


Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>Housing &amp; Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee</b>  2nd December 2024	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of.</b> David Joyce - Corporate Director Housing and Regeneration	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
Social Housing Landlords Performance Report – Quarter 4 2024	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Mubin Choudhury – Performance Improvement Analyst (Strategy, Policy and Improvement)
<b>Wards affected</b>	All wards

### Executive Summary

Social Landlords in the borough produce quarterly performance data for key customer facing performance indicators subsequently, tenants and residents can be assured they are delivering effective and customer focused services. The performance report attached at **Appendix 1** provides performance data for quarter three of the Social Landlords with homes in the borough. The KPIs are now in line with the Housing Regulators' Tenant Satisfaction Measures, this was done to ensure the RPs can report on the measures effectively whilst ensuring there is synergy between the borough's requests and those of the Housing Regulator.

### Recommendations:

The Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee is recommended to:

To review and note progress in the performance outturns achieved by individual Social Landlords and the overall performance trend.

## 1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 1.1 The Committee Chair has requested Registered Provider (RP) Social Landlord performance twice a year during quarter two and end of year period of quarter four. This is to oversee trends specific to frontline delivery of social housing services such as repair response times and complaint handing to

name a few. Moreover, this allows the scrutiny group to discuss other salient matters during the sessions which otherwise would be time constrained.

## **2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 2.1** Members review of Social Landlord performance to remain exclusively with the Cabinet Member for Housing.

## **3. DETAILS OF THE REPORT**

- 3.1** Through the Tower Hamlets Housing Forum (THHF), the Council works with key RPs who manage social rented stock in the borough. Performance information is presented to the Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing along with the Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee for information purposes.
- 3.2** The agreed Performance Management Framework is a set of key performance indicators (KPI's). Quarterly performance information is presented to the Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing and the Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee. Good performance from RPs supports the Council in ensuring the borough is one where residents are proud to live.
- 3.3** Each RP has their own governance arrangements for the scrutiny of performance. Targets are set and scrutinised by their respective RP Boards.
- 3.4** Performance for quarter four is listed in **Appendix 1**. The ability and commitment to supply borough-specific statistics is shared by all members of the Tower Hamlets Housing Forum and majority stock holding RPs. In addition, three landlords solely operate and manage housing stock in Tower Hamlets.
- 3.5** The KPIs currently compiled and authorised by THHF (Tower Hamlets Housing Forum) are shown in the table below and are aligned to metrics with housing providers are required to report to the Housing Regulator on an annual basis. THHF members unanimously decided as of April 2023, the group will adopt the following indicators in place of the preceding 17 KPIs. Additionally Housing Forum members consented to supply borough specific data and guarantee that stock owned in a different location was excluded from the LBTH statistical returns.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Format captured</u>
Homes that do not meet the Decent Homes Standard	%
Non-emergency repairs completed within target timescale	%
Emergency repairs completed within target timescale	%
Homes that have had necessary Gas safety checks	%

Homes that have had necessary fire risk assessments	%
Homes that have had necessary asbestos management surveys	%
Homes that have had all necessary water checks	%
Homes that have had necessary lift checks	%
Number of complaints received	Number
Complaints responded to within Complaint Handling Code timescales	Number
Anti-social Behaviour cases	Number
Average Re-let time in days (standard Re-lets)	Days
Average Re-let time in days (major works Re-lets)	Days
Number of units vacant but unavailable for letting at period end	Number

**3.6** RPs work to enhance every facet of the provision of services. Numerous factors influence performance, not all of which are under the RP's control. For instance, repair timeframes are negatively impacted by contractor capacity and the sparsity of specific parts.

Please see below quarter 4 observations for the committee's oversight.

#### **4. Quarter 4 items for observation**

##### Decent Homes and Repairs

#### **4.1 Decent home standards.**

Peabody, One Housing, Spitalfields, HARCA, Gateway and Providence Row all achieved 100% compliance to the decent-homes standard for all properties. A further 4 registered providers, Notting Hill Genesis, Swan, London and Quadrant and Clarion achieved over 99.8% compliance. EastEnd Homes, Tower Hamlets Community Housing and Tower Hamlets Council had the highest percentage non-decent, with a compliance rate of 95%, 91% and 82.46% respectively. Tower Hamlets Council have stated that a targeted programme focusing on kitchens, bathrooms, windows, roofs, doors and a 5-year electrical inspection programme will allow them to undertake works to more non-decent homes and they expect to start to see the benefits of this from 2024/25 onwards.

#### **4.2 Number of complaints received.**

London & Quadrant received the fewest complaints per 100 properties as was the case in the previous quarter. Notting Hill Genesis, Spitalfields, Clarion and HARCA all achieved under 2 complaints per 100 units of stock. The registered

provider with the highest number of complaints per 100 units of stock was Swan Housing with over 6 complaints per 100 properties, the highest for quarter 4.

