

HOUSING & NEW HOMES COMMITTEE	Agenda Item 12 Brighton & Hove City Council
--	---

Subject:	Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 4 and end of year 2015/16		
Date of Meeting:	15 June 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 This Housing Management performance report covers quarter four of the financial year 2015/16, alongside end year results.







2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Housing & New Homes Committee notes and comments upon the report, which went to the Special Area Panel on 18 May 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. Explanations of performance have been provided for indicators which are red or amber.

3.2 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	

3.3 The benchmarking figures in this report have been updated with data from the Housemark 2014/15 core benchmarking analysis, which became available in January 2016. This is the primary source of benchmarking data throughout the report, and compares Housing data against upper tier local authorities with a stock size of 10,000 dwellings or more. The participating local authorities who meet these criteria are as follows:



















Dudley MBC
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Hull City Council
LB of Croydon
LB of Ealing
LB of Southwark
LB of Wandsworth
North Tyneside Council
Rotherham MDC
Sheffield City Council
Southampton City Council

Some indicators use benchmarking data from other sources (which are denoted in the tables they feature in):

- Four 'Rent collection and current arrears' indicators use data from the Rent Income Excellence Network (RIEN) because comparable Housemark data is not available for them. These figures compare Brighton & Hove against the other participating unitary authorities, (Southampton, Swindon, Darlington and Slough) for the 2014/15 financial year. The results are not published as quartiles, but as averages.
- The 'Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works' indicator uses data from the 2014/15 Local Authority Housing Statistics (LAHS) and compares against the same local authorities as the Housemark figures. These statistics are collected and published by central government.

A visual report providing more detailed benchmarking information is attached as Appendix 3. It uses a broader range of comparator groups as discussed at the Housing & New Homes Committee in January 2016.

4.0 Rent collection and current arrears

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1	Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year (end year rate)	98.40%	98.3%	98.62% (£51.36m of £52.09m)	98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m)		↑	98.39% (£51.3m of £52.1m)	98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m)		↑
2	Tenants with seven or more weeks rent arrears (end year snapshot)	4.07%	3.96% (RIEN)	2.94% (337 of 11,459)	2.86% (327 of 11,437)		↑	4.07% (470 of 11,544)	2.86% (327 of 11,437)		↑
3	Tenants in arrears served a Notice of Seeking Possession (NOSP) (total NOSP's served as % of tenants in arrears at end year)	24.82%	41.77% (RIEN)	19.08% (503 of 2,636)	25.91% (680 of 2,624)		-	24.82% (743 of 2,993)	25.91% (680 of 2,624)		↓
4	Tenants evicted because of rent arrears (total evictions during the year as % of tenants at end year)	0.29%	0.33%	0.03% (4 of 11,469)	0.06% (7 of 11,435)		↓	0.07% (8 of 11,544)	0.06% (7 of 11,435)		↑
5	Rent loss due to empty dwellings (end year rate)	1.3%	1.1%	0.89% (£461k of £51.71m)	0.93% (£478k of £51.71m)		↓	0.86% (£436k of £50.9m)	0.93% (£478k of £51.71m)		↓
6	Former tenant arrears collected (amount collected during the year as % of debt at end year)	34.25%	18.29% (RIEN)	23.85% (£145k of £606k)	29.24% (£179k of £612k)		-	34.25% (£209k of £612k)	29.24% (£179k of £612k)		↓
7	Rechargeable debt collected (amount collected during the year as % of debt at end year)	19.78%	-	8.20% (£17.1k of £208k)	11.32% (£21.0k of £185k)		-	19.78% (£47k of £237k)	11.32% (£21.0k of £185k)		↓
8	Percentage collection rate of gross leaseholder arrears (annual indicator)	75%	-	-	69% (£3.2m of £4.57m)		-	73% (£2.89m of £3.98m)	69% (£3.2m of £4.57m)		↓
9	Percentage collection rate of recoverable leaseholder arrears (annual indicator)	98%	-	-	93% (£4.27m of £4.57m)		-	97% (£3.87m of £3.98m)	93% (£4.27m of £4.57m)		↓

4.0.1 Four indicators are on target (green), two are near target (amber) and three are below target (red).

The indicators below target are:

Former tenant arrears collected

The 34.25% target was very ambitious and was set at the former tenant arrears collection rate for the previous financial year, which was unprecedentedly high. The 2015/16 collection rate of 29.24% is still very good and is much higher than the upper quartile benchmark figure of 18.29%. The overall amount of former tenant arrears (£612k) has remained virtually unchanged since last year (as a smaller amount of debt was added to the total through new cases).

Rechargeable debt collected

The collection rate for rechargeable debt was lower than usual because the specialist recharges officer post became vacant, but has now been recruited to and so performance will improve going into 2016/17.

Percentage collection rate of gross leaseholder arrears

The collection rate for gross arrears fell from 73% last year to 69% this year. The main reason is the increasing level of billing due to our major works investment. Major works service charges have risen from £1.3 million in 2013/14 to £1.9 million in 2014/15 to £2m this year. The disputes and challenges around this type of billing lead to slower recovery of the money. The indicator 'percentage collection rate of recoverable leaseholder arrears' takes into account the arrears that have been disputed and are looking to be resolved or taken to tribunal or court, and performance stands at 93% for the end of 2015/16.

