

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| Subject: | Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 1 2016/17 | | |
| Date of Meeting: | 21 September 2016 | | |
| Report of: | Acting Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture | | |
| 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 one 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, a summary version of which went to Area Panels in July 2016.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 1 2016/17 has been re-designed as a separate document and is attached as Appendix 1. This has been done so that the performance report can be made more accessible to a wider audience. Changes have primarily been made to the formatting rather than to the content (which remains largely the same). For example, size 12 font is used throughout the report in order to meet the requirements for Area Panel documents.
- 3.2 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. These symbols have been re-designed to make them easier to read, and the key to them is included in the report, as are explanations of performance for indicators which are red or amber.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

- 4.1 A summary version of the performance report went to Area Panels in July 2016 and was noted and commented upon. It was agreed that future reports would include performance and satisfaction data for estate inspections and Estate Development Budget

works. Suitable indicators will be developed and tested with a view to publication during 2016/17 for the former and the start of 2017/18 for the latter.

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. For the first quarter 2016/17, the collection rate has increased by 0.14% to 98.91% when compared to the collection rate for the financial year 2015/16 and currently exceeds the target set for the year which is good news. This continues to be closely monitored so that appropriate action can be taken to minimise arrears as the effects of welfare reform unfold. Any improvement in rent collected has a direct impact on the resources available to spend on the management and maintenance of tenants' properties.

Finance Officer Consulted: Monica Brooks

Date: 25/08/16

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no legal implications to draw to Members' attention.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 22/08/2016

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 1 2016/17.

Background Documents:

1. None

Housing Management Performance Report (Quarter 1 2016/17)

This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 1 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 | |
|---|--|---|--|
|  | Performance is below target (red) |  | Poorer than previous reporting period |
|  | Performance is close to achieving target, but in need of improvement (amber) |  | Same as previous reporting period |
|  | 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 49 performance indicators are measured against a target, of which 34 are on target (green), eight are near target (amber) and seven 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 Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 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% | 98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m) | 98.91% (£50.57m of £51.13m) |  |  |
| 1.2 | Total current tenant arrears | £780k | £640k | £557k |  |  |
| 1.3 | Tenants served a Notice of Seeking Possession* | No target | 680 | 154 | - | - |
| 1.4 | Tenants evicted because of rent arrears* | Under 20 | 7 | 1 | - | - |
| 1.5 | Rent loss due to empty dwellings | 1% | 0.93% (£478k of £51.71m) | 0.91% (£461k of £50.94m) |  |  |
| 1.6 | Former tenant arrears collected* | 25% | 29.24% (£179k of £612k) | 7.79% (£50k of £641k) | - | - |
| 1.7 | Rechargeable debt collected* | 20% | 11.32% (£21k of £185k) | 3.21% (£6k of £185k) | - | - |

**Rent collection and current arrears indicators****Target
2016/17****Previous
quarter
Q4 2015/16****Current
quarter
Q1 2016/17****Status
against
target****Trend
since last
quarter**

| | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------|---------------|---------------|---|---|
| 1.8 | Universal Credit – affected tenants | No target | 23 | 32 | - | - |
| 1.9 | Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – affected tenants (under occupiers) | No target | 711 | 709 | - | - |
| 1.10 | Benefit Cap – affected tenants | No target | 8 | 8 | - | - |
| 1.11 | Arrears related to Universal Credit | No target | 2% (£10k) | 2% (£13k) | - | - |
| 1.12 | Arrears related to Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy | No target | 5% (£31k) | 6% (£36k) | - | - |
| 1.13 | Arrears related to Benefit Cap | No target | 0.3% (£2k) | 0.3% (£2k) | - | - |

1.14 Area breakdown of rent collected

|  Rent collection area | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Trend since last quarter |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| North (includes Seniors Housing) | 99.23% (£14.68m of £14.79m) | 99.25% (£14.42m of £14.53m) | ↑ |
| West | 99.00% (£10.45m of £10.55m) | 99.11% (£10.33m of £10.43m) | ↑ |
| Central | 98.64% (£9.26m of £9.38m) | 98.89% (£9.08m of £9.18m) | ↑ |
| East | 98.31% (£17.05m of £17.34m) | 98.51% (£16.74m of £16.99m) | ↑ |
| All areas | 98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m) | 98.91% (£50.57m of £51.13m) | ↑ |