#### **4.3 Emergency and non-emergency repairs.**

In quarter 4, Peabody Housing had the lowest percentage of emergency repairs completed within the allotted period (54.49%). Although this is an improvement from their performance in the previous quarter (44.6%), this is still the lowest figure of all the registered providers. Gateway, Tower Hamlets Council, OneHousing and London & Quadrant were the other registered providers to achieve under 90% of emergency repairs completed within the target timescale. Providence Row, Swan, Notting Hill Genesis and Tower Hamlets Community Housing all completed 100% of their emergency repairs within the target timescale.

For non-emergency repairs, Swan, Spitalfields, London & Quadrant were the highest performing registered providers, all with a repair completion rate of over 93% on time. Clarion were the registered provider with the lowest rate (67%), however 5 other RPs also had a rate of non-emergency repairs completed in time from 80-70%.

#### Relets/ Voids and vacant units.

#### **4.4 Standard Relets time/s.**

London & Quadrant had the highest figure with 380 days for average relet time. Last quarter, London & Quadrant also had the highest average re-let time at 287 days. Notting Hill Genesis had an average re-let time of 116 days. All other registered providers had a re-let time of under 100 days. EastEnd Homes, Tower Hamlets Community Housing and Tower Hamlets Council had the best performance in this metric, all with an average re-let time of under 33 days.

#### **4.5 Major works**

Only Gateway had an average re-let time of over 100 days (106 days). Tower Hamlets Council performed the best with an average re-let time of 40 days.

#### **4.6 Vacant units**

Tower Hamlets Council has the highest number of vacant units (221) in quarter 4, but also has the largest stock in the borough. Tower Hamlets reported that the figure reported here includes blocks being decanted, undergoing major works or block strengthening works as well as properties being used as temporary respite accommodation.

#### Safety Checks.

#### **4.7 Water Checks**

L&Q did not submit any data for quarter 4. The landlord commented saying conducting the checks was challenging and they were not required by law to provide the information to the council. According to registered providers in general, it can be challenging to enter properties frequently enough to carry

out inspections as tenants may repeatedly decline admission or fail to remain home for scheduled site visits. Of the providers who did submit data, EastEnd Homes and Tower Hamlets Council did not report a compliance rate of 100%.

#### **4.8 Lift checks.**

Clarion, Spitalfields, Providence Row, Gateway, Tower Hamlets Community Housing and Notting Hill Genesis all reported a compliance rate of 100%. Seemingly, Tower Hamlets Council had the lowest compliance rate for this metric at 58.97%, however, within the commentary Tower Hamlets Council explained at Q2 84% of their lifts are now LOLER compliant and with additional resources being deployed that further improvement will be seen in future data. Passenger lifts are inspected within our PPM contract by our lift contractor and this performance indicator maintains 100% for operational inspections.

#### **4.9 Fire Safety Risk Assessments**

All registered providers achieved a compliance rate of over 97%, with 8 of the 12 providers reporting a compliance rate of 100%.

#### **4.10 Gas checks**

All registered providers achieved a compliance rate of over 97% with 11 of the 12 providers reporting a compliance rate of over 99.46%.

#### **4.11 ASB cases**

All registered providers had fewer than 2 ASB cases per 100 properties barring Tower Hamlets Council. Tower Hamlets Council had the most with just over 2 cases per 100.

### **5. Areas of progression**

#### **5.1 Decent homes**

Peabody, OneHousing, Spitalfields, HARCA and Providence Row all had a decent-home rate of 100%.

#### **5.2 Emergency repairs**

Providence Row, Swan, Notting Hill Genesis and Tower Hamlets Community Housing had a 100% rate of emergency repairs being completed on time.

#### **5.3 Non-emergency repairs**

Swan, Spitalfields, London & Quadrant all had a rate of over 93.5% of their non-emergency repairs done within the target timescale.

#### **5.4 Safety checks**

Registered providers across the borough scored highly in compliance rate for all safety checks, with only 3 instances of compliance being below 90% across all safety checks for all registered providers.

#### **5.5 Re-let times for standard re-lets and major works.**

10 of the 12 registered providers reported an average standard re-let time of below 100 days. And 8 of the 10 registered providers reported an average major-works re-let time of below 100 days.

## **6. General updates**

- 6.1** The Tenant Satisfaction Measures requires all RPs of social housing to collect and report annually on their performance on a core set of defined measures to provide tenants with greater transparency about their landlord's performance. The data provided by the RPs must meet the methodology set by the regulator and be one submission for all stock rather than be broken down by borough. RPs have made their submission for 2023/24 in June 2024 awaiting regulator to publish the results in Autumn 2024.
- 6.2** As the current Asset Management subgroup Chair leaves her position at One Housing, the subgroup will be seeking to appoint a new chair to lead the group for the forthcoming year.