The indicators near target are:

Percentage collection rate of recoverable leaseholder arrears

Performance (93%) missed the target (98%) due to an increase in major works billing, as described in the commentary for 'percentage collection rate of gross leaseholder arrears.'

Tenants in arrears served a Notice of Seeking Possession (NOSP)

This indicator expresses the number of NOSP's served during the year as a proportion of tenants in arrears at the end of the year, which has slightly increased compared to the previous financial year – by 1.09% to 25.91%. However, this is because the number of tenants in arrears has decreased (from 2,993 to 2,624) and not because the number of NOSP's served has increased (this has also decreased from 743 to 680).

4.0.2 Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year by area
























Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year		Performance for the quarter			Performance for the year		
		Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Trend since last year
1	North (includes Seniors Housing)	99.04% (£14.65m of £14.80m)	99.23% (£14.68m of £14.79m)	↑	99.00% (£14.64m of £14.78m)	99.23% (£14.68m of £14.79m)	↑
2	West	99.01% (£10.45m of £10.55m)	99.00% (£10.45m of £10.55m)	↓	98.97% (£10.44m of £10.55m)	99.00% (£10.45m of £10.55m)	↑
3	Central	98.59% (£9.26m of £9.39m)	98.64% (£9.26m of £9.38m)	↑	98.42% (£9.52m of £9.67m)	98.64% (£9.26m of £9.38m)	↑
4	East	98.03% (£17.01m of £17.35m)	98.31% (£17.05m of £17.34m)	↑	97.50% (£16.71m of £17.14m)	98.31% (£17.05m of £17.34m)	↑
5	All areas	98.62% (£51.36m of £52.09m)	98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m)	↑	98.39% (£51.31m of £52.15m)	98.77% (£51.43m of £52.07m)	↑

4.0.3 Tenants in arrears by amount

Amount of arrears		Q4 2015/16
1	No arrears	77% 8,811
2	£0.01 to £49.99	6% 693
3	£50 to £99.99	4% 425
4	£100 to £499.99	10% 1,197
5	£500 to £999.99	2% 208
6	£1000 or more	1% 101
7	Total tenants	100% 11,435

4.0.4 A table presenting information relating to the impact of the Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy (RSRS) for under occupying households is attached as Appendix 1.

4.1 Customer services and complaints

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Benchmark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1a	Calls to Housing Customer Services Team (HCST) answered	84%	-	73% (11,483 of 15,803)	80% (11,904 of 14,852)			82% (46,586 of 56,731)	76% (46,221 of 61,019)		
1b	... of which direct dial calls from external customers (new as of 2015/16)	90%	97%	94% (7,470 of 7,919)	90% (8,072 of 8,944)			-	92% (31,531 of 34,136)		-
2	Stage 1 complaints upheld	36% or under	43%	26% (11 of 43)	28% (12 of 43)			37% (62 of 169)	27% (44 of 164)		
3	Stage 2 complaints upheld	6% or under	-	0% (0 of 6)	0% (0 of 3)			8% (2 of 26)	13% (3 of 24)		
4	Customer satisfaction with HCST (survey respondents who were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with HCST)	91%	-	84% (Q2 2015/16)	86% (243 of 284)		 (since Q2)	77% (201 of 262)	85% (378 of 445)		
5	Ease of effort to contact HCST (survey respondents who found HCST very easy or fairly easy to contact)	92%	-	87% (Q2 2015/16)	92% (260 of 282)		 (since Q2)	64% (167 of 262)	90% (398 of 441)		

NB It is not possible to present HCST performance using the same indicators as for the Repairs Helpdesk ('calls answered within 20 seconds' and 'longest wait time') because the team uses different telephony reporting software, which does not include these indicators.

- 4.1.1 As of the year end, two indicators are on target (green), two are near target (amber) and two are below target (red).

The indicators below target are:

Calls to Housing Customer Services Team (HCST) answered

The 84% target was missed during both Quarter 4 (80%) and the financial year 2015/16 (76%). The main reason for this is that calls to officers from other teams, such as the Neighbourhoods Team, were set to divert to the HCST whilst officers were on site. However, most callers would abandon the call once connected to the HCST, as they wanted to talk to the officer they originally phoned. Given that this was the case, the telephony system was amended in February 2016 so that it would not re-direct calls to HCST. Since then, performance has been back on target for February (86%) and March (84%) 2016.

Customer satisfaction with HCST

The target of 91% was missed despite a significant improvement in performance, from 77% last year to 85% this year. The target is an ambitious one, and will remain the same for the next financial year. As a result of these bi-annual surveys, the HCST have done the following to improve customer satisfaction:

- Changed their phone greeting to be more consistent and aware of data protection (as in asking security questions to make sure it is the tenant who is calling).
- Taken on the task of re-booking tenancy visits themselves, when a tenant calls to reschedule, rather than referring the query to the Neighbourhoods team – thereby dealing with it at first point of contact.
- Trained all members of the HCST in processing the decorations and gardening scheme, in order to deal with applications more quickly and effectively.

