HOUSING & NEW HOMES COMMITTEE	Agenda Item 76
	Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 3 2016/17	
Date of Meeting:	15 March 2017	
Report of:	Executive Director Neighbourhoods Communities & Housing	
Contact Officer:	Name: Ododo Dafé	Tel: 01273 293201
	Email: ododo.dafe@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All	

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1.   SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1   The Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 3 of the financial year 2016/17. The report is attached as Appendix 1.

2.   RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1   That the Housing & New Homes Committee notes and comments upon the report, which was circulated to Area Panel members for their feedback in February 2016.

3.   RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1   The report continues the use of the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

4.   COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

4.1   A full copy of this report was circulated to Area Panel members in February 2017 inviting them to provide feedback. No amendments were requested to the report.

5.   FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

5.1   The area of performance with the most significant financial impact is the ability to collect rents from tenants. During the third quarter 2016/17, the collection rate has decreased slightly by 0.05% to 98.8%. There was also a 0.06% reduction for quarter 2. However this is still above the collection rate for the financial year 2015/16 which was 98.77% and also above the target set for this year. The collection rate also compares favourably (top quartile) when benchmarked against other Councils. The amount of rent collected has a direct impact on the resources available to spend on

the management and maintenance of tenants' properties. Therefore, collection rates are closely monitored so that appropriate action can be taken to minimise arrears and target intervention to where it is most needed.

Finance Officer Consulted: Monica Brooks   *Date: 17/2/2017*

Legal Implications:

5.2   There are no significant legal implications to draw to Members' attention arising from this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley   *Date: 17/02/2017*

Equalities Implications:

5.3   There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Sustainability Implications:

5.4   The increase in the energy efficiency rating of homes reflects an improvement towards the council's sustainability commitments, among other objectives such as financial inclusion and reducing fuel poverty.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5   There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report. Cases of anti-social behaviour involving criminal activity are worked on in partnership with the Police and other appropriate agencies.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6   There are no direct risk and opportunity implications arising from this report.

Public Health Implications:

5.7   There are no direct public health implications arising from this report.

Corporate or Citywide Implications:

5.8   There are no direct corporate or city wide implications arising from this report. However, two performance indicators featuring in this report ('dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard' and 'energy efficiency rating of homes') are among those used to measure success against the Corporate Plan principle of increasing equality.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1.   Appendix 1. Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 3 2016/17.

Housing Management Performance Report (Quarter 3 2016/17)

This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 3 of the financial year 2016/17. It uses the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

	Status		Trend
(R)	Performance is below target (red)	⇩	Poorer than previous reporting period
(A)	Performance is close to achieving target, but in need of improvement (amber)	⇔	Same as previous reporting period
(G)	Performance is on or above target (green)	⇧	Improvement on previous reporting period

Explanations of performance have been provided for indicators which are red or amber. A total of 46 performance indicators are measured against a target, of which 34 are on target (green), eight are near target (amber) and four are below target (red).

The Quarter 4 2016/17 report will include benchmarking data from Housemark.

The icons used throughout the report are sourced from www.flaticon.com and were designed by 'Freepik.'

1. Rent collection and current arrears

Indicators marked with an * are accumulative throughout the year and their targets are set for the year end. Therefore, the status and trend symbols will be applied in the Quarter 4 report, once performance for the year is known.

	Rent collection and current arrears indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
1.1	Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year (projected rate)	98.50%	98.85% (£50.52m of £51.11m)	98.80% (£50.51m of £51.13m)	G	⬇
1.2	Total current tenant arrears	£780k	£586k	£615k	G	⬇
1.3	Tenants served a Notice of Seeking Possession*	No target	359	499	-	-
1.4	Tenants evicted because of rent arrears*	Under 20	3	6	-	-
1.5	Rent loss due to empty dwellings	1%	1.00% (£509k of £50.96m)	0.95% (£485k of £50.95m)	G	⬆
1.6	Former tenant arrears collected*	25%	17.80% (£103k of £580k)	24.08% (£141k of £586k)	-	-
1.7	Rechargeable debt collected*	20%	7.15% (£11k of £148k)	13.50% (£19k of £140k)	-	-