## **7 Equalities implications**

- 7.1** There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report. The measuring tools used to capture feedback such as texts survey's phone calls are carried out to all residents irrespective of their age, gender, status, social, economic, and ethnic background.

## **8 OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1** This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are either not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:

- Best Value Implications,
- Environmental (including air quality),
- Risk Management,
- Crime Reduction,
- Safeguarding.

- 8.2** There are no direct Best Value implications arising from these reports, although if performance is further improved for performance indicators 1, 2 and 3 which relate to repairs, this may lead to improvements in working practices that will in turn improve efficiency and potentially reduce costs for Social Landlords.

- 8.3** Another indirect Best Value Implication is a landlord's ability to ensure its general needs income target (rent collection) is achieved.

- 8.4** The percentage of properties with a valid gas safety certificate directly relates to health and safety risks to residents. It is important that statutory compliance of 100% is achieved, and that landlord performance in this area shows continued improvements.
- 8.5** The percentage of tall buildings (over 18m) owned RPs that have an up-to-date Fire Risk Assessments (FRA) in place also has a direct health and safety impact. It is a statutory requirement to ensure an FRA has been completed and is up to date.
- 8.6** There are no direct environmental implications arising from the report or recommendations.

## **9. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

- 9.1** There are no financial implications arising from this report which provides an update to the Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee on the performance of various providers of social housing (Social Landlords) that operate within the borough, including the Council's own housing stock.

## **10 COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

- 10.1** This report is recommending that the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Sub-Committee review the performance of individual Social Landlords during quarter 4 of 2023-2024.
- 10.2** Regeneration agency Homes England and the Regulator for Social Housing (RSH) focus their regulatory activity on governance, financial viability, and financial value for money as the basis for robust economic regulation. The objectives of the social housing regulator are set out in the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008.
- 10.3** The regulatory framework for social housing in England from the 1<sup>st</sup> of April 2005 is made up of: Regulatory requirements (i.e., what Social Landlords need to comply with); Codes of practice; and Regulatory guidance. There are nine (9) categories of regulatory requirements, and these are:
1. Regulatory standards – Economic (i.e., Governance and Financial Viability Standard; Value for Money Standard; and Rent Standard)
  2. Regulatory standards – Consumer (i.e., Tenant Involvement and Empowerment Standard; Home Standard; Tenancy Standard; and Neighbourhood and Community Standard)
  3. Registration requirements
  4. De-registration requirements
  5. Information submission requirements
  6. The accounting direction for social housing in England from April 2012
  7. Disposal Proceeds Fund requirements.
  8. Requirement to obtain regulator's consent to disposals.
  9. Requirement to obtain regulator's consent to changes to constitutions.

- 10.4** In addition to RSH regulation, there is a Performance Management Framework ('PMF') agreed with the Council which also reviews the performance of the Social Landlords in key customer facing areas. These are monitored cumulatively every three months against 8 key areas that are important to residents. This has a direct bearing on the Council's priority to ensure that Social Landlords are delivering effective services to their residents who are also, at the same time, residents in the local authority area. This provides re-assurance for the Council that the main Social Landlords in the Borough are delivering effective services to their residents.
- 10.5** The Council has no power to act against any Social Landlord (other than THH which it monitors already) but one of its Community Plan aspirations is for Tower Hamlets to be a place where people live in a quality affordable housing with a commitment to ensuring that more and better-quality homes are provided for the community. Social landlords (including local authorities) are regulated by the Regulator of Social Housing. The Regulator sets the standards which providers of social housing must meet. The regulatory framework includes regulatory requirements; codes of practice in relation to certain standards and regulatory guidance in relation to the requirements and how they will be regulated. The Regulator has enforcement powers in relation to consumer and economic standards; can carry out surveys and inspections of properties and can require a provider to prepare a performance improvement plan if certain conditions are not met or will not be met if no action is taken. The Regulator can also issue enforcement notices if a standard has been breached. The Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023 has also introduced new provisions to strengthen the respective roles of the Regulator and the Housing Ombudsman and improve the relationship between these bodies to ensure a more joined up approach to regulation and the handling of complaints.
- 10.6** The review of the Social Landlords performance though not a legal requirement fits in with the above Community Plan objective and the regulatory standards as stated above. The standards require Social Landlords to co-operate with relevant partners to help promote social, environmental, and economic wellbeing in the area where they own properties.
- 10.7** The review of housing matters affecting the area or the inhabitants in the borough fall within remit of the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Sub-Committee and are accordingly authorised by the Council's Constitution.

### **Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents**

#### **Linked Report**

- None

#### **Appendices**

- Quarter 4 2023/4 Register Provider Performance Detail

### **Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)**



**List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report.**

- None
  
- **Officer contact details for documents:** Mubin Choudhury – Performance Improvement Analyst (Strategy, Policy and Improvement)