1.15 Tenants in arrears by amount

|  Amount of arrears (Q1 2016/17) | All tenants |
|--|----------------|
| No arrears | 79% (9,069) |
| Any arrears | 21% (2,351) |
| ... arrears of £0.01 to £99.99 | 9% (1,003) |
| ... arrears of £100 to £499.99 | 9% (1,075) |
| ... arrears of £500 and above | 2% (273) |
| Total tenants | 11,420 |

2. Customer services and complaints

|  | Customer services and complaints indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 2.1 | Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST) | 92% | 90% (8,072 of 8,944) | 94% (7,239 of 7681) |  |  |
| 2.2 | Customer satisfaction with HCST ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied') | 91% | 86% (243 of 284) | TBC (next report) | - | - |
| 2.3 | Ease of effort to contact HCST ('very easy' or 'fairly easy' to contact) | 92% | 92% (260 of 282) | TBC (next report) | - | - |
| 2.4 | Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days – housing management | 80% | 59% (22 of 37) | 69% (24 of 35) |  |  |
| 2.5 | Stage 1 complaints upheld – housing management | 33% or under | 19% (7 of 37) | 14% (5 of 35) |  |  |
| 2.6 | Stage 1 complaints escalated to Stage 2 – housing management | 10% | 8% (3 of 37) | 9% (3 of 35) |  |  |
| 2.7 | Stage 2 complaints upheld – housing management | 15% or under | 33% (1 of 3) | 0% (0 of 3) |  |  |
| 2.8 | Housing Ombudsman Complaints upheld – housing management | 20% or under | 0% (0 of 2) | 0% (none) |  |  |

Customer services and complaints commentary

Five indicators are on target and one is below target. Two indicators are to be confirmed (TBC) because the HCST carries out customer satisfaction surveys every six months, so results from the September 2016 survey will be presented in the next report.

The indicator below target is:

Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days

The 80% target has been set by the Corporate Customer Feedback Team and response times have been identified as a key area in which Housing can improve. A total of 35 complaints were responded to, of which 11 took longer than 10 working days (these complaints were overdue by an average of 9 days).

Although the target was missed, there has been a significant improvement in performance compared to the previous quarter, from 59% to 69%, and a similar improvement is expected during the next quarter.

3. Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

|  | Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchange indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 3.1 | Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days) | 18 | 17 (126 lets) | 16 (147 lets) |  |  |
| 3.2 | ... as above for general needs properties | 17 | 14 (98 lets) | 16 (110 lets) |  |  |
| 3.3 | ... as above for Seniors Housing properties | 30 | 30 (28 lets) | 16 (37 lets) |  |  |
| 3.4 | Average re-let time, including time spent in major works (calendar days) | No target | 32 (126 lets) | 58 (147 lets) | - | - |
| 3.5 | Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within 42 calendar days (statutory timescale) | 100% | 100% (30 of 30) | 100% (56 of 56) |  |  |