		Rent collection and current arrears indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
1.8		Universal Credit – affected tenants	No target	0.3% (32 of 11,408)	0.50% (57 of 11,382)	-	-
1.9		Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – affected tenants (under occupiers)	No target	6.2% (709 of 11,408)	5.97% (680 of 11,382)	-	-
1.10		Benefit Cap – affected tenants	No target	0.1% (8 of 11,408)	0.06% (7 of 11,382)	-	-
1.11		Universal Credit – arrears of affected tenants as proportion of total arrears	No target	3% (£17k)	3% (£19k)	-	-
1.12		Under occupiers – arrears of affected tenants as proportion of total arrears	No target	12% (£70k)	11% (£71k)	-	-
1.13		Benefit Cap – arrears of affected tenants as proportion of total arrears	No target	0.1% (£0.7k)	0.3% (£2.4k)	-	-

1.14 Area breakdown of rent collected

Rent collection area	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Trend since last quarter
North (includes Seniors Housing)	99.19% (£14.40m of £14.52m)	99.10% (£14.38m £14.51m)	⬇
West	99.07% (£10.33m of £10.43m)	99.07% (£10.34m of £10.44m)	⬌
Central	98.83% (£9.09 of £9.19m)	98.83% (£9.10m of £9.21m)	⬌
East	98.45% (£16.71m of £16.97m)	98.35% (£16.68m of £16.96m)	⬇
All areas	98.85% (£50.52m of £51.11m)	98.80% (£50.51m of £51.13m)	⬇

1.15 Tenants in arrears by amount

Amount of arrears	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Trend since last quarter
No arrears	75% (8,570)	80% (9,076)	⬆
Any arrears	25% (2,838)	20% (2,305)	⬆
… £0.01 to £99.99	13% (1,472)	9% (992)	⬆
… £100 to £499.99	10% (1,090)	9% (994)	⬆
… £500 and above	2% (276)	3% (320)	⬇
Total tenants	11,408	11,382	-

2. Customer services and complaints

	Customer services and complaints indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
2.1	Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST)	92%	93% (9,148 of 9,859)	89% (6,562 of 7,378)	(A)	⬇
2.2	Customer satisfaction with HCST ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')	91%	53% (50 of 94)	Next result due Q4	-	-
2.3	Ease of effort to contact HCST ('very easy' or 'fairly easy' to contact)	92%	85% (81 of 95)	Next result due Q4	-	-
2.4	Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days – housing management	80%	75% (24 of 32)	58% (21 of 36)	(R)	⬇
2.5	Stage 1 complaints upheld – housing management	33% or under	19% (6 of 32)	25% (9 of 36)	(G)	⬇
2.6	Stage 1 complaints escalated to Stage 2 – housing management	10%	9% (3 of 32)	17% (6 of 36)	(R)	⬇
2.7	Stage 2 complaints upheld – housing management	15% or under	0% (0 of 3)	0% (0 of 6)	(G)	⬄
2.8	Housing Ombudsman Complaints upheld – housing management	20% or under	0% (0 of 1)	0% (none)	(G)	⬄

Customer services and complaints commentary

Three indicators are on target, one is near target and two are below target.

The indicators below target are:

Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days – housing management

Performance as of Quarter 3 stands at 58% against a target of 80%, and has decreased from 75% since Quarter 2. A total of 36 Stage 1 complaints were responded to, of which 21 were done within 10 working days and 15 took longer. Most of the overdue complaints related to teams that were reorganised as part of the service redesign in October 2016 and so there may have been issues with responding to the complaints during the handover of work between the old and new teams. The result for the next quarter will indicate whether these issues have been resolved. The average time taken to reply to all Stage 1 complaints was 11 working days during Quarter 3.

Stage 1 complaints escalated to Stage 2 – housing management

A larger than usual proportion (17%) of Stage 1 complaints was escalated to Stage 2 during Quarter 3, therefore performance missed the target to keep this proportion under 10%. A total of six complaints were escalated to Stage 2, meaning the complainant was not satisfied with the response at Stage 1 and that the complaint was investigated by the corporate Customer Feedback Team. Four of six Stage 2 complaints related to reorganised teams and therefore it appears this trend was for similar reasons as outlined in the commentary for the indicator above. None of the Stage 2 complaints were upheld by the corporate Customer Feedback Team.

The indicator near target is:

Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST)

The proportion of calls answered by the Housing Customer Services Team was 89% and slipped below the 92% target during Quarter 3. This was because the team had fewer call handlers than usual (3.5 on average when at least four are needed) due to staff vacancies which have since been filled. Also, the team has taken on additional work to deal with more enquiries at first contact (rather than referring them to other teams) as well as administration and research work to support the wider Housing service.

3. Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

	Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchange indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
3.1	Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days)	18	16 (118 lets)	20 (122 lets)	(A)	⬇
3.2	… as above for general needs properties	17	14 (91 lets)	18 (91 lets)	(A)	⬇
3.3	… as above for Seniors Housing properties	30	23 (27 lets)	26 (31 lets)	(G)	⬇
3.4	Average re-let time, including time spent in major works (calendar days)	No target	42 (118 lets)	43 (122 lets)	-	-
3.5	Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within 42 calendar days (statutory timescale)	100%	100% (51 of 51)	100% (47 of 47)	(G)	⬄

Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges commentary

Two indicators are on target and two are near target.

The indicators near target are:

Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days)
During Quarter 3, the average re-let time increased to 20 days, missing the target of 18 days or under. A possible explanation for this trend is that fewer properties were let upon the first offer (52%) compared to during the previous quarter (68%). This increases the time taken to let properties because of the need to make further offers. Of the 58 properties not let on the first offer, 42 were general needs and 16 were Seniors Housing.

Average re-let time for general needs properties, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days)
During Quarter 3, the 18 day average re-let time for general needs properties slightly missed target of 19 days or under as part of the same trend as outlined in the commentary for the indicator above.

3.6. Long term empty dwellings by ward (empty 6 weeks or more as of 31 December 2016)

Ward name (excludes those with no long term empty properties)	No. dwellings	Average days empty for	Range of days empty for	Comment
Central Hove	1	182	182-182	One flat ready to let.
East Brighton	2	70	49-91	One house and one flat ready to let.
Hangleton and Knoll	3	191	56-441	One house for extension/refurbishment (empty 441 days) and two flats ready to let.
Hanover and Elm Grove	19	322	63-952	One house in major works, one flat in major works, one house ready to let and 16 studio flats within Stonehurst Court (which is to be closed as part of Seniors Housing scheme review).
Hollingdean and Stanmer	2	73	63-84	One flat in major works and one flat ready to let.
Moulsecoomb and Bevendean	5	331	63-462	Three houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 462 days), one house ready to let and one Seniors Housing studio flat to be converted into a larger dwelling.
Patcham	4	155	63-266	Four Seniors Housing studio flats to be converted.
North Portslade	2	91	49-133	Two Seniors Housing studio flats to be converted.
South Portslade	4	435	224-616	Three houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 616 days) and one Seniors Housing studio flat to be converted.
Queens Park	1	84	84-84	One flat ready to let.
Wish	2	500	399-602	Two houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 602 days).
Total	45	277	952	The dwelling which has been empty longest (952 days) is a Seniors studio flat in Hanover and Elm Grove, as per above.

4. Repairs and maintenance

	Repairs and maintenance indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
4.1	Emergency repairs completed in time	99%	99.7% (3,350 of 3,359)	99.8% (3,274 of 3,282)	G	⬆
4.2	Routine repairs completed in time	99%	99.7% (4,833 of 4,843)	99.6% (4,381 of 4,399)	G	⬇
4.3	Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)	14 days	20 days	21 days	R	⬇
4.4	Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made	97%	96.4% (9,732 of 10,094)	99.9% (10,662 of 11,111)	G	⬆
4.5	Tenant satisfaction with repairs ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')	96%	95.2% (374 of 393)	96.0% (1,735 of 1,807)	G	⬆
4.6	Responsive repairs passing post-inspection	97%	96.6% (1,284 of 1,329)	95.2% (858 of 901)	A	⬇
4.7	Repairs completed at first visit	92%	89.8% (7,370 of 8,202)	89.6% (6,883 of 7,681)	R	⬇
4.8	Cancelled repair jobs	Under 5%	6.7% (671 of 10,011)	6.9% (690 of 10,078)	A	⬇

