Schemes at Paget Road and St Thomas Road**

This item was chaired by Councillor Bird

### **Matter for Decision**

Two garage sites had been identified for a proposed Net Zero Carbon pilot: St Thomas's Road Garages and playground (Coleridge) and Paget Road Garages (Trumpington).

The scheme was being brought forward because it represented an opportunity to redevelop existing garage sites to create new additions to the Council's rented housing stock, built in accordance with Net Zero Carbon Standards. It was hoped that the project would be seen as an exemplar for the region and will facilitate knowledge transfer of Net Zero Carbon technology

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Approved the scheme budget of £3,947,000. This is split between St Thomas's Rd Garages (£2,105,000) and Paget Rd Garages (£1,842,000). Part of the scheme budget totalling £265,000 (£141,000 and £124,000 respectively) is subject to a successful bid to the ERDF to cover the cost of the uplift from Passivhaus to Net Zero.
- 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.

### **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 the Housing Development Agency.

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.

### **21/50/HSC Combined Update on New Build Council Housing Delivery**

This item was chaired by Councillor Bird

### **Matter for Decision**

This report provided an update on the housing development programme.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Noted the continued progress on the delivery of the Combined Authority programme.
- ii. Noted the work undertaken to date toward development of the new housing programme for 2022-2032.
- iii. Delegated authority to the Section 151 officer to start the process to set-up a housing company as a Registered provider with a full report of the details of this proposal to be brought to a future committee.

### **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 the Housing Development Agency.

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.

The meeting ended at 8.24 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank