

HOUSING MANAGEMENT CONSULTATIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 7

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 4 and end of year 2012/13		
Date of Meeting:	28 May 2013		
Report of:	Executive Director – Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Ododo Dafé	Tel: 293201
	Email:	ododo.dafe@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 4 of the financial year 2012/2013 and, as requested, year end performance. It also includes benchmarking figures for the 2011/12 financial year, which are attached as Appendix 2. It incorporates changes suggested at previous meetings, including specifying whether an indicator is a Service Pledge as 'Yes' or 'No' rather than abbreviating, and the inclusion of figures from the same quarter last year.







2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee notes and comments on the report.

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 reporting period. Where indicators are red or amber explanations have been provided.
- 3.2 The 'Service Pledge' column describes which indicators reflect performance against the housing service pledges, which were developed through working with tenants and leaseholders. Our service pledge summary leaflet was included as an appendix to the Quarter 2 performance report, which was presented to HMCSC on 26 March 2013.
- 3.3 The year end figures for the 2012/13 financial year, along with respective 'RAG' ratings and trend arrows (comparing to the previous financial year) are provided as additional columns at the end of each table, where applicable. Figures from Quarter 4 2011/12 are included immediately before those for Quarter 4 2012/13 to allow for comparison between them.

3.4 Key to symbols used in the report:

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	

4.0 Rent collection and current arrears

*Separate figures are not provided for Quarter 4 because these indicators are reported on a year to date basis, and therefore performance is the same at the year end.

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Target	Actual (Year End 11/12)*	Actual (Year End 12/13)*	Status (Year End 12/13)*	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)*
Rent collected as proportion of rent due each year	Yes	98.75% (£47,472,364)	98.75% (£44,865,132)	98.66% (£47,559,925)		
Tenants with more than seven weeks rent arrears	Yes	2.85%	2.85% (323)	2.63% (310)		
Notice of Seeking Possession (NoSP) served for rent arrears	Yes	27.02% (706)	27.02% (706 NoSPs)	25.87% (722 NoSPs)		
Households evicted because of rent arrears	Yes	Less than 0.29% (less than 35)	0.13% (16)	0.08% (10)		
Rent loss due to empty properties	No	1.6% (£718,717)	1.76% (£788,830)	0.76% (£357,781)		
Total former tenant arrears	No	£511,522	£545,064	£531,636		
Former tenant arrears collected	No	18% (£98,116)	25.26% (£137,702)	18.10% (£96,216)		
Rechargeable debt collected	Yes	20% (£66,758)	17.93% (£40,099)	10.80% (£24,561)		
Percentage collection rate of leaseholders' gross arrears	No	89%	88% (£203,979)	83% (£403,151)		
Percentage collection rate of leaseholders' recoverable arrears	No	92%	91% (£142,404)	92% (£189,923)		

4.0.1 Percentage of rent collected as proportion of rent due each year

The year end collection rate fell by 0.09% compared to last year. This was largely due to the state of the economy, with increased pressure placed on household incomes. We are taking a proactive approach to supporting our tenants with paying their rent in the light of the introduction of Welfare Reforms from April 2013 onwards. Examples of this include referring tenants to our Financial Inclusion Officers for support and we now have a contract with the Money Advice and Community Support Service (MACS) who work with households facing financial difficulties to manage their money successfully.

4.0.2 **Total former tenant arrears**

Although performance has improved since last year, the target was narrowly missed because there was more new debt than had been estimated. This is a fairly good result considering the reduction in the number of staff working on former tenant debt compared to last year, and the collection rate target of 18% was achieved. We attempt to trace (eg through searching tax and benefits records) all former tenants with debt at least every 6 months and continue to do so indefinitely, unless a specified reason arises to write off this debt. The most common reason for writing off former tenant debt is where the tenant has died and there is no estate. The decision to write off is not taken lightly, as all write-offs have to be approved by the Housing Income Manager and Finance. Debt can be written back on at any point, depending on the reason it was originally written off.