	Repairs and maintenance indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
4.9	Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard	100%	100% (11,555 of 11,555)	100% (11,549 of 11,549)	G	⟺
4.10	Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009)	65.6	65.5	65.8	G	⇧
4.11	Planned works passing post-inspection	97%	100% (332 of 332)	100% (274 of 274)	G	⟺
4.12	Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates	100%	100% (10,084 of 10,084)	100% (10,045 of 10,045)	G	⟺
4.13	Empty properties passing post-inspection	98%	100% (127 of 127)	98.3% (112 of 114)	G	⇩
4.14	Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond	2 hours	1h 56m	1h 40m	G	⇧
4.15	Lifts restored to service within 24 hours	95%	97.1% (134 of 138)	94.3% (100 of 106)	A	⇩
4.16	Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours	7 days	3 days (13 days, 4 lifts)	4 days (25 days, 6 lifts)	G	⇩

	Repairs and maintenance indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
4.17	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered	90%	93% (20,071 of 21,586)	97% (21,578 of 22,198)	G	⇧
4.18	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds	75%	58% (11,618 of 20,071)	82% (17,727 of 21,578)	G	⇧
4.19	Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time	5 mins	13m 40s	7m 6s	A	⇧

Repairs and maintenance commentary

Thirteen indicators are on target, four are near target and two are below target.

The indicators below target are:

Repairs completed at first visit
Performance on repairs completed at first visit stands at 89.6% and is 2.4% below the 92% target. Mears are increasingly delivering external and complex work via responsive repairs which due to the nature of the work cannot be completed in a single visit.

Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)
During Quarter 3 it took an average of 21 calendar days to complete routine repairs, compared to a target of 14 days. This is because an increasing number of responsive repairs are complex and by their nature take longer than 14 days to complete. The partnership has agreed to pilot a new process during February 2017 with the aim of managing these works more effectively. Examples of these types of repairs include independent structural surveys, cooperation of utility suppliers, party wall agreements and those which require leaseholder consultation.

The indicators near target are:

Cancelled repair jobs
The proportion of repair jobs that were cancelled during Quarter 3 is 6.9% against a target of under 5%. A sizeable proportion of the cancellations were due to avoidable reasons like 'incorrect instructions' or 'duplicate jobs.' Of 690 cancelled jobs, 301 (44%) were for either of these reasons. The partnership is committed to reducing the number of these cancellations. The main other

reason for cancelled jobs was that they were cancelled at the request of the tenant (213, or 31%).

Responsive repairs passing post-inspection
During Quarter 3, there were 901 post-inspections carried out by Mears (a sample of 11.7%) of which 43 failed. The reasons for the failures are as follows: 16 were due to needing corrections to the Schedule of Rates (SOR) codes used; 19 were due to poor quality work; 7 were due to extra works being required to complete the job; and one was due to a health & safety concern.

Lifts restored to service within 24 hours
Of 106 lift breakdowns during Quarter 3, 94.3% (100) resulted in the lift being successfully restored to service within 24 hours. This is only 0.7% below the 95% target, and the target would have been reached if just one more breakdown had been restored to service within 24 hours.

Repairs Helpdesk - longest wait time
During Quarter 3, the longest time that a caller waited for their call to be answered was 7 minutes and 6 seconds. This happened in December and was atypical of the average call answering time during that month, which was 15 seconds.

