

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 4 and end of year 2016/17</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>14 June 2017</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director Neighbourhoods Communities &amp; Housing</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Ododo Dafé</b>	<b>Tel: 01273 293201</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>ododo.dafe@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 4 of the financial year 2016/17, alongside year end results. The report is attached as Appendix 1.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Housing & New Homes Committee notes and comments upon the report, which went to Area Panel on 25 May 2017.

**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 went to Area Panel on Thursday 25 May. As a result of Area Panel feedback during the year, performance indicators relating to Estate Inspections and Estate Development Budget (EBD) works will be included in future performance reports from Quarter 1 2017/18.

**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. The report shows that during the year 2016/17, the collection rate has increased by 0.19% when compared year on year with 2015/16. 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: 19/05/17*

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no significant legal implications arising from this report for noting.

*Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley*

*Date: 17/05/17*

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 4 and end of year 2016/17.





## Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 4 and end of year 2016/17

This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 4 of the financial year 2016/17 alongside year end results. 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

A total of 47 performance indicators are measured against a quarterly target. Of these, 33 are on target (G), seven are near target (A) and seven are below target (R). There are 53 annually measured indicators, of which 37 are on target, 12 are near target and four are below target. Explanations of performance have been provided for indicators which are near or below target.





























The following symbols are also used to indicate Brighton & Hove City Council's benchmarking position when compared against other local authority landlords:

Benchmarking position	
	Performance is within first quartile (top 25%)
	Performance is within second quartile (next 25% to 50%)
	Performance is within third quartile (next 50% to 75%)
	Performance is within fourth quartile (bottom 25%)

The benchmarking figures are sourced from Housemark and cover the 2015/16 financial year. They compare Brighton & Hove City Council against other Housemark members who are also single tier local authorities with a stock size of 10,000 dwellings or more. These are Dudley, Hull, Croydon, Ealing, Hackney, Southwark, North Tyneside, Rotherham and Southampton.


The icons used throughout the report are sourced from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com) and were designed by 'Freepik.'

## 1. Rent collection and current arrears


 Rent collection and current arrears indicators	Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year	Benchmarking position 2015/16
1.1 Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year	98.50%	98.80% (£50.5m of £51.1m)	98.96% (£50.6m of £51.1m)			98.77% (£51.4m of £52.1m)	98.96% (£50.6m of £51.1m)			
1.2 Total current tenant arrears	£780k	£615k	£533k			£640k	£533k			
1.3 Tenants served a Notice of Seeking Possession	No target	139	193	-	-	680	692	-	-	-
1.4 Tenants evicted because of rent arrears	Under 20 per year	3	0	-	-	6	6			
1.5 Rent loss due to empty dwellings	Under 1%	0.95% (£485k of £50.9m)	0.93% (£474k of £50.9m)			0.90% (£465k of £51.7m)	0.93% (£474k of £50.9m)			
1.6 Former tenant arrears collected during the year	25%	24.08% (£141k of £586k)	36.09% (£195k of £541k)	-	-	29.24% (£179k of £612k)	36.09% (£195k of £541k)			
1.7 Rechargeable debt collected during the year	20%	13.50% (£19k of £140k)	22.03% (£28k of £128k)	-	-	11.32% (£21.0k of £185k)	22.03% (£28k of £128k)			-
1.8 Collection rate of gross leaseholder arrears during the year	71%	Annual result due Q4	71% (£3.65m of £5.12m)	-	-	69% (£3.2m of £4.57m)	71% (£3.65m of £5.12m)			-
1.9 Collection rate of recoverable leaseholder arrears during the year	96%	Annual result due Q4	96% (£4.99m of £5.12m)	-	-	93% (£4.27m of £4.57m)	96% (£4.99m of £5.12m)			-

<b>DWP Welfare reform information</b>		<b>Q3 2016/17</b>	<b>Q4 2016/17</b>	<b>Year end 2015/16</b>	<b>Year end 2016/17</b>
1.10	Universal Credit – affected tenants	57	71	23	71
1.11	Universal Credit – arrears of affected tenants	£19k	£24k	£11k	£24k
1.12	Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – affected tenants (under occupiers)	680	664	711	664
1.13	Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – arrears of affected tenants (under occupiers)	£71k	£48k	£63k	£48k
1.14	Benefit Cap – affected tenants	7	48	8	48
1.15	Benefit Cap – arrears of affected tenants	£2.4k	£6.1k	£2.4k	£6.1k




































