

Non-Executive Report of the: Housing & Regen Sub Scrutiny Committee 19 th October 2021	
Report of Ann Sutcliffe, Corporate Director, Place Directorate, Corporate and Capital delivery.	Classification: Unrestricted
Social Housing Landlords Performance Report – (Quarter 1)	

Originating Officer(s)	Shalim Uddin Affordable Housing Coordinator
Wards affected	All wards

Executive Summary

Social Landlords in the borough produce quarterly performance data for key customer facing performance indicators so tenants and local residents can be assured they are delivering effective and customer focused services. The performance report attached at appendix 1 provides cumulative performance data from quarter one of the Social Landlords with homes in the borough.

Recommendations:

The Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee is recommended to:

1. 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 Chair of the Housing & Regeneration Sub Scrutiny Committee has requested the Social Landlord Performance be provided for every Scrutiny meeting held to oversee the KPI performance of RP's and is improvement can be made to specific areas of delivery such as repair response times and resident complaint satisfaction levels.

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 registered providers who manage social rented stock in the borough.

THHF through its Performance Management Framework has agreed a set of key performance indicators (KPI's); to review and assess performance and drive performance improvements through the THHF Benchmarking sub-group. Quarterly performance information is presented to the Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing along with the Housing scrutiny Sub Committee for information. Good performance is an indicator of quality housing management and supports the Council in ensuring the borough is one that residents are proud of and love to live in whilst also support delivery of partnership priorities.

3.2 Each Registered Provider (RP) has its own governance arrangements for the scrutiny of performance and service delivery to residents. Targets for each service area are set at RP level by their respective Boards and Committees and the performance in the quarterly reports is scrutinised through their governance structures.

3.3 Cumulative performance information on the agreed list of measures below is attached at appendix 1.:

- Number of stage 1 complaints received
- Percentage of complaints responded to within target time
- Number of stage 2 complaints received
- Number of ME/MP enquiries received
- Total number of re-lets
- Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)
- Average re-let time in days (major works units, including time spent in works)
- Number of units vacant but unavailable for letting at period end
- Total number of emergency repairs completed year-to-date
- Total number of non-emergency repairs completed year-to-date
- Number of repairs appointments made
- Number of repairs appointments kept
- Satisfaction with repairs
- The number of properties which had their gas safety record renewed by their anniversary date.
- FRA on percentage of buildings over 18 metres
- General needs Stock figure.

3.4 Appendix 1 outlines cumulative performance for quarter one, five of the fourteen key registered providers who operate in the borough can produce borough specific data. These being Gateway, Poplar HARCA, Tower Hamlets Homes, Tower Hamlets Community Homes and Spitalfields. This is currently not possible for the remaining Rps as they hold housing stock on a regional /national scale. In such instances, the landlords are requested to manipulate data captured to provide the most accurate figure possible in relation to the borough.

3.5 The Benchmarking subgroup have concluded finalising the KPI questions and created the KPI handbook. The next task on the agenda is for the group to decide as a collective what the minimum levels of acceptable performance /

targets per KPI. The group and RP's will need to state any targets they have set for the KPI's for their organisations in number or percentage format. This will in turn ensure all RPs set a benchmark they all agree to try and achieve, and assist the H&RSSC to establish which RP has met, exceeded, or failed to reach targets.

- 3.6** Furthermore, the subgroup will decide on the parameters for each KPI and how this is reflected in terms of colour grade and key for the KPI returns. Therefore, once collated it will be clear to ascertain which RP has met or exceeded targets and which RP's have unfortunately not been able to do so. In addition, RP's will decide how to RAG rate the performance therefore making it clear for the Sub scrutiny committee to digest the information with ease and clarity.
- 3.7** The table below displays the KPI's and in what format the RP has been asked to report back on. As previously mentioned during Sub Scrutiny Meetings, within the old format RP's were reporting percentages this meant smaller stock RPs often looked to be achieving very high levels in comparison to their counterparts that held larger stock. The group have decided to use a combination of percentages and numbers to capture data. This in turn will be used to base discussions within the subgroup and encourage RP's to share good practice and lessons learned with one another. An example of this would be KPI's 11 and 12, these KPI's were changed from percentages to numbers in order to make sure RPs of large and smaller stock sizes were measured as equally as possible. For example, Eastend Homes appointments made was 1,573 of kept reported at 1,550 therefore, 23 appointments missed this would translate as 98%. THCH made 681 appointments and kept 669 thus 12 being missed, also translates as 98%. THCH appear to have the same percentage outcome, however, does not take into account Eastend Homes had 892 more appointments for the quarter. The subgroup wanted to highlight in number format how many exactly were made, kept, or missed. However, rest-assured the statistics provided to the residents will for obvious reasons be published in percentage format in order for residents to tangibly highlight how RP's have performed against previous years or quarters performance.
- 3.8** The Benchmarking subgroup will be applying for THHF funding to have a consultant or commission a student to carry out a piece of work analysing the KPI data collected. Pending funding approval, the group envisage this piece of work will help to analyse data in depth and identify more detailed ways of improving and capturing data helping RP's offer a better service to residents / tenants.

