

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REVIEW SCOPING DOCUMENT

REVIEW TOPIC: Governance of the CPCA's Housing Programme

Relevant Links/Decisions/Forward Plan Reference	
Terms of Reference for the Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review the management of the housing fund To consider governance recommendations
Lead O&S Member	Aidan Van de Weyer
Task and Finish Group Membership (if applicable)	
Review Type (T&F Group/Full Committee etc.)	Rapporteur investigation
Key Officer(s)	Roger Thompson
Combined Authority Portfolio Holder(s)/Executive Committee Chair (where appropriate)	Lewis Herbert, Lead Member for Housing
Rationale for the Review	In addition to the concerns about the CPCA's governance arrangements that have been recently raised, a number of specific issues relating to the governance of the CPCA's housing fund have been raised in the past, including in ministerial letters, and these have not been fully scrutinised. An examination of these issues has the potential to provide lessons for the wider governance improvements being undertaken, as well as re-establish public trust that the CPCA is being held to account.
Timescales and Milestones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday 25 July 2022: scoping document to Overview & Scrutiny Committee Monday 19 September 2022: initial report to Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Scope of the Review (reference what is inside and outside the scope of the review)	<p>In scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance of the CPCA housing fund Lessons for the governance of the CPCA <p>Outside scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future role of the CPCA in housing
Key Lines of Enquiry:	Key lines:
What primary/new evidence is needed for the scrutiny review? (Identify what information is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall governance processes of the CPCA housing fund

<p>required to take the review forward, and what information is not already available)</p> <p>What secondary/existing information will be needed? (Identify background information, performance indicators, complaints, existing reports, legislation, central government information and reports etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process for establishing the partnership with Laragh Homes and the contractual arrangements put in place • The decision to establish a loan fund with part of the housing funding, including communications with central government • The governance of the approval of the loans to ECDC, ECTC and Laragh Homes • In particular, the decision to approve a loan after the start of the Covid pandemic • The governance around the decision to support Community Land Trusts • The issuing of a statement of community benefit in relation to the Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust <p>Evidence needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correspondence between CPCA and partners • Correspondence between CPCA and government • Correspondence between officers • Procurement and contract documents
What briefings and site visits will be relevant for the review?	Briefings from officers
Which witnesses should be invited to provide evidence for the review?	<p>Lewis Herbert</p> <p>Roger Thompson</p> <p>Other relevant officers</p> <p>Laragh Homes</p> <p>Stretham & Wilburton CLT</p> <p>Save Wilburton from Over Development</p>
<p>Implications of reviewing this topic. Have the following been taken into consideration in the planning for this review?</p> <p>Legal implications</p> <p>Financial implications</p> <p>Equality and Diversity</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
What resources are required for the review?	Officer time
<p>Indicators of success:</p> <p>What overview and scrutiny role are the committee performing in this case?</p> <p>What factors would tell you what a good review should look like in this case?</p>	<p>This review would be successful if it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) provides the public with greater clarity relating to historic governance questions b) draws lessons for governance arrangements that can inform the current wider governance improvement process

What are the potential outcomes of the review
e.g., service improvements, policy
review/change, etc?

What value is being added by undertaking the
review?