### 1.16 Area breakdown of rent collected

 Rent collection area	Previous quarter Q3 2016/17	Current quarter Q4 2016/17	Trend since last quarter
North (includes Seniors housing)	99.10% (£14.38m of £14.51m)	99.16% (£14.38m of £14.50m)	↑
West	99.07% (£10.34m of £10.44m)	99.11% (£10.36m of £10.45m)	↑
Central	98.83% (£9.10m of £9.21m)	98.90% (£9.11m of £9.21m)	↑
East	98.35% (£16.68m of £16.96m)	98.72% (£16.73m of £16.96m)	↑
All areas	98.80% (£50.51m of £51.13m)	98.96% (£50.60m of £51.14m)	↑

### 1.17 Tenants in arrears by amount

 Amount of arrears	Previous quarter Q3 2016/17	Current quarter Q4 2016/17	Trend since last quarter
No arrears	80% (9,076)	79% (8,968)	↓
Any arrears	20% (2,306)	21% (2,408)	↓
... £0.01 to £99.99	9% (992)	10% (1,188)	↓
... £100 to £499.99	9% (994)	8% (960)	↑
... £500 and above	3% (320)	2% (260)	↑
Total tenants	11,382	11,376	-

## 2. Customer services and complaints

 <b>Customer services and complaints indicators</b>		Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year	Benchmarking position 2015/16
2.1	Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST)	92%	89% (6,562 of 7,378)	92% (8,291 of 9,060)			92% (31,531 of 34,136)	90% (31,240 of 34,578)			
2.2	Customer satisfaction with HCST (very or fairly satisfied)	91%	53% (Sept. 2016)	85% (226 of 265)			86% (243 of 284)	85% (226 of 265)			-
2.3	Ease of effort to contact HCST (very or fairly easy to contact)	92%	85% (Sept. 2016)	87% (228 of 262)			92% (260 of 282)	87% (228 of 262)			-
2.4	Stage one complaints responded to within 10 working days	80%	58% (21 of 36)	88% (23 of 26)			66% (76 of 116)	71% (92 of 129)			-
2.5	Stage one complaints upheld	33% or under	25% (9 of 36)	12% (3 of 26)			22% (25 of 116)	18% (23 of 129)			
2.6	Stage one complaints escalated to stage two	10%	17% (6 of 36)	19% (5 of 26)			17% (20 of 116)	13% (17 of 129)			-
2.7	Stage two complaints upheld	15% or under	0% (0 of 6)	40% (2 of 5)			15% (3 of 20)	12% (2 of 17)			-
2.8	Housing Ombudsman Complaints upheld	20% or under	0% (none)	0% (none)			0% (0 of 8)	0% (0 of 1)			-

## **Customer services and complaints commentary**

The indicators below or near target are:

### **Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST) – target 92%**

Performance here was slightly below the target and had slipped during Quarter 3, having been on target during the first two quarters. This was because the team had fewer call handlers than usual due to staff vacancies which have since been filled, and took on additional work to deal with more enquiries at first contact (rather than referring them to other teams).

### **Customer satisfaction with HCST (very or fairly satisfied) – target 91%**

A customer survey was carried out in March 2017 which indicates that end year performance was 85%. This is a significant improvement upon the previous survey in September 2016. Reasons for dissatisfaction centred around queries not being resolved from the customers perspective and/or not enough information being given. To improve performance, the full breakdown of results and comments will be taken to the next Housing Customer Services Team meeting so they can be discussed in detail and acted upon.

### **Ease of effort to contact HCST (very or fairly easy to contact) – target 92%**

End year performance was 87%, which is an improvement on the 85% result for September 2016. This result is sourced from the same customer survey outlined above and will be acted upon in the same way.

### **Stage one complaints responded to within 10 working days – target 80%**

Performance during 2016/17 stood at 71% and is a key area for improvement. A total of 129 complaints were responded to, of

which 92 were done within target. The dip in performance is related to the service redesign in October 2016, with most of the overdue complaints relating to teams that were reorganised. Performance subsequently improved to reach 88% for Quarter 4.