4.0.3 **Percentage of rechargeable debt collected**

The collection rate of rechargeable debt has fallen because of a combination of reduced numbers of staff working on recharges combined with a larger amount of overall rechargeable debt compared to last year. We continue to vigorously pursue these arrears.

4.0.4 **Percentage collection rate of leaseholders' gross arrears**









The gross collection rate has been negatively influenced by a significant increase in major works billing for leaseholders in 2012/13, which increased by 300%. Wherever major works charges are included in arrears figures, the level of billing is a key factor in the ease or otherwise of recovery. Whilst the gross collection rate is lower than last year, the recoverable arrears collection rate – which takes into account charges that are being disputed, cases where we have instructed our solicitors to take action, charging orders that have been placed and agreed payment arrangements – is actually higher than last year. We offer a range of payment options to help leaseholders meet their major works bills.

4.0.5 **Percentage of rent collected as proportion of rent due each year by area**

Area	Target	Actual
North (includes Sheltered housing)	98.95%	99.12% (£13,550,150)
West	98.74%	98.69% (£9,604,919)
Central	98.85%	98.87% (£8,952,438)
East	98.51%	98.13% (£15,449,313)
All areas	98.75%	98.66% (£47,559,925*)

*Includes collection from small number of HRA properties used as Temporary Accommodation.

4.1 Empty home turnaround time

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Target	Actual (Q4 11/12)	Actual (Q4 12/13)	Status (Q4 12/13)	Trend (Q3 to Q4 12/13)	Actual (Year End 12/13)	Status (Year End 12/13)	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)
Average re-let time in calendar days (BV212)	No	21	17	18			15		
Average re-let time in calendar days – all properties (including those excluded from BV212)	No	32	36	36			32		

4.1.1 Average re-let time in calendar days – all properties

The average re-let time of 36 days was longer than usual due to a number of long-term empty properties – such as those which have undergone major works – being brought back into use. Year end performance has improved significantly, at 32 days for 2012/13 compared to 45 days for 2011/12.

4.1.2 A table presenting a recent snapshot of long term empty properties is attached as Appendix 1.

4.2 Property & Investment

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Target	Actual (Q4 11/12)	Actual (Q4 12/13)	Status (Q4 12/13)	Trend (Q3 to Q4 12/13)	Actual (Year End 12/13)	Status (Year End 12/13)	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)
Emergency repairs completed in time	Yes	99%	99.55% (1,545)	99.33% (2,369)			99.57% (8,281)		
Urgent repairs completed in time	Yes	98%	98.98% (877)	99.53% (210)			99.36% (618)		
Routine repairs completed in time	Yes	98%	99.69% (8,591)	99.73% (8,648)			99.78% (33,799)		
Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)	Yes	15 days	8 days	9 days			9 days		
Percentage of appointments kept by contractor	No	95%	90.98% (7,196)	95.46% (7,379)			94.56% (27,434)		
Tenant satisfaction with repairs (respondents from period who were satisfied or very satisfied)	No	95%	98.11% (2,017)	97.40% (2,213)			97.03% (7,493)		
Percentage of responsive repairs passing post-inspection	Yes	95%	95.43% (1,339)	96.65% (1,240)			95.44% (4,728)		
Percentage of repairs completed right first time	Yes	97%	98.17%	98.63% (12,622)			98.09% (45,717)		
Cancelled repair jobs	No	Under 10%	14% (1,553)	5.21% (633)			11.04% (4,875)		-
Percentage of homes that are decent	No	95%	88.1%	95.30%			95.30%		
Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009)	No	61	-	62.5			62.5		
Percentage of planned works passing post-inspection	Yes	97%	98.03% (1,545)	100% (253)			99.14% (1,493)		
Stock with up-to-date gas certificates	Yes	100%	99.87% (10,676)	99.97% (10,387)			99.97% (10,387)		
Percentage of empty properties passing post-inspection	Yes	98%	97.95% (191)	100% (157)			98.99% (591)		

4.2.1 **Percentage of appointments kept by contractor**

Although year end performance around appointments slightly missed the target, we are pleased to report that this has improved considerably since last year - from 90.24% for 2011/12 to 94.56% for 2012/13. Furthermore, as of Quarter 4 we now meet our target of 95%. This reflects a concerted effort throughout the year to improve performance around appointments, including through completing a data quality audit in February. The recommendations followed will minimise IT related issues in order that this indicator focuses on reasons for lateness that reflect the service received by residents – eg delays due to traffic, parking and other jobs taking longer than expected.