3.6 Long term empty dwellings by ward (empty 6 weeks or more as of 1 July 2016)

| Ward name (excludes those with no long term empty properties) | No. dwellings | Average days empty for | Range of days empty for | Comment |
|--|---------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| East Brighton | 7 | 93 | 48-181 | One ready to let and six to go to Seaside Homes (including one empty 181 days). |
| Goldsmid | 2 | 146 | 125-167 | One in major works (empty 167 days) and one to go to Seaside Homes. |
| Hangleton and Knoll | 5 | 116 | 48-258 | One for extension/refurbishment (empty 258 days), one in major works and three to go to Seaside Homes. |
| Hanover and Elm Grove | 16 | 248 | 48-769 | Majority (14 studios, including one empty 769 days) within Stonehurst Court – which is to be closed as part of Seniors Housing scheme review – and two ready to let. |
| Hollingdean and Stanmer | 1 | 146 | 146-146 | One to go to Seaside Homes. |
| Moulsecoomb and Bevendean | 12 | 185 | 48-433 | Five for extension/refurbishment (one of which empty 433 days), three to be converted to larger dwellings (in Seniors Housing Scheme) and four to go to Seaside Homes. |
| North Portslade | 1 | 118 | 118-118 | One to go to Seaside Homes. |
| Patcham | 4 | 79 | 48-104 | Three to be converted to larger dwellings (in Seniors Housing Scheme) and one to go to Seaside Homes. |
| South Portslade | 3 | 323 | 258-433 | Three for extension/refurbishment (one of which empty 433 days). |
| Queens Park | 1 | 111 | 111-111 | One to go to Seaside Homes. |
| Wish | 4 | 189 | 48-419 | Two ready to let and two to go to Seaside Homes (one of which empty 419 days). |
| Woodingdean | 1 | 545 | 545-545 | One ready to let following major works (which has since been let). |
| Total | 57 | 187 | 48-769 | The dwelling which has been empty longest (769 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 Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 4.1 | Emergency repairs completed in time | 99% | 100% (3,209 of 3,209) | 99.8% (2,739 of 2,745) |  |  |
| 4.2 | Routine repairs completed in time | 99% | 99.9% (5,165 of 5,173) | 99.4% (4,097 of 4,121) |  |  |
| 4.3 | Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days) | 14 days | 18 days | 16 days |  |  |
| 4.4 | Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made | 97% | 96.5% (10,188 of 10,556) | 97.1% (11,535 of 11,879) |  |  |
| 4.5 | Tenant satisfaction with repairs ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied') | 96% | 94.4% (1,156 of 1,225) | 96.4% (1,013 of 1,051) |  |  |
| 4.6 | Responsive repairs passing post-inspection | 97% | 94.3% (1,129 of 1,197) | 95.8% (978 of 1,021) |  |  |
| 4.7 | Repairs completed at first visit | 92% | 91.4% (7,657 of 8,382) | 89.8% (6,164 of 6,866) |  |  |
| 4.8 | Cancelled repair jobs | Under 5% | 6.7% (742 of 11,134) | 7.3% (699 of 9,624) |  |  |

|  Repairs and maintenance indicators | | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 4.9 | Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard | 100% | 100% (11,573 of 11,573) | 100% (11,552 of 11,552) |  |  |
| 4.10 | Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009) | 64.4 | 65.2 | 65.2 |  |  |
| 4.11 | Planned works passing post-inspection | 97% | 100% (456 of 456) | 100% (317 of 317) |  |  |
| 4.12 | Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates | 100% | 99.96% (10,124 of 10,128) | 100% (10,083 of 10,083) |  |  |
| 4.13 | Empty properties passing post-inspection | 98% | 98% (148 of 151) | 100% (145 of 145) |  |  |
| 4.14 | Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond | 2 hours | 1h 45m | 2h 10m |  |  |
| 4.15 | Lifts restored to service within 24 hours | 95% | 97.7% (169 of 173) | 94.6% (106 of 112) |  |  |
| 4.16 | Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours | 7 days | 3 days (11 days, 4 lifts) | 3 days (19 days, 6 lifts) |  |  |

|  Repairs and maintenance indicators | | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 4.17 | Repairs Helpdesk - calls answered | 90% | 98% (24,123 of 24,680) | 96% (20,909 of 21,779) |  |  |
| 4.18 | Repairs Helpdesk - calls answered within 20 seconds | 75% | 83% (20,113 of 24,123) | 73% (15,270 of 20,909) |  |  |
| 4.19 | Repairs Helpdesk - longest wait time | 5 mins | 5m 23s | 7m 2s |  |  |

Repairs and maintenance commentary

Eleven indicators are on target, six 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 (89.8%) is 2.2% below the target (92%) in Quarter 1 and has declined slightly (by 1.6%) since the previous quarter.

Mears have undertaken a significant review of the responsive repairs service over the past six months. Mears are now directly delivering more external trades that are not completed in one appointment, including plastering, building and roofing.

