

Non-Executive Report of the: <b>Housing &amp; Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee</b> 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2023	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of.</b> Paul Patterson Interim Corporate Director Housing and Regeneration	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
Social Housing Landlords Performance Report – Q2 2023	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Shalim Uddin- Partnerships Officer (Strategy, Policy and Improvement - Housing and Regeneration)  Mubin Choudhury - Data Analyst (Strategy, Policy and Improvement - Housing and Regeneration)
<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 quarters one and two 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 registered providers who manage social rented stock in the borough. Six monthly 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 the first and second quarters 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. 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.

<b><u>Indicator</u></b>	<b><u>Format captured</u></b>
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.
- 3.7** While the sector is gradually adjusting to the TSM reporting procedures, forum members are undergoing an experimental phase of data collection in advance of their first annual submission to the Housing Regulator (published in the autumn of 2024).
- 3.8** For RPs, repairs remain a challenge, with eight reaching 86% or less for the specified repair timetable or times. As previously stated in the report, lift inspections provide additional challenges for the RPs with the sparsity of some components significantly extending the repair duration. Nonetheless RPs continue to perform well in areas of carrying out regulatory safety checks upon properties such as Gas and Fire safety. Moreover, the RPs work to guarantee that a greater proportion of their properties adhere to the Decent Homes Standards. The RPs will continue to monitor property SAP ratings collectively and will continue to oversee and monitor stock condition surveys through the Asset Management subgroup.

Please see below quarter 1 and 2 observations for the committee's oversight.

#### **4. Quarter 1 & 2 items for observation**

##### Decent Homes and Repairs

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

All homes managed by Providence Row, Poplar HARCA, and Spitalfields meet the decent home standards. Furthermore, Peabody reported 0.05% homes as non-decent. Notable improvement in the number of non-decent

homes from Q1 to Q2 are seen for Notting Hill Genesis and One Housing Riverside.

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

At the end of Q2, 1045 complaints were received by all RPs. The number of complaints received by London and the Quadrant increased by 22 from 17 in Q1 to 39 in Q2. In Q2, Swan Housing received 77 complaints, up from 61 in QTR 1. The number of complaints received by One Housing Riverside and Gateway decreased from 163 in Q1 to 144.

#### **4.3 Emergency repairs.**

In Q2, Peabody Housing had the lowest percentage of emergency repairs completed within the allotted period (47%), followed by Tower Hamlets Homes (77%), One Housing (80%), and Tower Hamlets Homes (77%). RPs did not include any commentary with their figures. Ninety percent of emergency repairs were accomplished and finished on schedule on average.

#### Relets/ Voids and vacant units.

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

London and Quadrant had the highest figure with 269 days for average relet time with Clarion also achieving a lengthy time for 180 days for standard relets for Q2. L&Q also had a high figure for Q1 for standard relets at 287.

#### **4.5 Major works**

L&Q had the highest Q2 and Q1 figures, 487 and 316, respectively. RPs averaged 97 days in Q2 and 75 days in Q1.

#### **4.6 Vacant units**

THH had the highest percentage in both Q2 and Q1, coming in at 120 and 174, respectively. In Q2, One Housing Riverside had the second-highest number of vacant units, at 52. Overall RPs averaged about 20 unoccupied units over the quarter.

#### Safety Checks.

#### **4.7 Water Checks**

Four RPs were not able to complete water safety inspections with 100% compliance. THH had the lowest percentage in both Q2 (69%), and Q1 (44%). Furthermore, two more RPs attained 99%, while L&Q did not submit any data for Q2. 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 RPs 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. Collectively, 97% was attained on average.

#### **4.7 Lift checks.**

At 67% completion rate of lift inspections, THH had the lowest percentage. While three other RPs scored 84,92, and 98%, eight RPs attained a perfect

score of 100%. **Gas safety** Eight RPs managed to achieve a 100% with a following three RPs achieving 99%. Eastend Homes failed to submit the required data within the deadline. Furthermore, One Housing failed to provide any supplementary comments and reasons as to why their figure (92%) was the lowest compared to the other RPs.

#### **4.8 Fire Safety Risk Assessments**

Nine RPs succeeded in reaching the goal of 100%, while Peabody, One Housing, reached 99%. For Q2, Clarion had the lowest percentage 98% but did not offer an explanation or analysis of why the percentage was so low. No comparison with Q2 could be made since Clarion did not submit the necessary data for Q1.