The indicators near target are:

Stage 2 complaints upheld

Of the 24 Stage 2 complaints dealt with during the year, three (13%) were partially upheld after being investigated by the corporate Customer Feedback Team. Therefore the 2015/16 target to uphold less than 6% of Stage 2 complaints was missed. The subjects of the upheld complaints and lessons learned were:

- A Scheme Manager being only available on reception during afternoons at a Seniors Housing scheme, due to them having to cover another scheme. It was recommended that their hours should be staggered so that they could be available during some mornings and some afternoons each week
- Tenancy enforcement action not being taken quickly enough against a noise complaint – in this case the perpetrator lived above the complainant and had hard flooring, which is a breach of tenancy and therefore action could have been taken sooner.
- A tenant was visited without an appointment, after having informed the council that they would not answer the door without a prior appointment by letter. Generally speaking, officers do not need an appointment to knock on the door of tenants, but in this case the tenant made a specific request which should have been honoured.

Ease of effort to contact HCST

The 92% target was narrowly missed (by 2%) despite a major improvement in performance, which increased from 64% last year to 90% this year. The target will remain the same for the next financial year.

4.2 Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

Performance Indicator (re-let times indicators are in calendar days)		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1a	Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works	21	23 (LAHS)	17 (136 lets)	17 (126 lets)			23 (645 lets)	20 (549 lets)		
1b	... as above for general needs properties	18	-	14 (113 lets)	14 (98 lets)			18 (544 lets)	16 (438 lets)		
1c	... as above for Seniors Housing properties	30	-	30 (23 lets)	30 (28 lets)			54 (101 lets)	35 (111 lets)		
2	Average re-let time, including time spent in major works	-	35	37 (136 lets)	32 (126 lets)	-		49 (645 lets)	42 (549 lets)	-	
3	Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within statutory timescale of 42 calendar days	100%	-	100% (26 of 26)	100% (30 of 30)			89% (173 of 194)	100% (147 of 147)		

As of the year end, four indicators are on target (green) and one is below target (red). The indicator below target is:

Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works, for Seniors Housing properties

Whilst end year performance of 35 days has missed the target of 30 days, it has significantly improved upon the previous year's performance of 54 days. Furthermore, the re-let time for Seniors Housing properties decreased from 58 to 34 days between the first two quarters of 2015/16, and decreased further to 30 days for the latter two quarters, thereby bringing performance on target. As part of the Seniors Housing stock review, works have been taking place to convert unpopular studio flats into one bedroom flats. These hard-to-let studio flats have been a major reason why Seniors Housing properties have higher re-let times compared to general needs properties.

4.3 Property & Investment

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1	Emergency repairs completed in time	99%	-	99.97% (2,875 of 2,876)	100% (3,209 of 3,209)		↑	99.7% (9,412 of 9,436)	99.96% (11,169 of 11,173)		↑
2	Routine repairs completed in time	99%	-	99.9% (5,175 of 5,178)	99.8% (5,165 of 5,173)		↓	99.7% (25,144 of 25,213)	99.9% (22,707 of 22,722)		↑
3	Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)	14 days	-	13 days	18 days		↓	14 days	12 days		↑
4	Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made	97%	98%	96.7% (7,567 of 7,824)	96.5% (10,188 of 10,556)		↓	97.7% (27,117 of 27,768)	97.1% (33,018 of 34,019)		↓
5	Tenant satisfaction with repairs (respondents during the quarter who were very satisfied or fairly satisfied)	96%	96%	98.1% (1,157 of 1,179)	94.4% (1,156 of 1,225)		↓	95.7% (6,402 of 6,688)	97.3% (6,578 of 6,764)		↑
6	Responsive repairs passing post-inspection	97%	-	90.0% (1,522 of 1,692)	94.3% (1,129 of 1,197)		↑	98.7% (3,284 of 3,328)	93.3% (4,457 of 4,778)		↓
7	Repairs completed at first visit	92%	94%	91.4% (7,361 of 8,054)	91.4% (7,657 of 8,382)		↔	94.3% (32,667 of 34,649)	92.3% (31,290 of 33,895)		↓
8	Cancelled repair jobs	Under 5%	-	6.3% (596 of 9,471)	6.7% (742 of 11,134)		↓	4.9% (1,965 of 40,350)	5.6% (2,190 of 38,896)		↓
9	Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard	100%	100%	100% (11,640 of 11,640)	100% (11,588 of 11,588)		↔	99.5% (11,626 of 11,683)	100% (11,588 of 11,588)		↑