### **Stage one complaints escalated to stage two – target 10%**






















Although performance has improved from the previous year, during 2016/17 13% of stage one complaints (17 of 129) were escalated to stage two. This means that the complainant was not satisfied with the response at stage one and that the complaint was investigated by the corporate Customer Feedback Team. Five of 17 stage two complaints related to teams that were reorganised as part of the service redesign in October 2016, which may have affected performance around responding to stage one complaints during the handover of work between the old and new teams.

### **Stage two complaints upheld – target 15%**

The target was missed during Quarter 4 but met for 2016/17. Two such complaints were upheld, which account for 40% of the total during Quarter 4 (2 of 5) and 12% during the year (2 of 17).



### 3. Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

 <b>Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchange indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Q3 2016/17</b>	<b>Q4 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>	<b>Year end 2015/16</b>	<b>Year end 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last year</b>	<b>Benchmarking position 2015/16</b>
3.1	Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days)	18	20 (122 lets)	25 (148 lets)			20 (549 lets)	19 (538 lets)			
3.2	... as above for general needs properties	17	18 (91 lets)	18 (110 lets)			16 (438 lets)	16 (404 lets)			
3.3	... as above for Seniors Housing properties	30	26 (31 lets)	44 (38 lets)			35 (111 lets)	29 (134 lets)			
3.4	Average re-let time, including time spent in major works (calendar days)	No target	43 (122 lets, 63 major)	56 (148 lets, 92 major)	-	-	42 (549 lets, 320 major)	51 (538 lets, 320 major)	-	-	
3.5	Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within 42 calendar days (statutory timescale)	100%	100% (47 of 47)	100% (28 of 28)			100% (147 of 147)	100% (186 of 186)			-

## **Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges commentary**

The indicators below or near target are:

### **Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works – target 18 calendar days**

The 2016/17 result missed the target by one day due to a higher than usual re-let time during Quarter 4 2016/17 (25 days), particularly for Seniors housing properties (44 days). The target time had been met during Quarters 1 and 2.

There have been several challenges affecting lettings of council homes during the year, including the decommissioning of Stonehurst Court (a former Seniors housing scheme), changes to allocations policy and processes, and staff shortages in the Re-Housing team during the latter half of the year.

60% of homes (323 of 538) were let on the first offer, which is an improvement upon the previous year's result of 54%. Of the refused offers, 50% related to the property itself (size and accessibility in particular), 19% related to the area, 17% were due to the applicant not responding to contact or attending the sign up, 11% were due to the personal circumstances of the applicant and 3% were for other reasons.

### **Average re-let time for general needs properties, excluding time spent in major works – target 17 calendar days**

The target time was missed by one day during Quarters 3 and 4 but this was offset by good performance during the first half of the year, meaning the overall target was met for 2016/17.






































## **Average re-let time for Seniors housing properties, excluding time spent in major works – target 30 calendar days**




































The 2016/17 result was 29 days and met the target time for re-letting Seniors housing properties. Performance missed the target during Quarter 4 (44 days) because many properties were 'hard to let' (23 out of 38 took longer than six weeks) but was good during the rest of the year.















### 3.6. Long term empty dwellings by ward (empty six weeks or more as of 31 March 2017)

Ward name (excludes those with no long term empty properties)	No. dwellings	Average days empty for	Range of days empty for	Comment
East Brighton	1	55	55-55	One flat ready to let.
Hangleton and Knoll	5	161	48-531	One flat ready to let and four houses for extension/refurbishment (all four are waiting for works to start).
Hanover and Elm Grove	12	307	153-629	One house ready to let, one house in major works, one flat in major works and nine studio flats within Stonehurst Court (a decommissioned Seniors housing scheme).
Moulsecomb and Bevendean	4	412	69-552	One house ready to let, one Seniors studio flat ready to let and two houses for extension/refurbishment (one waiting for work to start and one on site).
North Portslade	3	115	104-139	Three Seniors studio flats – two ready to let and one to be converted.
Patcham	3	155	55-356	Two flats ready to let (one of which Seniors) and another Seniors flat due to be converted.
Preston Park	2	58	48-69	One flat ready to let and one flat undergoing major repairs.
Queens Park	2	55	55-55	One flat ready to let and one Seniors studio flat ready to let.
South Portslade	3	391	90-552	Two houses ready to let (longest empty 552 days) and one house for extension/refurbishment (waiting for work to start).
Wish	1	489	489	One house for extension/refurbishment (waiting for work to start).
Total	36	247	48-629	Of the 36 properties empty on 31 March 2017, 14 were ready to let (38%).