5. Estates Service

	Estates Service indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
5.1	Cleaning quality inspection pass rate	99%	100% (176 of 176)	100% (116 of 116)	G	⟷
5.2	Estates Response Team quality inspection pass rate	99%	100% (178 of 178)	100% (77 of 77)	G	⟷
5.3	Cleaning tasks completed	99%	99.6% (13,493 of 13,543)	99.8% (13,346 of 13,373)	G	⬆
5.4	Bulk waste removed within 7 working days	93%	99.6% (840 of 843)	98% 712 of 724	G	⬇
5.5	Light replacements/repairs completed within 3 working days	99%	100% (167 of 167)	99% (324 of 327)	G	⬇
5.6	Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days	96%	97% (971 of 998)	97% (1,431 of 1,479)	G	⟷
5.7	Incidents of drug paraphernalia collected and reported to the Police	No target	20	59	-	-

6. Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

	Anti-social behaviour (ASB) indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
6.1	Victim satisfaction with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with*	88%	89% (16 of 18)	90% (19 of 21)	G	⇧
6.2	Tenants evicted due to ASB	No target	1	1	-	-
6.3	ASB cases closed without the need for legal action	No target	80% (37 of 46)	85% (28 of 33)	-	-

*Year to date indicator measuring telephone survey respondents who were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with.

6.4 ASB incidents by type

Type of ASB incident	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Change between quarters Q2 to Q3
Noise incidents	9% 13	18% 36	+23
Harassment / threats incidents	53% 77	34% 69	-8
Hate-related incidents	4% 6	5% 11	+5
Vandalism incidents	5% 7	8% 16	+9
Pets / animals incidents	1% 2	7% 15	+13
Drugs incidents	8% 12	8% 17	+5
Alcohol related incidents	1% 2	0% 1	-1
Domestic violence / abuse incidents	3% 4	6% 13	+9
Other violence incidents	8% 11	6% 12	+1
Prostitution / Sex incidents	0% 0	1% 2	+2
Other criminal behaviour incidents	7% 10	6% 12	+2
Total ASB incidents	100% 144	100% 204	+60

NB To improve the quality of ASB incident reporting, the methodology has been revised to only count incidents that relate to or create an ASB case dealt with by Housing – where the complainant or alleged perpetrator is a council resident such as a tenant or leaseholder. This has been done for consistency with recording by Housemark, the Police and the new teams formed upon the service redesign effective October 2016. The revised methodology has been applied to the Quarter 2 results in order to allow for a comparison between quarters.

6.5 ASB incidents by ward

Ward name	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Change between quarters Q2 to Q3
Brunswick and Adelaide	0	0	0
Central Hove	0	4	+4
East Brighton	25	33	+8
Goldsmid	3	8	+5
Hangleton and Knoll	16	16	0
Hanover and Elm Grove	5	7	+2
Hollingdean and Stanmer	21	28	+7
Hove Park	0	0	0
Moulsecoomb and Bevendean	15	18	+3
North Portslade	6	12	+6
Patcham	3	9	+6
Preston Park	1	3	2
Queen's Park	28	34	+6
Regency	0	2	+2
Rottingdean Coastal	0	0	0
South Portslade	6	7	+1
St. Peter's and North Laine	6	6	0
Westbourne	2	3	+1
Wish	1	5	+4
Withdean	0	1	+1
Woodingdean	6	8	+2
Total	144	204	+60

7. Tenancy management

	Tenancy management indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
7.1	Properties taken back due to tenancy fraud (year to date indicator)	30 by year end	3	8	-	-
7.2	Closed Tenancy Sustainment Officer cases where the tenancy was sustained	97%	98% (40 of 41)	97% (36 of 37)	Ⓖ	⬇
7.3	Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years	90%	88% (9,005 of 10,253)	91% (9,292 of 10,257)	Ⓖ	⬆

8. Seniors Housing

	Seniors Housing indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q2 2016/17	Current quarter Q3 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
8.1	Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months	98%	95% (815 of 860)	97% (822 of 851)	A	⬆
8.2	Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities	95%	97% (831 of 860)	99.8% (849 of 851)	G	⬆
8.3	Residents living in schemes offering regular exercise activities	65%	80% (689 of 860)	79% (669 of 851)	G	⬇
8.4	Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations	90%	96% (22 of 23)	96% (22 of 23)	G	⬌

Seniors Housing commentary

Three indicators are on target and one is near target.

The indicator near target is:

Seniors Housing residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months

As of 31 December 2016, 97% of Seniors housing residents had a tenancy visit during the past year against a target of 98%. Performance has steadily increased during 2016/17 and is now 1% away from reaching the target.