Cancelled repair jobs

The number of jobs being cancelled due to being a duplicate order has decreased from 184 in Quarter 4 to 154 in Quarter 1. A further 192 jobs were cancelled at the request of the tenant.

Mears have committed to reducing the number of jobs that are cancelled due to “incorrect instructions” or “duplicate jobs”, as these jointly account for 40% (279 out of 699) of jobs which were raised and later cancelled.

The indicators near target are:

Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)

Although the 14 day target has not yet been met, the average time to complete routine repairs (16 days) has improved by two days since the previous quarter. This was anticipated, as the number of overdue orders had reduced – from 466 at the end of May to 185 at the end of June.

Responsive repairs passing post-inspection

During Quarter 1, there were 1,021 post-inspections carried out (a sample of 14.8%) of which 43 failed. This is an improvement of 1.5% from the previous quarter.

The reasons for the failures are as follows: 11 were due to needing corrections to the Schedule of Rates codes used; 17 were due to poor quality work; 13 were due to extra works being required to complete the job; and two were due to poor customer service.

Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond

Lift breakdowns were responded to in an average of 2 hours 10 minutes, which is 10 minutes in excess of the target of two hours. There were two breakdowns which included a person trapped in the lift, and both these calls were attended to in less than two hours.

Lifts restored to service within 24 hours

106 of 112 lift breakdowns (94.6%) had the lift successfully restored to service within 24 hours. This is only 0.4% below the 96% target, and needed just one more breakdown to be restored within 24 hours in order to reach target.

Repairs Helpdesk - calls answered within 20 seconds

At 73%, performance is 2% below the 75% target. This is due to an increase in staff turnover and time spent training new staff, but is anticipated to be back on target in Quarter 2.

Repairs Helpdesk - longest wait time

This indicator measures the longest time that a caller has waited for their call to be answered which was 7 minutes and 2 seconds. This was in April and the second longest wait was in 5m 55s (in June). The average time that a caller waited during this period was 25 seconds.

5. Estates Service

|  | Estates Service indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 5.1 | Cleaning quality inspection pass rate | 99% | 100% (181 of 181) | 100% (147 of 147) |  |  |
| 5.2 | Emergency Response Team quality inspection pass rate | 99% | 100% (97 of 97) | 100% (74 of 74) |  |  |
| 5.3 | Cleaning tasks completed | 99% | 98% (13,191 of 13,513) | 99% (13,146 of 13,323) |  |  |
| 5.4 | Bulk waste removed within 7 working days | 93% | 95% (711 of 746) | 93% (707 of 760) |  |  |
| 5.5 | Light replacements/repairs completed within 3 working days | 99% | 99% (292 of 296) | 99% (171 of 173) |  |  |
| 5.6 | Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days | 96% | 97% (1,344 of 1,381) | 98% (1,282 of 1,305) |  |  |
| 5.7 | Incidents of drug paraphernalia collected and reported to the Police | No target | 50 | 15 | - | - |

6. Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

|  Anti-social behaviour (ASB) indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 6.1 Victim satisfaction with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with* | 88% | 90% (47 of 52) | 93% (13 of 14) |  |  |
| 6.2 Tenants evicted due to ASB | No target | 1 | 0 | - | - |
| 6.3 ASB cases closed without need for legal action | No target | 87% (60 of 69) | 95% (35 of 37) | - | - |

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

6.6 Reports of ASB incidents by type

|  Type of ASB incident | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Noise incidents | 21% (130) | 21% (119) |
| Harassment / threats incidents | 17% (106) | 25% (144) |
| Hate-related incidents | 1% (5) | 1% (7) |
| Vandalism incidents | 1% (5) | 4% (20) |
| Pets / animals incidents | 14% (88) | 15% (83) |
| Vehicles incidents | 4% (25) | 0% (1) |
| Drugs incidents | 9% (56) | 8% (45) |
| Alcohol related incidents | 2% (12) | 1% (8) |
| Domestic violence / abuse incidents | 3% (16) | 3% (18) |
| Other violence incidents | 3% (19) | 4% (22) |
| Rubbish incidents | 13% (81) | 5% (30) |
| Garden nuisance incidents | 7% (41) | 7% (41) |
| Communal areas / loitering incidents | 5% (34) | 3% (17) |
| Prostitution / Sex incidents | 0% (1) | 1% (6) |
| Other criminal behaviour incidents | 1% (6) | 2% (9) |
| Total ASB incidents | 100% (625) | 100% (570) |