<u>Code</u>	<u>KPI Component</u>	<u>Detail</u>
1.	Number of stage 1 complaints received	Number
2.	Percentage of complaints responded to within target time	%
3.	Number of stage 2 complaints received	Number
4.	Number of ME/MP enquiries received	Number

5.	Total number of re-lets	Number
6.	Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	Number
7.	Average re-let time in days (minor and major works units, including time spent in works)	Number
8.	Number of units vacant but unavailable for letting at period end	Number
9.	Total number of emergency repairs completed year-to-date	Number
10.	Total number of non-emergency repairs completed year-to-date	Number
11.	Number of repairs appointments made	Number
12.	Number of repairs appointments kept	Number
13.	Customer Satisfaction with repairs as a % of completed repairs	%
14.	The percentage of properties with LGSR	%
15.	Percentage of FRAs for buildings over 18 metres	%

3.9 With regards to quarter four some key points to note are:

- 3.10** Southern HA received 615 stage one complaints making them the highest figure with a LBTH stock size of 1159. Tower Hamlets Homes received 390 complaints with stock size of 11,465. THH managed to respond to 100% of the complaints whilst Southern managed to respond to 94.84% of the 615 they received. In addition, Peabody received 22 stage one complaints however, only managed to respond to 36% of these within target which was the lowest figure out of all RP's.
- 3.11** Clarion and Tower Hamlets Homes had the highest number of ME and MP enquires received. Clarion received a 150 whilst THH received 353. Clarion are currently unable to report on KPI's 6,7 and 8 due to problems with their core reporting system and having to make changes. They hope to be able to capture and report on these KPI's once system changes have been made.
- 3.12** In terms of total number of relets Southern Housing had the highest figure with 320 however, their standard relet time for properties was only 32 days compared to the highest figure 114 achieved by Providence Row.
- 3.13** The highest total number of vacant and unavailable units was from Southern HA, Southern had 100 units which were not fit to be let. Spitalfields and Providence Row had the lowest with 2 for Spitalfields and none for Providence Row.

3.14 Some positive notes for the report were:

3.15 Providence Row managed to obtain 97% in repair satisfaction results and also had one of the faster re-let turnaround times of only 3 days for general needs. They also had the lowest figure of stage one complaints received with only 3 for the quarter.

3.16 Spitalfields only had two stage one complaints for the quarter and 2 properties which were not available for let.

3.17 Tower Hamlets Homes and Poplar Harca had the highest figure of non-emergency repairs completed year to date.

- Tower Hamlets Homes =11,725
- Poplar Harca=£3,932
- Taking into consideration the backlog of repairs created by Covid and many outstanding jobs which had accumulated with all RP's resorting to an emergency repair service only for majority of the year.

3.18 The THHF 2020-2021 Annual Report has been completed and published with virtual copies sent out to the council and stakeholders. A copy of the been published on the Members bulletin for the perusal of all Councillors. Furthermore, the THHF forum has been supportive in the production of the new Intermediate Housing Register set up by the council.

3.19 With fire safety being of salient issue RP's are in the process of setting up workshops with council members regarding fire safety. The first session has already taken place on the 28th of September with 8 members in attendance with another session due to take place on the 21st of October. These workshops will be a general presentation on collective high-level approaches and then breakouts for each RP with relevant councillors for further discussion on RP specific approaches. The workshop/s and discussions will cover the following topics below.

1. Information on Fire Risk Assessments
2. Dealing with obstructions in shared areas
3. Engaging with residents
4. Likely impacts of upcoming forthcoming legislation

4. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

4.1 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.

5. OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

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

5.4 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.

5.5 The percentage of tall buildings (over 18m) owned by Registered Providers 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.

5.6 There are no direct environmental implications arising from the report or recommendations.

6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

6.1 This report 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. This includes the comparative data for Tower Hamlets Homes which manages the Council's housing stock. There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report.

7. COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES

7.1 This report is recommending that the Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee review the performance of individual Social Landlords during 20-21.

7.2 Regeneration agency Homes England and the Regulator for Social Housing (RSH) focus of their regulatory activity is 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.

7.3 The regulatory framework for social housing in England from the 1st 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

7.4 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.

7.5 The Council has very limited 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.

7.6 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.

The review of housing matters affecting the area or the inhabitants in the borough fall within remit of the Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee and accordingly authorised by the Council's Constitution.

Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

Linked Report

- None

Appendices

- Social Housing Landlords Performance KPI Sheet Quarter One 2021-22
- Supporting commentary and explanations from social landlords accompanying their KPI submissions.
- RP QTR1 Performance Graphs
- KPI 12/13 % conversion table.

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:

- Shalim Uddin RP Coordinator