



AGENDA FOR THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee are summoned to Committee Room 5, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on, **26 January 2016 at 7.30 pm.**

John Lynch
Head of Democratic Services

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 020 7527 3308
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 18 January 2016

Membership 2015/16

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan (Chair)
Councillor Dave Poyser (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Raphael Andrews
Councillor Alex Diner
Councillor Aysegul Erdogan
Councillor Una O'Halloran
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche MBE
Councillor Flora Williamson
Rose Marie McDonald (PFI Managed Tenants)
Jim Rooke (Directly Managed Tenants)

Substitute Members

Councillor Gary Heather
Councillor Olly Parker
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Gary Doolan
Councillor Rakhia Ismail
Councillor Jenny Kay
Councillor Angela Picknell
Councillor Nurullah Turan

Quorum: is 4 Councillors



A. Formal Matters

Page

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declaration of Substitute Members
3. Declarations of Interests

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest*** in an item of business:

- if it is not yet on the council's register, you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent;
- you may **choose** to declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is already in the register in the interests of openness and transparency.

In both the above cases, you **must** leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If you have a **personal** interest in an item of business **and** you intend to speak or vote on the item you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent but you **may** participate in the discussion and vote on the item.

***(a) Employment, etc** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.

(b) Sponsorship - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of your expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of your election; including from a trade union.

(c) Contracts - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between you or your partner (or a body in which one of you has a beneficial interest) and the council.

(d) Land - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.

(e) Licences- Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.

(f) Corporate tenancies - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which you or your partner have a beneficial interest.

(g) Securities - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

This applies to **all** members present at the meeting.

4. Minutes of Previous meeting
5. Chair's Report
6. Order of Business
7. Public Questions

1 - 8

B.	Scrutiny Items	Page
1.	Capital Programming: Witness Evidence and Draft Recommendations	9 - 10
2.	Responsive Repairs: Witness Evidence	11 - 24
3.	Executive Member Presentation	
4.	2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey Results	25 - 38

C. Urgent Non Exempt Matters

Any non- exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgently by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

D. Exclusion of Public and Press

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the remaining items on the agenda, any of them are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt or confidential information within the terms of the Access to Information Procedure rules in the Constitution and if so, whether to exclude the Public and Press during discussion thereof.

E. Exempt Reports (if any)

The next meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee will be on 29 February 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

London Borough of Islington

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 16 November 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 16 November 2015 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** O'Sullivan (Chair), Poyser (Vice-Chair), Andrews, O'Halloran, and Williamson.

Co-opted members: Rose-Marie McDonald and Jim Rooke.

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan in the Chair

128 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alex Diner, Aysegul Erdogan and Mouna Hamitouche MBE.

129 **DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)**

None.

130 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Item A3)**

None.

131 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

132 **CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A5)**

The Chair advised that representatives of the council's capital works contractors had been due to provide witness evidence at the meeting; however this had been deferred to the January 2016 meeting. It was noted that the January meeting would be the last opportunity to consider capital programming witness evidence before the Committee considered its recommendations.

It was advised that a meeting for Circle 33 tenants would be held in the Town Hall on 25 November 2015. The Chair explained the ongoing problems with the housing association's repairs service, and all members of the Committee and Circle 33 tenants and leaseholders were invited to attend the meeting.

The Chair advised of the annual Homes exhibition and seminar at Olympia on 16 and 17 November 2015.

133 **ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A6)**

The Chair outlined the procedure for public questions and the filming and recording of meetings.

It was agreed that public questions would be invited following the Committee's consideration of each item, and any further public questions would then be invited before the conclusion of the meeting.

134 **SERVICE REVIEW GROUP: LEARNING FROM AND RESPONDING TO COMPLAINTS (Item B1)**

Jim Rooke presented the report which set out the recommendations of the Service Review Group on how the housing service should learn from and respond to complaints.

The Committee noted the findings and methodology of the review. A discussion was had during which the following main points were made:

- The review found the quality of response to be inconsistent, with some responses lacking empathy, and some written responses not adhering to a consistent format.
- The review found that in most cases learning from complaints had been applied, however further work was required to improve the consistency of response.
- The Committee was encouraged by the reduction in the number of complaints and the number of upheld complaints.
- The Committee noted the findings of the Service Review Group's mystery shopping exercise, which found the majority of responses to be courteous, however some responses did not provide all of the required information. Members commented that this reflected their own experiences of the council's housing service.
- The Committee acknowledged the hard work of officers in responding to resident enquiries.
- The Committee queried if the Service Review Group considered the level of compensation payable by the housing service to be appropriate. It was advised that compensation levels varied from £20 to £70 depending on the circumstances of the complaint, however the Service Review Group had not formed an opinion on the appropriateness of the sums payable. It was requested that further details of compensation arrangements, including the average amount paid, be circulated to the Committee. Dr Brian Potter, Chair of the Islington Leaseholder's Association, also requested a copy of the compensation data.
- A member of the public noted that the council's target response time for responding to complaints was 21 days, commenting that other local authorities had a more challenging target. It was advised that the Service Review Group had recommended that complainants should be provided with an update if their complaint was not resolved within 10 days.

The Committee thanked Jim Rooke and the Service Review Group for carrying out the comprehensive review.

RESOLVED:

That the recommendations of the Service Review Group be received.

135 **UPDATE ON PFI PERFORMANCE: REPORT AND PRESENTATION FROM PARTNERS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN ISLINGTON (Item B2)**

Sharon Pearce, Managing Director of Partners for Improvement in Islington, introduced the report and made a presentation, copy interleaved, which provided an update on the organisation's performance. A number of other Partners representatives were also present.