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
10	Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009)	64.4	68	64.9	65.2		↑	64.5	65.2		↑
11	Planned works passing post-inspection	97%	-	100% (426 of 426)	100% (456 of 456)		↔	99.9% (1,047 of 1,048)	100% (1,600 of 1,600)		↑
12	Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates	100%	100%	100% (10,149 of 10,149)	99.96% (10,124 of 10,128)		↓	100.0% (10,249 of 10,249)	99.96% (10,124 of 10,128)		↓
13	Empty properties passing post-inspection	98%	-	98.6% (138 of 140)	98.0% (148 of 151)		↓	99.0% (704 of 711)	98.8% (601 of 608)		↓
14	Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond	2 hours	-	1h 46m	1h 45m		↑	1h 28m	1h 42m		↓
15	Lifts restored to service within 24 hours	95%	-	97.9% (140 of 143)	97.7% (169 of 173)		↓	96.7% (595 of 615)	97.6% (572 of 586)		↑
16	Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours	7 days	-	7 days (23 days, 3 lifts)	3 days (11 days, 4 lifts)		↑	5 days (89 days, 20 lifts)	8 days (106 days, 14 lifts)		↓
17	Repairs Helpdesk - calls answered	90%	-	98.1% (20,369 of 20,758)	97.7% (24,123 of 24,680)		↓	95.0% (79,123 of 83,285)	97.7% (81,524 of 83,436)		↑
18	Repairs Helpdesk - calls answered within 20 seconds	75%	-	88.5% (18,026 of 20,369)	83.4% (20,113 of 24,123)		↓	76.7% (60,658 of 79,123)	85.3% (69,525 of 81,524)		↑
19	Repairs Helpdesk - longest wait time	5 mins	-	4m 23s	5m 23s		↓	13m 12s	6m 6s		↑

4.2.1 As of Quarter 4, eleven indicators are on target (green), six are near target (amber) and two are below target (red).

The indicators below target are:

Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)

This has increased to 18 days during Quarter 4 because Mears have been moving towards using their own local staff to carry out jobs which were previously done by sub-contractors, and adjusting to this has caused some temporary resourcing issues. The types of jobs include plastering, building and roofing.

Percentage of responsive repairs passing post-inspection

Performance has improved since Quarter 3, from 90% to 94% but the 97% target has not yet been met. During Quarter 4, there were 1,197 post-inspections carried out, of which 68 failed. The reasons for the failures are as follows:

- 26 due to poor quality work
- 20 due to extra works being required to finish the job
- 18 needed corrections to the recorded description and cost of work carried out
- 4 due to poor customer service.

As stated in the previous performance report, Mears have looked to improve the standard of repairs they are carrying out in tenants properties. They have now established a new checking standard for post inspection quality checks carried out by supervisors, and have recruited a Quality Assurance Manager to oversee these checks and ensure the standard of repairs is continually improved. As a result Mears had indicated that the numbers of inspections which fail would increase (by 7 to 8%) in the short term while the workforce and sub-contractors are brought up to this improved standard.

The indicators near target are:

Percentage of appointments kept by contractor

Performance on this indicator has dropped by 0.2% from the previous quarter and is just below target (0.5%) for quarter four. This is due to operatives becoming familiar with new appointment booking and attendance processes.

Tenant satisfaction with repairs

Overall satisfaction among respondents has fallen to 94% during Quarter 4, from 98% during the previous quarter. This is mainly due to the increased time taken to complete jobs, as per the 'average time to complete routine repairs' indicator.

Percentage of repairs completed at first visit

Performance remains at 0.6% below the 92% target during Quarter 4. This is because Mears are now directly delivering more external trades that are not typically completed in one appointment (eg plastering, building and roofing, as stated above).

Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time

During Quarter 4, the longest time that any caller had to wait before their call was answered was 5 minutes and 23 seconds. This wait time was on the Tuesday

following the Easter Bank Holiday weekend, when the Repairs Helpdesk received an unprecedented 700 calls in one day (about twice as many as usual). The average time taken to answer a call during quarter four was only 17 seconds.

Cancelled repair jobs

The proportion of cancelled repair jobs has steadily increased over the past three quarters and is 1.7% outside the target (under 5%). The main reasons for increase between Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 are:

- The number of jobs where access to the property cannot be arranged increased by 50% (from 82 to 126)
- The number of duplicate jobs raised increased by 33% (from 137 to 184).

On a positive note, the number of jobs issued to another contractor has reduced by almost half (from 70 in Q3 to 41 in Q4). Cancellations are now being reviewed by operational managers within Mears, in line with the process reviews detailed on the previous page.

Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates

On the 31 March there were four gas safety certificates that were overdue in the Mears gas contract area. This was due to staff shortages ahead of the change of gas contractor on the 1st April 2016. The four safety certificates have now been issued in line with gas access procedures. The gas new contractor is K&T Heating and the contract covers the whole stock.

4.2.2 Asbestos

To enable Brighton & Hove City Council to comply with the Control of Asbestos Regulations (2012), our partners Mears arrange for the annual inspection of all communal areas and dwellings known to contain asbestos containing materials. During the financial year 2015/16, a total of 673 inspections were carried out, with no further works required. These annual inspections will continue until such a time when the asbestos containing materials need to be removed, or are removed as part of other repairs.

























4.2.3 Legionella

Communal hot and cold water systems in high and low-rise blocks and Seniors' Housing schemes undergo a detailed periodic inspection. The results are incorporated into the council's Annual Legionella Report for the Health & Safety Committee – which is due in November 2016. The housing extract of that report can be made available to the Housing & New Homes Committee after that date.