#### 4. Repairs and maintenance

	Repairs and maintenance indicators	Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year	Benchmarking position 2015/16
4.1	Emergency repairs completed in time	99%	99.8% (3,274 of 3,282)	99.7% (2,765 of 2,774)			99.96% (11,169 of 11,173)	99.7% (12,128 of 12,160)			-
4.2	Routine repairs completed in time	99%	99.6% (4,381 of 4,399)	99.5% (7,012 of 7,048)			99.9% (22,707 of 22,722)	99.6% (20,323 of 20,411)			-
4.3	Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)	14 days	21 days	21 days			12 days	20 days			
4.4	Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made	97%	96.0% (10,662 of 11,111)	97.1% (9,995 of 10,298)			97.1% (33,018 of 34,019)	96.6% (41,924 of 43,382)			
4.5	Tenant satisfaction with repairs ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')	96%	96.0% (1,735 of 1,807)	96.6% (2,568 of 2,659)			97.3% (6,578 of 6,764)	96.3% (5,690 of 5,910)			
4.6	Responsive repairs passing post-inspection	97%	95.2% (858 of 901)	92.4% (827 of 895)			93.3% (4,457 of 4,778)	95.4% (3,939 of 4,219)			-
4.7	Repairs completed at first visit	92%	89.6% (6,883 of 7,681)	83.1% (8,164 of 9,822)			92.3% (31,290 of 33,895)	87.7% (28,581 of 32,571)			
4.8	Cancelled repair jobs	Under 5%	6.9% (690 of 10,078)	6.7% (693 of 10,313)			5.6% (2,190 of 38,896)	6.9% (2,753 of 40,026)			-

 Repairs and maintenance indicators		Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year	Benchmarking position 2015/16
4.9	Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard	100%	100% (11,504 of 11,504)	100% (11,488 of 11,488)			100% (11,551 of 11,551)	100% (11,488 of 11,488)			
4.10	Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009)	65.6	65.8	66.0			65.2	66.0			-
4.11	Planned works passing post-inspection	97%	100% (274 of 274)	100% (405 of 405)			100% (1,600 of 1,600)	100% (1,328 of 1,328)			-
4.12	Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates	100%	100% (10,045 of 10,045)	100% (10,036 of 10,036)			99.96% (10,124 of 10,128)	100% (10,036 of 10,036)			
4.13	Empty properties passing post-inspection	98%	98.3% (112 of 114)	99.2% (131 of 132)			98.8% (601 of 608)	99.4% (515 of 518)			-
4.14	Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond	2 hours	1h 40m	2h 53m			1h 42m	2h 18m			-
4.15	Lifts restored to service within 24 hours	95%	94.3% (100 of 106)	98.0% (149 of 152)			97.6% (572 of 586)	96.3% (489 of 508)			-
4.16	Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours	7 days	4 days (25 days, 6 lifts)	1 day 8 hours (4 days, 3 lifts)			8 days (106 days, 14 lifts)	4 days (68 days, 19 lifts)			-

 <b>Repairs and maintenance indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Q3 2016/17</b>	<b>Q4 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>	<b>Year end 2015/16</b>	<b>Year end 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last year</b>	<b>Benchmarking position 2015/16</b>
4.17	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered	90%	97% (21,578 of 22,198)	98% (22,519 of 23,091)			97.7% (81,524 of 83,436)	96.0% (85,077 of 88,654)			
4.18	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds	75%	82% (17,727 of 21,578)	82% (18,439 of 22,519)			85.3% (69,525 of 81,524)	74.1% (63,054 of 85,077)			-
4.19	Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time	5 mins	7m 6s	5m 42s			6m 6s	13m 40s			-

## Repairs and maintenance commentary

The indicators below or near target are:

### **Average time to complete routine repairs – target 14 calendar days**

During 2016/17, average performance was 20 days and the Quarter 4 result was 21 days. This is because Mears have taken on an increasing volume of complex repairs that typically take longer than 14 days, such as those which require leaseholder consultation, independent structural surveys, cooperation of utility suppliers and party wall agreements. A new repair category was introduced in April 2017 for these repairs which sits alongside an improved communications process for residents.