4.2.2 **Cancelled repair jobs**

This indicator was introduced part-way through the 2011/12 financial year and – once time had been allowed to monitor trends to identify natural patterns (eg seasonal variations) – a target of 10% was agreed by the Partnership Core Group. Although the year end figure missed the target by 1.04%, performance has improved with each consecutive quarter in 2012/13 and has been on target since Quarter 3. Work has been undertaken throughout the year to reduce the admin related cancellations and to focus on those cancellations that have an impact on residents.

4.2.3 **Stock with up-to-date gas certificates**

The Gas Partnership has achieved its best ever result with just 3 overdue gas safety certificates at the end of Quarter 4 compared to 10 at the end of the previous quarter. This trend has continued and we have since reached 100% as of April 2013. Cases where the tenant repeatedly does not allow access to the property are vigorously pursued by housing staff, who take legal action – if necessary – to ensure access is gained for the safety check. During Quarter 4, 120 such cases were closed, taking an average of 28 calendar days between them.

4.3 Estates Service

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Target	Actual (Q4 11/12)	Actual (Q4 12/13)	Status (Q4 12/13)	Trend (Q3 to Q4 12/13)	Actual (Year End 12/13)	Status (Year End 12/13)	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)
Percentage passing quality inspections of our cleaning service	Yes	98%	99% (202)	98% (184)			98% (719)		
Percentage passing quality inspections of our minor repairs service	Yes	98%	100% (70)	99% (145)			99% (657)		
Completion of cleaning tasks	No	98%	97% (13,323)	97% (12,337)			98% (53,424)		
Emergency removal of bulk waste within 24 hours	No	100%	100% (11)	100% (3)			100% (17)		
Routine removal of bulk waste within 7 calendar days	No	97%	100% (806)	97% (829)			98% (3,270)		
Emergency removal of graffiti within 24 hours	No	100%	100% (2)	100% (2)			83% (5)		
Routine removal of graffiti within 7 calendar days	No	100%	92% (12)	90% (9)			95% (20)		
Replacement of lights within 1 working day	No	100%	100% (433)	100% (270)			99% (718)		-
Routine replacement of lights within 7 calendar days	No	97%	96% (622)	74% (200)			94% (1,410)		-
Neighbourhood Response Team jobs completed within target times	No	96%	97% (4,020)	96% (1,986)			97% (8,027)		-

4.3.1 Completion of cleaning tasks

Our target was missed in Quarter 4 because of the bad weather at the start of the year. These adverse circumstances meant that, for health and safety reasons, our cleaning staff prioritised gritting and shovelling snow ahead of non-urgent cleaning tasks.

4.3.2 Emergency removal of graffiti within 24 hours

Although 100% of emergency graffiti removals were completed in time in Quarter 4, year end performance missed the target due to one job being overdue during the first quarter. This job was overdue because the removal process had to be repeated to ensure it was done to the highest standard. Whilst the graffiti itself is usually removed within target in such cases, these jobs are not counted as complete until all work, such as repainting, has been carried out.

4.3.3 Routine removal of graffiti within 7 calendar days

The target was missed in Quarter 4 because one minor job to remove a graffiti tag was late by two days. This, in turn, is the reason why the year end target was missed, as no other routine jobs were late during the year.

4.3.4 Replacement of lights within 1 working day target

The year end target was missed by 1% because of five jobs missing the target during Quarter 3, when there were staff shortages over the Christmas period. All five jobs were completed within three days rather than one day. This was discussed at HMCSC in March, with members emphasising the importance of prioritising these jobs. We are pleased to report that 100% of emergency light replacements were completed on time in Quarter 4, in spite of adverse weather conditions early in the year.