4.2.4 Decent Homes Standard

The council continues to ensure that 100% of stock meets the government's Decent Homes Standard. This reflects sustained investment in council housing stock over the last ten years. The council reached 100% decency in December 2013 and has subsequently maintained stock at that level. The Housing Revenue Account - Asset Management Strategy agreed by committee in March 2016 includes maintaining 100% achievement of properties meeting the standard and our local Brighton & Hove Standard over the medium term (initially the next 5 years).

4.4 Estates Service









Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1	Cleaning quality inspection pass rate	98%	-	99% (143 of 144)	100% (181 of 181)			99% (701 of 706)	100% (728 of 731)		
2	Emergency Response Team quality inspection pass rate (minor repairs and bulk waste)	99%	-	100% (146 of 146)	100% (97 of 97)			100% (617 of 617)	100% (574 of 574)		
3	Cleaning tasks completed	98%	-	99.9% (13,528 of 13,543)	98% (13,191 of 13,513)			98% (53,168 of 54,026)	98% (53,026 of 54,142)		
4	Bulk waste removed within 7 working days	98%	-	99.7% (742 of 744)	95.3% (711 of 746)			96% (2,758 of 2,874)	97% (2,940 of 3,018)		
5	Light replacements/repairs completed within 3 working days	99%	-	99% (389 of 393)	99% (292 of 296)			98% (2,073 of 2,117)	99% (1,319 of 1,338)		
6	Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days	96%	-	98% (1,493 of 1,531)	97% (1,344 of 1,381)			97% (6,805 of 7,008)	97% (5,693 of 5,877)		
7	Incidents of drug paraphernalia collected and reported to the Police	-	-	63	50	-	-	243	254	-	-

As of Quarter 4, five indicators are on target (green) and one is near target (amber). The indicator near target is:

Bulk waste removed within 7 working days

The target was missed because 35 jobs were done late, out of a total of 746. These jobs took an average of 10 working days to complete and the bulk waste was located in storage and bin rooms, and therefore not obstructing common ways.

4.5 Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Bench- mark	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
				Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1	Victim satisfaction with closed ASB cases (indicator is always year to date)	80%	75%	88% (29 of 33)	90% (47 of 52)			70% (31 of 44)	90% (47 of 52)		
2	ASB cases closed resulting in tenancy legal action (including eviction)	-	-	9% (6 of 69)	13% (9 of 69)	-	-	4% (15 of 338)	14% (40 of 284)	-	-
3	Tenants evicted due to ASB	-	-	0	1	-	-	5	2	-	-
4	Success rate of tenancy sustainment cases	95%	-	96% (27 of 28)	100% (23 of 23)			97% (103 of 106)	98% (106 of 108)		

4.5.2 Reports of ASB incidents by type



ASB incident category		Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16
1	Noise incidents	22% (125)	21% (130)
2	Harassment / threats incidents	17% (96)	17% (106)
3	Hate-related incidents	1% (7)	1% (5)
4	Vandalism incidents	3% (16)	1% (5)
5	Pets / animals incidents	15% (86)	14% (88)
6	Vehicles incidents	5% (28)	4% (25)
7	Drugs incidents	7% (38)	9% (56)
8	Alcohol related incidents	1% (8)	2% (12)
9	Domestic violence / abuse incidents	3% (18)	3% (16)
10	Other violence incidents	1% (6)	3% (19)
11	Rubbish incidents	10% (57)	13% (81)
12	Garden nuisance incidents	5% (31)	7% (41)
13	Communal areas / loitering incidents	7% (40)	5% (34)
14	Prostitution / Sex incidents	0% (0)	0% (1)
15	Other criminal behaviour incidents	2% (14)	1% (6)
16	Total ASB incidents	100% (570)	100% (625)

4.5.3 Reports of ASB incidents by ward during the quarter

Ward	Q3 2015/16 incidents	Q4 2015/16 incidents	Incidents per 1,000 properties (Q4)	Change since last quarter (Q3 to Q4)
Brunswick and Adelaide	2	0	0	-2
Central Hove	3	11	122	8
East Brighton	77	105	42	28
Goldsmid	13	19	41	6
Hangleton and Knoll	62	82	48	20
Hanover and Elm Grove	19	27	49	8
Hollingdean and Stanmer	60	78	51	18
Hove Park	0	0	0	0
Moulsecoomb and Bevendean	64	56	34	-8
North Portslade	18	23	46	5
Patcham	34	25	43	-9
Preston Park	4	6	48	2
Queen's Park	121	107	51	-14
Regency	0	0	0	0
Rottingdean Coastal	3	0	0	-3
South Portslade	30	23	54	-7
St. Peter's and North Laine	24	26	50	2
Westbourne	4	7	47	3
Wish	7	9	18	2
Withdean	3	5	88	2
Woodingdean	22	16	32	-6
Total	570	625	45	55










4.6 Tenancy Fraud

Please note that Housemark do not provide comparable benchmarking data for the indicators in the following table.

