

## **Appendix 2. Housing Management Benchmarking Report 2011/12**

### **1.0 Summary**

This benchmarking report presents how our year end performance for the financial year 2011/12 compares to that of other housing providers. It covers the performance indicators that feature in the performance report for which comparable data are available.

### **1.1 Benchmarking Group**

This report uses the Housemark benchmarking service, which is subscribed to by over 500 social landlords, including 75% of stock retaining councils. The data is collected using a standard methodology and is independently validated, in order to ensure that the information provided is reliable and transparent.

Benchmarking is primarily used as a tool for internal performance management and self assessment, and can be used to understand current levels of performance in comparison to other organisations. This in turn helps us to understand where we need to improve and how we can learn from other organisations about how to improve the quality of the service. In order to ensure that Brighton and Hove are compared to a similar group of providers, analysis was undertaken to find housing providers who use the Housemark benchmarking service and who have two or more of the following attributes:

- Similar stock size
- Similar Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Part of the CIPFA Nearest Neighbour group
- Similar percentage of flats to houses
- Similar percentage of High rise and medium rise flats

As a result of this analysis, 11 Housing providers that use Housemark have been chosen to benchmark against. These are:

1. Bristol City Council
2. Derby Homes (ALMO)
3. Enfield Homes (ALMO)
4. Hounslow Homes (ALMO)
5. London Borough of Croydon
6. London Borough of Wandsworth
7. North Tyneside Council
8. Norwich City Council
9. Plymouth Community Homes
10. Southampton City Council
11. Thurrock Borough Council






Although Enfield, Derby and Hounslow are all ALMOS and Plymouth is a new Housing Association (LSVT) they have many similar attributes to Brighton and Hove so will be included in future benchmarking exercises.

## 1.2 Source of Benchmarking Data




Several Performance Indicators presented in the quarterly Housing Management Performance Report are the same as those used by Housemark, which allows us to compare our performance to other organisations. These indicators relate to rent collection and current arrears, empty home turnaround time and Property & Investment. Unfortunately, it is not currently possible to provide benchmarking data for our ASB, Estates Service and Sheltered performance indicators, because they were developed internally and are not measured by Housemark.

## 1.3 Presentation of Benchmarking Data

Our performance compared to other organisations is presented in terms of both rank (out of how many members provided data) and quartile. Quartiles divide a range of data – in this case performance for each benchmarking group member against a given indicator – into four equal parts. These parts are expressed as the Lower Quartile (within which lies the bottom performing 25% of members), the Middle Lower Quartile (members below the median but above the bottom 25%), the Upper Middle Quartile (data above the median but below the top 25%) and the Upper Quartile (the top performing 25% of members). In some cases, performance may reflect the exact median value and is therefore expressed as such. The key to the symbols used is as follows:


Quartile	
Performance is in the Upper Quartile	
Performance is in the Upper Middle Quartile	
Performance is equivalent to the median	
Performance is in the Middle Lower Quartile	
Performance is in the Lower Quartile	

## 2.0 Rent collection and current arrears

Performance Indicator	Our Performance 2010/11	Our Performance 2011/12	2011/12 Rank	2011/12 Quartile
Rent collected as proportion of rent due each year	98.70%	98.75%	1 of 12	
Households evicted because of rent arrears	0.22%	0.13%	2 of 11	
Former tenant arrears collected	No data	18.1%	1 of 6	









2.0.1 We are pleased to report that we rank in first place within our benchmarking group for both the percentage of rent collected (98.75%, against a median average of 97.2%) and the percentage of former tenant arrears collected. The percentage of our households evicted because of rent arrears (0.13%) is significantly lower than the group median (0.22%) and second only to Norwich City Council (0.11%). The purpose of this indicator is to ensure that eviction action for rent arrears is used as a last resort, when all other options have failed, and therefore a lower percentage represents a better performance.

## 2.1 Empty home turnaround time

Performance Indicator	Our Performance 2010/11	Our Performance 2011/12	2011/12 Rank	2011/12 Quartile
Average re-let time in calendar days (BV212)	18	17	1 of 12	

2.1.1 Our average re-let time of 17 calendar days not only places us as the top performer within our Benchmarking group, we are also significantly above the median average for the group of 28.52 days. The further improvement we have seen in 2012/13 makes it likely that we shall retain this position next time round. The indicator used (BV212, which was set up by central government several years ago) excludes properties whilst they are undergoing major works, as well as mutual exchanges and properties that the council intends to sell or demolish. It will be possible to also provide the re-let time without any exclusions for the 2012/13 benchmarking.

## 2.2 Property & Investment

Performance Indicator	Our Performance 2010/11	Our Performance 2011/12	2011/12 Rank	2011/12 Quartile
Emergency repairs completed in time	98.4%	99.1%	2 of 12	
Urgent repairs completed in time	96.0%	96.7%	3 of 12	
Routine repairs completed in time	98.4%	99.3%	1 of 12	
Percentage of appointments kept by contractor	95.4%	90.2%	7 of 7	
Percentage of repairs completed right first time	97.1%	98.0%	1 of 10	
Percentage of homes that are decent	64%	88.1%	10 of 12	
Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2005)	70.5	71.0	3 of 10	
Stock with up-to-date gas certificates	99.81%	99.87%	7 of 11	

2.2.1 Our performance for timely completion of responsive repairs is in the top quartile for all three priority categories of emergency. Our results are ahead of group median averages by 1.1% for emergency repairs, 2.9% for urgent repairs and 7.7% for routine repairs. Plymouth Community Homes was the top performer for both emergency and urgent repairs. We are top performer for both completion of routine repairs on time, and for the percentage of repairs completed right first time, which is defined by Housemark as repair jobs completed on the first visit.

Our comparatively poor performance against the percentage of appointments kept by the contractor is unfortunate but not unexpected considering that the below-target performance has been regularly highlighted in HMCSC performance reports. Fortunately our target has since been met as of Quarter 4 2012/13, and so hopefully our position will improve relative to the rest of the group.

Our decent homes performance is comparatively poor because 6 of 11 group members reported that they have already reached full decency at the end of 2011/12. However, performance has improved considerably since then (95.3% at the end of March 2012/13) and we are on course to meet full decency by December 2013. Similarly, our stock with up-to-date gas certificates is comparatively low as of 2011/12 but has increased considerably since then, with us achieving 100% in April 2013. Three group members have achieved 100%, placing them in joint first place. Our Energy Efficiency rating of 71 is good, and is only slightly behind that of Enfield Homes (72.25) and North Tyneside (71.40).