#### **4.10 ASB cases**

Tower Hamlets Homes had the greatest ASB cases, with 208 for Q2 and 363 for Q1. The second highest number of ASB cases reported to Poplar HARCA was 171 in Q2 and 141 in Q1. According to Poplar HARCA, all tenures are included in the statistics, and they were unable to distinguish between hate crimes. 42 ASB instances were received by Clarion for Q2, However, no comparison could be made because Clarion did not submit ASB stats for Q1. Whilst Tower Hamlets Homes and Poplar HARCA may have had the highest reported figures for the quarter, this does not always indicate inadequate performance or high ASB levels on their estates. Rather, it can also indicate residents' trust in their RP to take action and find solutions to the ASB being caused. Conversely, low reporting numbers may also indicate residents' frustration and reluctance to report cases because they believe the RP will not take proactive measures to resolve the issues.

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

#### **5.1 ASB**

On average 38 ASB cases were received for Q2 and 69 for Q1 thus a considerable improvement in the second quarter with majority RP's having less ASB cases reported. For all RPs that reported ASB cases in both Q1 and Q2 except for London and Quadrant, there is a notable reduction, with Tower Hamlets Homes down to 208 from 363.

#### **5.2 Repairs**

Swan and Tower Hamlets Community Housing completed all emergency repairs within the allotted period, followed by Poplar HARCA at 99% completion rate. Five RPs achieved above 90% for non-emergency repairs. On average RP's managed to achieve a total of 87% compared to the 69% average figure for Q1.

#### **5.3 Safety Checks**

Nine RPs achieved a 100% on the KPI of water checks which overall meant a higher average of 97% then the previous quarter figure of 83%. The same also applied to lift checks which on average was an improved overall total figure with RPs achieving 95% in Q2 instead of the average of 75% in Q1.

#### 5.4 Asbestos management

Witnessed an improvement since the previous quarter one figure with RP's achieving on average a 100% compared to 88% for Q1.

#### 5.5 Number of units vacant but not available for let.

On average 20 days was achieved by RPs with nine landlords managing to relet properties back out under 20 days ten-day improvement compared to the average of 30 days for quarter one.

### 6. General updates

6.1 The Tenant Satisfaction Measures requires all registered providers 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 information must meet the regulator's requirements as set out in Tenant Satisfaction Measures. Currently RPs are in the process of collating the measures for their first submission to the regulator who will thereon publish the results in Autumn 2024. The THHF partners will submit data as shown in the above indicator table (3.5) for the interim to the council and scrutiny board.

6.2 Please refer to the list below for the TSM questions that the Regulator of Social Housing will be posing to all RPs as of April 2023.

<b>TSM Questions</b>	<b>Measured via</b>
Overall satisfaction	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction with repairs	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction with time taken to complete most recent repair	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction that the home is well-maintained	Tenant perception survey
Homes that do not meet the Decent Homes Standard	Landlords' management information
Repairs completed within target timescale	Landlords' management information
Satisfaction that the home is safe	Tenant perception survey
Gas safety checks	Landlords' management information
Fire safety checks	Landlords' management information
Asbestos safety checks	Landlords' management information
Water safety checks	Landlords' management information
Lift safety checks	Landlords' management information
Satisfaction that the landlord listens to tenant views and acts upon them	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction that the landlord keeps tenants informed about things that matter to them	Tenant perception survey
Agreement that the landlord treats tenants fairly and with respect	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction with the landlord's approach to handling of complaints	Tenant perception survey
Complaints relative to the size of the landlord	Landlords' management information

Complaints responded to within Complaint Handling Code timescales	Landlords' management information
Satisfaction that the landlord keeps communal areas clean and well-maintained	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction that the landlord makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods	Tenant perception survey
Satisfaction with the landlord's approach to handling anti-social behaviour	Landlords' management information
Anti-social behaviour cases relative to the size of the landlord	Landlords' management information

### 6.3 Condensation, Damp and Mould

As part of its action plan, the Asset Management subgroup has made monitoring CDM levels a top focus. Additionally, each RP will share and recommend novel approaches or innovations that they are testing and that seem to be working to assist other partners more broadly. The subgroup keeps an eye on SAP ratings as well, with a particular emphasis on the stock's EPC rating.

#### Subgroups

- 6.4** Following retirement of the subgroup Chair and their role in Eastend Homes, the Common Housing Register will be appointing a new chair imminently.
- 6.5** Following the merging of Sanctuary and Swan Housing, Communities—previously known as the CIN subgroup—will also name a new Chair. Given that the incumbent chair is unsure about their future and role for the time being.
- 6.6** As current Chair Susan Hanlon leaves her position at One Housing, the Asset Management subgroup will also be selecting a new chair.

## 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 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.
- 8.6** There are no direct environmental implications arising from the report or recommendations.

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

- 9.1** 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 this report. All current costs associated with monitoring of the performance of social landlords are contained within existing budget provision.

## **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 Q2 & Q3 of 2022-2023.
- 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.

**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**

- Q2 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:**

- Shalim Uddin- Partnerships Officer (Strategy, Policy, and Improvement - Housing and Regeneration)
- Mubin Choudhury - Data Analyst (Strategy, Policy, and Improvement - Housing and Regeneration)