Performance Indicator		Target 2015/16	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
			Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1	Properties taken back due to tenancy fraud	15 by year end	7	7	-	-	15	26		
2	Tenancy fraud cases investigated and closed	-	33	29	-	-	65	127	-	-
3	New tenancy fraud cases opened	-	56	47	-	-	98	166	-	-
4	Total open tenancy fraud cases	-	89	101	-	-	62	101	-	-

4.7 Seniors Housing

Please note that Housemark do not provide comparable benchmarking data for the indicators in the following table.

Performance Indicator	Target 2015/16	Performance for the quarter				Performance for the year			
		Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last quarter	Year end 2014/15	Year end 2015/16	Status against target	Trend since last year
1 Individual wellbeing calls made to residents	-	28,093	26,312	-	-	-	113,534	-	-
2 Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities	95%	97% (838 of 863)	97% (818 of 843)			-	97% (837 of 861)		-
3 Residents living in schemes offering regular exercise classes	61%	69% (592 of 863)	68% (570 of 843)			-	66% (565 of 861)		-
4 Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations	91%	83% (19 of 23)	87% (20 of 23)			-	87% (20 of 23)		-

NB It is not possible to provide figures from last year, because these indicators were new at the time and came into effect as of Quarter 3 2014/15.

4.7.1 Two indicators are on target (green) and one is near target (amber).

The indicator near target is:

Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations

Two schemes did not host events in collaboration with external organisations during Quarter 3. One of them is Stonehurst Court, which is to be closed as part of the Seniors Housing scheme review, as approved by Housing & New Homes Committee in November 2015. The other scheme (the bungalows at Manor Paddock) does not host regular events, as there hadn't been much interest among residents in the past, but the Seniors Housing team are planning to get some running in 2016/17.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

- 5.1 A draft version of this report went to the Special Area Panel on 18 May 2016. The report was noted and commented upon, and an error which was pointed out in the 'Reports of ASB incidents by ward during the quarter' table has since been corrected.

6. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 6.1 The area of performance with the most significant financial impact is the ability to collect rents from tenants. For the year 2015/16, the collection rate has increased by 0.38% to 98.77% compared to 2014/15 and currently exceeds the target set for the year as well as benchmarked targets 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: 19/05/16

Legal Implications:

- 6.2 The Committee has overall responsibility for the management of property within the Housing Revenue Account. This report informs Members about the management of that property, and allows them to discharge the Committee's oversight responsibilities.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 23/05/16

Equalities Implications:

- 6.3 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Sustainability Implications:

- 6.4 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:

- 6.5 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:

- 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 or Citywide Implications:

6.8 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. Outline of under occupation arrears and related information.
2. Appendix 2. Long-term empty properties.
3. Appendix 3. Benchmarking comparison report

Background Documents:

1. None

Appendix 1. Outline of council under occupation arrears and related information

Item	Indicator	Baseline March 2013*	Feb 2016	Mar 2016	April 2016
1	Number of under occupying households affected by the Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy (RSRS)	949	715	711	701
2	Percentage of under occupying households in arrears (number in brackets below)	29% (277)	43% (305)	44% (313)	44% (308)
3	Percentage of all current tenants in arrears (number in brackets below)	24% (2,791)	21% (2,386)	23% (2,592)	23% (2,624)
4	Average arrears per under occupying household in arrears	£303	£244	£202	£208
5	Total arrears of under occupying households	£84k	£75k	£63k	£64k
6	Percentage increase in arrears of under occupying households since baseline (amount in brackets below)	0% (£0k)	-11% (-£9k)	-25% (-£21k)	-24% (-£20k)
7	Percentage increase in arrears of all current tenants since baseline (amount in brackets below)	0% (£0k)	0% (-£2k)	2% (£13k)	-7% (-£45k)
8	Under occupier arrears as a percentage of total arrears	13%	12%	10%	11%
9	Cumulative number of under occupying households moved via mutual exchange since baseline	0	70	70	73
10	Cumulative number of under occupying households moved via a transfer since baseline	0	123	124	129

*Baseline = before the RSRS was introduced in April 2013.

N.B. The arrears figures include both rents and service charges.

Appendix 2. Long term empty properties

Of the 50 general needs and Seniors Housing properties that have, as of 29 April 2016, been empty for six weeks or more:

- Eight are ready to let
- 31 require or are undergoing major repairs/refurbishment (21 are Seniors Housing)
- 11 are to be leased to Seaside Homes (last batch was leased in September 2015).