6.7 Reports of ASB incidents by ward

|  Ward name | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Incidents per 1,000 properties Q1 2016/17 | Change between quarters Q4 to Q1 |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Brunswick and Adelaide | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Central Hove | 11 | 4 | 44 | -7 |
| East Brighton | 105 | 87 | 35 | -18 |
| Goldsmid | 19 | 14 | 30 | -5 |
| Hangleton and Knoll | 82 | 43 | 25 | -39 |
| Hanover and Elm Grove | 27 | 29 | 53 | 2 |
| Hollingdean and Stanmer | 78 | 91 | 59 | 13 |
| Hove Park | 0 | 1 | 59 | 1 |
| Moulsecoomb and Bevendean | 56 | 54 | 33 | -2 |
| North Portslade | 23 | 25 | 50 | 2 |
| Patcham | 25 | 16 | 27 | -9 |
| Preston Park | 6 | 0 | 0 | -6 |
| Queen's Park | 107 | 116 | 55 | 9 |
| Regency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rottingdean Coastal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Portslade | 23 | 13 | 30 | -10 |
| St. Peter's and North Laine | 26 | 28 | 54 | 2 |
| Westbourne | 7 | 6 | 41 | -1 |
| Wish | 9 | 7 | 14 | -2 |
| Withdean | 5 | 6 | 105 | 1 |
| Woodingdean | 16 | 30 | 61 | 14 |
| Total | 625 | 570 | 41 | -55 |

7. Tenancy management

|  | Tenancy management indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 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 | 7 | 2 | - | - |
| 7.2 | Tenancy fraud cases investigated and closed | No target | 29 | 29 | - | - |
| 7.3 | New tenancy fraud cases | No target | 47 | 49 | - | - |
| 7.4 | Total open tenancy fraud cases | No target | 101 | 121 | - | - |
| 7.5 | Closed Tenancy Sustainment Officer cases where the tenancy was sustained | 97% | 100% (23 of 23) | 97% (34 of 35) |  |  |
| 7.6 | Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years | 90% | 80% (8,214 of 10,268) | 86% (8,782 of 10,259) |  |  |

Tenancy management commentary

One indicator is on target (green), one is near target (amber) and four are monitored without targets.

The indicator near target is:

Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years

The Neighbourhoods Team have been successfully clearing a backlog of overdue tenancy visits, which are carried out every five years for general needs households with secure (non-introductory) tenancies. Of the 10,259 households who require such a visit, 86% (8,732) have had one within the past five years, meaning that performance does not yet meet the 90% target set for the year. However, performance has continually improved on a monthly basis – from 82% in April, to 83% in May, to 86% in June – and is progressing towards reaching this target.

8. Seniors Housing

|  | Seniors Housing indicators | Target 2016/17 | Previous quarter Q4 2015/16 | Current quarter Q1 2016/17 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8.1 | Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months | 98% | 88% (764 of 870) | 91% (788 of 864) |  |  |
| 8.2 | Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities | 95% | 97% (818 of 843) | 97% (838 of 864) |  |  |
| 8.3 | Residents living in schemes offering regular exercise classes | 65% | 68% (570 of 843) | 66% (571 of 864) |  |  |
| 8.4 | Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations | 90% | 87% (20 of 23) | 91% 21 23 |  |  |

Seniors Housing commentary

Three indicators are on target and one is below target.

The indicator below target is:

Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months

Although performance has improved since the previous quarter, from 88% to 91%, it has not yet reached the target of 98%. The ability to carry out home visits has been hampered due to local issues in some schemes (such as tenancy management casework taking precedence over home visits) but performance has improved each month since this indicator was introduced at the end of March 2016.