4.3.5 Routine replacement of lights within 7 calendar days





















Performance was unusually low in this period as the team were undertaking a lighting programme across the city to change bathroom and kitchen lights for tenants who can't replace them due to the design of the sealed units. These jobs had to be done urgently, and were therefore prioritised ahead of routine light replacements in external areas. Quarter 4 performance is the key contributor to the year end performance missing the target by 3%, as performance was above target during the other three quarters.

4.4 Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

4.4.1 The data below is activity based, rather than performance based, hence no targets have been included. Its purpose is to present HMCSC with a picture of ASB work. We encourage residents to report anti-social behaviour in order for us to respond quickly and effectively to the issue.

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Actual (Q4 11/12)	Actual (Q4 12/13)	Trend (Q4 12/13)	Actual (Year End 12/13)	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)
Number of new ASB cases	Yes	9	57	-	165	-
Number of closed ASB cases	Yes	1	82	-	233	-
Number of enforcement and support actions taken by housing	Yes	760	446	-	2,311	-
Customer satisfaction with cases managed by the ASB Team (very or fairly satisfied)	Yes	79%	75% (6 surveys)	↓	82% (23 surveys)	-

4.5 Sheltered housing

Performance Indicator	Service Pledge	Target	Actual (Q4 11/12)	Actual (Q4 12/13)	Status (Q4 12/13)	Trend (Q3 to Q4 12/13)	Actual (Year End 12/13)	Status (Year End 12/13)	Trend (Year End 11/12 to 12/13)
People with an up to date support plan	Yes	100% (887)	97% (888)	95% (844)			95% (844)		
People who decline a support plan	No	0%	2% (19)	3% (25)			3% (25)		
New residents with a support plan completed within 21 calendar days	Yes	100% (20)	92% (34)	95% (19)			95% (76)		
Call each resident personally (if requested)	Yes	100%	100%	100%			100%		
Provision of at least one social activity per week (in 21 of our 23 schemes)	Yes	100%	100%	100%			100%		

4.5.1 People with an up to date support plan

Of our 887 sheltered residents, 844 have an up to date support plan. Of the 43 residents who do not, 25 have declined one and 18 were absent at the time of review (due to hospitalisation, respite care etc). As this is a snapshot figure, Quarter 4 performance is the same as year end performance.

4.5.2 People who decline a support plan

The numbers of sheltered residents who decline a support plan remain steady and represent a small core group who choose not to receive this part of the service. A resident may decline a support plan if they do not need any help to live independently, such as if they are in employment. Our staff nonetheless keep in contact with these residents.

4.5.3 New residents with a support plan completed within 21 days

Out of the 20 tenants who moved in during this period wanting a support plan, 19 had their plan completed in 21 days (the average being 12 days). One tenant missed this deadline due to staff sickness. Of the 80 new support plans due during the year 2012/13, 76 were completed within the target time of 21 days.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

- 5.1 The performance measures in this report demonstrate whether we are delivering quality service and achieving the priorities set by our residents.

6. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 6.1 Although there are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report, changes in most performance areas will have a financial implication. The area with the most significant financial impact is the ability to collect rents from tenants. Given the current economic climate and the on-going welfare reform changes, these indicators are being very closely monitored to ensure that any changes in current trends are highlighted early. Any financial implications arising from changes to any of the performance indicators will be included in the Housing Revenue Account Targeted Budget Management (TBM) report, which is reported quarterly to Policy and Resources Committee.

Finance Officer Consulted: Monica Brooks

Date: 14/05/2013

Legal Implications:

- 6.2 There are no significant legal or Human Rights Act implications arising directly from this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 15/05/13

Equalities Implications:

- 6.3 Where appropriate, equalities implications are included within the body of the report.

Sustainability Implications:

- 6.4 Where appropriate, sustainability implications are included within the body of the report.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 6.5 There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Public Health Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 6.8 There are no direct corporate or city wide implications arising from this report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix 1. Long term empty properties
2. Appendix 2. Housing Management Benchmarking Report 2011/12

Documents in Members' Rooms:

1. None

Background Documents:

1. None