General needs and Seniors Housing long term empty properties (6 weeks or more)		
Calendar days empty as at 29/04/2016	Ward	Status
62	East Brighton	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom flat
76	East Brighton	Ready to let following major repairs - 2 bedroom house
76	East Brighton	Ready to let following major repairs - 2 bedroom flat
118	East Brighton	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom flat
62	Goldsmid	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom flat
104	Goldsmid	With Mears for major repairs - 1 bedroom flat
62	Hangleton Knoll	Ready to let following major repairs - 1 bedroom flat
83	Hangleton Knoll	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 3 bedroom maisonette
195	Hangleton Knoll	With BHCC for extension and refurbishment - 3 bedroom house
48	Hanover Elm Grove	Ready to let following major repairs - 3 bedroom house
55 to 706 (12 dwellings)	Hanover Elm Grove	Twelve studio dwellings which will not be let because they are part of a Seniors Housing scheme (Stonehurst Court) which is to be closed. This decision is part of the Seniors Housing scheme review, because the scheme cannot be made fit for purpose, and was approved by Housing & New Homes Committee in November 2015.
62	Hanover Elm Grove	Ready to let following major repairs - 2 bedroom house
83	Hollingdean Stanmer	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 3 bedroom flat
62	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom house
69	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom flat
167	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	With BHCC for extension and refurbishment - 3 bedroom house

General needs and Seniors Housing long term empty properties (6 weeks or more)		
Calendar days empty as at 29/04/2016	Ward	Status
188	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 3 bedroom house
216	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	With BHCC for extension and refurbishment - 3 bedroom house
300 to 937 (3 dwellings)	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	Three studio dwellings within a Seniors Housing scheme which are to be converted into 1 bedroom flats (as studios are unpopular). This is being done as part of the Seniors Housing stock review, which Housing Committee accepted in principle in January 2015.
321	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	With BHCC for refurbishment - 3 bedroom house. Works commenced Feb 2016.
328	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	Ready to let following refurbishment - 3 bedroom house.
370	Moulsecoomb Bevendean	With BHCC for refurbishment - 3 bedroom house. Works commenced Feb 2016.
55 to 90 (2 dwellings)	Patcham	Two studio dwellings within a Seniors Housing scheme which are to be converted into 1 bedroom flats (as studios are unpopular). This is being done as part of the Seniors Housing stock review, which Housing Committee accepted in principle in January 2015.
55 to 538 (4 dwellings)	Portslade North	Four studio dwellings within a Seniors Housing scheme which are to be converted into 1 bedroom flats (as studios are unpopular). This is being done as part of the Seniors Housing stock review, which Housing Committee accepted in principle in January 2015.
55	Portslade North	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 2 bedroom house
195	Portslade South	With BHCC for extension and refurbishment - 3 bedroom house
216	Portslade South	With BHCC for extension and refurbishment - 3 bedroom house
370	Portslade South	With BHCC for refurbishment - 3 bedroom house. Completion of works expected July 2016.
48	Queens Park	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 3 bedroom flat
55	Queens Park	Ready to let following major repairs - 1 bedroom flat
153	Wish	With BHCC for refurbishment - 3 bedroom house
356	Wish	To be leased to Seaside Homes - 3 bedroom house
482	Woodingdean	Ready to let following major repairs - 3 bedroom house
Total of 50 dwellings		





Appendix 3: Benchmarking Comparison Report (2014/15)

This benchmarking report compares the cost and performance of Brighton & Hove (BHCC) as a social landlord with other local authorities (LAs) and housing associations (HAs). The data covers the 2014/15 financial year (2015/16 data collection is still in progress).

The report uses a variety of indicators collected by Housemark, who provide the benchmarking service. The indicators are presented in separate tables for each of the service areas devised by Housemark (which are different to team structures within BHCC). The tables present BHCC in comparison with the following groups of social landlords:

- Similar LAs: upper tier local authorities with a stock size of 10,000 dwellings or more who use Housemark (the peer group used in the quarterly performance reports)
- LAs: all local authorities using Housemark, including those above
- HAs: all housing associations using Housemark
- All: all social landlords in England using Housemark
















The tables compare BHCC to these groups using the following symbols:

	BHCC within top quartile (top 25% best performing or cheapest landlords in the comparator group)
	BHCC within second quartile (next 25% to 50% as per above)
	BHCC within third quartile (next 50% to 75% as per above)
	BHCC within fourth quartile (bottom 25% as per above)

For information, the tables also provide BHCC's result for the 2014/15 financial year and ranking within each group.




Rent arrears and collection

BHCC costs are lower than average, and performance better than average, when compared to all groups.

Rent arrears and collection indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total cost per property (CPP) of rent arrears and collection (<i>lower is better</i>)	£79	 (4 of 12)	 (13 of 46)	 (6 of 274)	 (31 of 368)
 Current tenant arrears as a percentage of rent due	1.67%	 (2 of 12)	 (20 of 45)	 (33 of 279)	 (67 of 373)
 Former tenant arrears as a percentage of rent due	1.09%	 (2 of 12)	 (19 of 45)	 (127 of 273)	 (155 of 367)







Lettings

BHCC costs are lower than average compared to all groups, and performance is mixed depending on which groups are compared to. The average re-let time, including time spent in works, has since improved from 49 days to 42 days during 2015/16.

Lettings indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of lettings (lower is better)	£35	☆ (3 of 12)	☆ (4 of 45)	☆ (15 of 274)	☆ (41 of 368)
 Average re-let time in days (all re-lets, including time spent in works)	49	△ (5 of 10)	○ (26 of 37)	! (167 of 203)	! (199 of 251)
 Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as proportion of rent due	0.86%	☆ (2 of 12)	△ (14 of 45)	! (196 of 278)	△ (151 of 373)




Responsive repairs and void works

BHCC costs are generally lower, and performance generally better, when compared to most groups.