### **Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made – target 97%**

End of year performance was only slightly below target at 96.6%. However, Quarter 4 performance improved and was above target at 97.1%.

### **Responsive repairs passing post-inspection – target 97%**

End of year performance was 95.4% and performance for Quarter 4 was 92.4%. Common reasons for jobs that fail post-inspection include quality failures, extra works being required to complete the job, corrections to Schedule Of Rates codes used and health & safety concerns. Housing and Mears are carrying out joint inspections of responsive repairs and the aim of these is to increase understanding of the exact quality of work that is expected, in order to improve performance.

### **Repairs completed at first visit – target 92%**

End of year performance was 87.7% and 83.1% for Quarter 4. Mears are continuing to deliver external and complex work via responsive repairs which due to the nature of the work cannot be

completed in a single visit. As outlined above these repairs will be managed through a different process from April 2017.

### **Cancelled repair jobs – target under 5%**

The proportion of cancellations was 6.9% during 2016/17, and 6.7% during Quarter 4. Mears have committed to reducing the number of jobs that are cancelled due to 'incorrect instructions' or 'duplicate jobs', which account for around two fifths of cancelled jobs. Although these types cancellations are avoidable, they generally relate to how jobs are administered using the repairs ICT system and do not directly affect the customers' experience.

### **Lifts – average time taken to respond – target 2 hours**

End of year performance missed the target by 18 minutes. During Quarter 4 there were three breakdowns where somebody was inside the lift at the time, and these were responded to within an hour.

### **Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds – target within 75%**

End of year performance was 74%. However, it has been comfortably above target at 82% during both Quarters 3 and 4.

### **Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time – target 5 minutes**

The longest time that any caller has waited for their call to be answered was 13 minutes and 40 seconds during 2016/17. This occurred during Quarter 2, on a day when there were only three call handlers, two of whom were new starters, compared to the usual minimum of five. Performance has since improved and the Quarter 4 result is only 42 seconds outside of the target.

### **Asbestos**

Housing and Mears carry out annual inspections of all communal areas that have been identified as containing asbestos based materials. During 2016/17, 583 inspections were carried out.

These properties will continue to be inspected on an annual basis, remaining on the inspection schedule until a time when the asbestos based materials are removed (eg due to the need for works or if repairs are required that result in removal).


























The council has completed a planned review of the Housing Asbestos Management Strategy. The strategy clearly defines the requirements, roles, responsibilities and processes that housing and service providers are required to follow to ensure compliance when managing asbestos within our housing stock. This is delivered in line with the council's Management of Asbestos Standard.

### **Legionella**

Communal hot and cold water systems are subject to a detailed inspection programme across the council's housing stock based upon the Health & Safety Executive's Approved Code of Practice HSG 274 L8.









## 5. Estates Service

 Estates Service indicators	Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year
5.1 Cleaning quality inspection pass rate	99%	100% (116 of 116)	99% (210 of 213)			100% (728 of 731)	99% (696 of 699)		
5.2 Estates Response Team quality inspection pass rate	99%	99% (120 of 121)	100% (158 of 158)			100% (574 of 574)	100% (651 of 652)		
5.3 Cleaning tasks completed	99%	99.8% (13,346 of 13,373)	99.2% (13,410 of 13,518)			97.9% (53,026 of 54,142)	99.3% (53,395 of 53,757)		
5.4 Bulk waste removed within 7 working days	93%	98% (712 of 724)	98% (665 of 681)			97% (2,940 of 3,018)	97% (2,924 of 3,008)		
5.5 Light replacements/repairs completed within 3 working days	99%	99% (324 of 327)	99% (283 of 286)			99% (1,319 of 1,338)	99% (945 of 953)		
5.6 Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days	96%	97% (1,431 of 1,479)	98% (1,622 of 1,658)			97% (5,693 of 5,877)	98% (5,306 of 5,440)		


NB There is no Housemark benchmarking data available for these indicators.