Responsive repairs and void works indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of responsive repairs and void works (lower is better)	£688	○ (7 of 12)	△ (16 of 47)	☆ (59 of 281)	☆ (90 of 379)
 Average number of calendar days taken to complete repairs (lower is better, includes both emergency and routine repairs)	10	○ (8 of 12)	△ (21 of 44)	○ (170 of 258)	○ (224 of 348)
 Percentage of repairs completed at the first visit	94.3%	☆ (3 of 9)	△ (9 of 30)	△ (58 of 187)	△ (78 of 253)
 Average number of responsive repairs per property (lower is better)	2.97	☆ (3 of 10)	△ (15 of 39)	☆ (64 of 253)	△ (86 of 334)
 Appointments kept as a percentage of appointments made	97.7%	△ (4 of 8)	△ (13 of 30)	○ (91 of 173)	○ (125 of 242)
 Satisfaction with last repair (Repairs Helpdesk survey respondents who were very or fairly satisfied)	95.7%	☆ (3 of 9)	△ (13 of 36)	△ (81 of 239)	△ (106 of 313)



Major works and cyclical maintenance

BHCC costs are higher than average when compared to all groups, and performance is generally lower when compared to most groups (with the exception of similar LAs). The higher costs reflect the money invested towards improving the quality of homes, and continuing to maintain the standard of 100% of properties as they fall out of the Decent Homes Standard which was achieved in 2013.

Major works and cyclical maintenance indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of major works and cyclical maintenance (lower is better)	£2,729	⚠ (11 of 12)	⚠ (44 of 47)	⚠ (267 of 281)	⚠ (353 of 379)
 Percentage of dwellings that are decent at the end of the year	99.51%	△ (5 of 12)	○ (26 of 46)	⚠ (200 of 242)	○ (244 of 327)
 Satisfaction with quality of home (2014 STAR survey respondents who were very or fairly satisfied)	80%	△ (4 of 10)	○ (22 of 36)	⚠ (177 of 231)	○ (221 of 302)



Estate services

BHCC costs are mixed (depending on which groups are compared to) and performance is lower than average compared to most groups. The exception is for similar LAs, who are predominantly urban and have similar levels of deprivation to BHCC, whereas many of the other LAs are in less urban and less deprived areas, as is much of the stock for HAs.

Estate services indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of estate services (lower is better)	£161	△ (6 of 12)	○ (20 of 36)	△ (128 of 281)	○ (191 of 379)
 Satisfaction with neighbourhood (2014 STAR survey respondents who were very or fairly satisfied)	84%	☆ (2 of 10)	○ (20 of 36)	⚠ (206 of 237)	○ (185 of 296)



Anti-social behaviour (table is on next page)

BHCC costs are higher than average when compared to all groups, and performance was worse when compared to most groups. The higher costs are expected given that the city has a relatively high rate of anti-social behaviour (Police recorded incidents were 38% higher than the average for England and Wales during 2014/15) and locally a significant proportion of ASB casework relates to council housing. On a positive note, satisfaction with ASB case handling has improved significantly since 2014/15, increasing from 71% then to 90% for 2015/16.

Anti-social behaviour indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of anti-social behaviour (lower is better)	£91	⚠ (11 of 12)	⚠ (46 of 46)	⚠ (236 of 273)	⚠ (326 of 368)
 Satisfaction with ASB case handling (victims of ASB interviewed by phone who were very or fairly satisfied)	71%	△ (5 of 10)	○ (14 of 22)	○ (127 of 171)	○ (163 of 223)



Tenancy management

BHCC costs are higher than average compared to all groups, and performance is lower than average when compared to most groups. The high costs are expected given that the proportion of vulnerable people living in BHCC council housing is high (48%), which tends to increase demand on tenancy management services. The satisfaction data is sourced from the 2014 STAR survey, and an update will be available from this year's survey.

Tenancy management indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of tenancy management (lower is better)	£142	⚠ (11 of 12)	⚠ (41 of 46)	○ (188 of 274)	○ (272 of 368)
 Satisfaction with the service provided (2014 STAR survey respondents who were very or fairly satisfied)	78%	△ (4 of 10)	○ (29 of 36)	⚠ (206 of 237)	⚠ (265 of 311)

Resident involvement

BHCC costs were higher, and performance was generally lower, when compared to most groups. However, tenant satisfaction that views are being listened to (sourced from the 2014 STAR survey) compares well to similar LAs.

Resident involvement indicators	BHCC 2014/15	Our position (quartile) compared to:			
		Similar LAs	All LAs	HAs	All
 Total CPP of resident involvement (lower is better)	£61	⚠ (11 of 12)	⚠ (39 of 46)	△ (116 of 274)	○ (197 of 368)
 Satisfaction that views being listened to (2014 STAR survey respondents who were very or fairly satisfied)	64%	☆ (3 of 10)	○ (19 of 36)	⚠ (165 of 213)	○ (205 of 283)

NB All icons the report are sourced from www.flaticon.com and were designed by 'Freepik.'