## 6. Anti-social behaviour (ASB)


 Anti-social behaviour (ASB) indicators	Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year	Benchmarking position 2015/16
6.1 Victim satisfaction with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with*	88%	90% (19 of 21)	90% (19 of 21)			90% (47 of 52)	90% (19 of 21)			
6.2 Tenants evicted due to ASB	No target	1	2	-	-	2	4	-	-	-
6.3 ASB cases closed without the need for legal action	No target	85% (28 of 33)	88% (60 of 68)	-	-	86% (244 of 284)	85% (178 of 209)	-	-	-

\*Year to date indicator measuring survey respondents who were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with. These surveys are carried out over the phone by Housing staff who were not involved in the case.












## 6.4 ASB incidents by type

 Type of ASB incident	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Change between Q3 and Q4	Year end 2016/17
Harassment / threats	34% 73	41% 91	+18	41% 319
Noise	17% 37	17% 38	+1	14% 110
Drugs	8% 18	8% 17	-1	9% 66
Other criminal behaviour	6% 14	11% 24	+10	8% 59
Domestic violence / abuse	6% 14	8% 18	+4	6% 48
Other violence	6% 13	6% 13	0	6% 47
Pets / animals	7% 16	5% 11	-5	5% 38
Vandalism	7% 16	1% 2	-14	5% 36
Hate-related	6% 12	2% 5	-7	5% 35
Alcohol related	0% 1	1% 3	+2	1% 9
Prostitution / sex	1% 2	0% 1	-1	1% 5
Total ASB incidents	100% 216	100% 223	+7	1 772

## 6.5 ASB incidents by ward

 Ward name	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Change between Q3 and Q4	Year end 2016/17
Brunswick and Adelaide	0	0	0	1
Central Hove	4	0	-4	6
East Brighton	36	33	-3	129
Goldsmid	10	14	+4	30
Hangleton and Knoll	17	23	+6	65
Hanover and Elm Grove	7	14	+7	36
Hollingdean and Stanmer	29	29	0	108
Hove Park	0	0	0	1
Moulsecoomb and Bevendean	19	23	+4	71
North Portslade	12	7	-5	36
Patcham	10	9	-1	26
Preston Park	3	1	-2	5
Queen's Park	35	49	+14	156
Regency	2	0	-2	2
Rottingdean Coastal	0	0	0	0
South Portslade	7	6	-1	22
St. Peter's and North Laine	7	10	+3	29
Westbourne	3	1	-2	10
Wish	5	3	-2	10
Withdean	1	0	-1	4
Woodingdean	9	1	-8	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>+7</b>	<b>772</b>

## 7. Tenancy management

 <b>Tenancy management indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Q3 2016/17</b>	<b>Q4 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>	<b>Year end 2015/16</b>	<b>Year end 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last year</b>
7.1	Properties taken back due to tenancy fraud	30 by year end	8	8	-	-	26	21		
7.2	Closed Tenancy Sustainment Officer cases where the tenancy was sustained	97%	97% (36 of 37)	100% (19 of 19)			98% (106 of 108)	98% (146 of 149)		
7.3	Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years	90%	91% (9,292 of 10,257)	90% (9,164 of 10,203)			80% (8,214 of 10,268)	90% (9,164 of 10,203)		


















NB There is no Housemark benchmarking data available for these indicators

The indicator near target is:

### Properties taken back due to tenancy fraud – target 30

Year end performance was 21 properties taken back. A tenancy amnesty was undertaken from 1st December 2016 until 31st January 2017 which led to the recovery of six properties and a further campaign will be considered in 2017/18. The team also commenced pro-active Right-to-Buy checks to help prevent fraudulent applications.

## 8. Seniors Housing

 Seniors Housing indicators	Target 2016/17	Q3 2016/17	Q4 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2015/16	Year end 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last year
8.1 Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months	98%	97% (822 of 851)	97% (826 of 854)			88% (758 of 861)	97% (826 of 854)		
8.2 Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities	95%	99.8% (849 of 851)	100% (854 of 854)			97% (837 of 861)	98% (837 of 854)		
8.3 Residents living in schemes offering regular exercise and/or wellbeing activities	65%	79% (669 of 851)	82% (700 of 854)			66% (565 of 861)	77% (658 of 854)		
8.4 Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations	90%	96% (22 of 23)	95% (21 of 22)			87% (20 of 23)	91% (21 of 23)		

NB There is no Housemark benchmarking data available for these indicators.

The indicator near target is:

**Seniors Housing residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months – target 98%**

Year end performance was 97% and has increased from 88% at the start of 2016/17.