A discussion was had during which the following main points were made:

- Partners managed around 6,500 street properties on behalf of the council through two long-term contracts. The organisation had completed major refurbishment works to ensure that the properties met the Decent Homes standard and was now responsible for the ongoing management and maintenance of the properties.
- It was explained that a number of the organisation's services were delivered through sub-contractors. Rydon was responsible for maintenance, major repairs and cyclical

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 16 November 2015

work; Hyde was responsible for tenancy and leasehold management; and United Living was responsible for capital works and gas and heating maintenance.

- The Committee noted the latest key performance indicator data, which indicated that the percentage of repairs completed within timescales, and tenant satisfaction with repairs, was better than the contractual target. All indicators suggested a high level of performance.
- It was advised that the organisation previously had a backlog of major repairs; however this had been cleared following a revision of processes and the introduction of new staff.
- Independent inspections of responsive and major repair works had found that 94% of repairs met the required quality standard.
- It was advised that the organisation's cyclical works programme operated on a geographic basis. Following the 2014 cycle the organisation had improved its processes to make the programme more effective.
- The organisation had maintained rent collection rates at between 99-100% and the average re-let time was between 12 and 16 days, below the target of 27 days.
- Partners was concerned by the results of a recent leaseholder satisfaction survey which identified dissatisfaction with major repairs and billing processes. The organisation was making changes as a result of the findings and hoped for improved leaseholder satisfaction as a result.
- Partners had created a new central complaints team. It was reported that since the introduction of the team, Partners had experienced a reduction in complaints and upheld complaints, and an increase in consistency of response. In particular, it was noted that fewer complaints relating to roofing and major works were being received.
- The Committee expressed surprise at the reported levels of performance, commenting that the performance indicators did not match the information provided to councillors by local residents.
- In response to a query on methods of data collection, it was advised that repairs performance was assessed monthly by ORS, an independent research organisation that contacted a sample of residents by telephone. To compile repairs satisfaction data, ORS was provided with a list of residents whose homes recently required repair and surveyed a minimum of 10% of these residents. The Committee commented that it would be helpful to compare performance levels against historic data.
- It was noted that Partners' performance indicators were audited both independently and by the council.
- The Committee queried if a comparison between Partners' key performance indicators and the council's own performance could be provided.
- It was commented that the response times to member enquiries had significantly improved in recent years.
- The Committee queried how Partners was working with leaseholders to improve billing arrangements. It was advised that, following feedback from leaseholders, Partners had sought the expertise of Hyde's home ownership team in January 2015 to improve its service. Partners was committed to improving the quality and accuracy of its service charge bills, however explained that improvements to this service would take some time to come to fruition. It was requested that figures relating to the number of leaseholder complaints and how many bills had been contested be reported to the Committee.
- It was queried how the Government's proposed Housing Bill would impact on Partners, and in particular how the requirement for the council to sell its most expensive properties would impact on Partners' business plan. In response, it was advised that there was a contractual mechanism which required the council to compensate Partners for the lost income arising from taking properties out of the contract.

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 16 November 2015

- Partners had its own roofing team which was supplemented by sub-contractors when required. The roofing team was achieving the performance targets set out in the contracts.
- A Partners leaseholder advised of a particular service charge billing issue where the scope of works had changed and cost of the works had almost doubled from the estimate issued in the Section 20 notice. The leaseholder suggested that it would be helpful for repairs to be photographed before and after works to demonstrate the necessity and quality of the works. In response it was advised that Rydon staff scrutinised the value and extent of all bills before they were issued and, although some variation was to be expected, some further work with staff may be required in this area.
- A member of the public queried Partners' repair satisfaction levels, advising of instances where an independent surveyor found Partners' maintenance and repair work to be deficient. In response it was commented that cyclical works, such as painting, did not fall within the scope of the repairs satisfaction performance indicator, which measured responsive repairs.
- A member of the public queried Partners' performance indicator methodology. It was advised that their roof had required repair ten times within six years and, although each individual repair had been carried out within agreed timescales, the fact that repeated repairs were required suggested that the repairs were not carried out successfully. It was suggested that there was no way of recognising such issues within the agreed performance indicator framework. Partners noted that they were making service improvements and considering component lifecycles and repair histories when assessing the need for works. It was recognised that in some instances replacements were more appropriate than repairs.
- Following a question from Dr Brian Potter of the Islington Leaseholders Association, it was advised that Partners employed four surveyors for cyclical works, three for major repairs, a dedicated roof supervisor and team, and two surveyors to investigate leaseholder challenges. It was noted that all were technically trained, although Partners did not insist on a RICS qualification. Dr Potter invited representatives of Partners to attend the next meeting of the Islington Leaseholders Association.
- It was commented that the Partners tenant and leaseholder forum used to consider regular performance reports, however this had been disbanded. It was advised that, although Partners' resident scrutiny arrangements had been revised, an open forum was held which could consider performance matters.
- Members of the public raised several issues specific to their homes and experiences of Partners, which included roofing, scaffolding, complaints handling, compensation arrangements, guarantees, billing leaseholders before works had been completed, and the use of sub-contractors.
- Partners clarified that the multiple sub-letting of repairs contracts did not occur and all Partners contractors were vetted and required to demonstrate technical competency.
- Following a question, it was advised that Partners had considered minimising the use of scaffolding and making use of alternative work platforms and technologies, however scaffolding was almost always required to access the rear of street properties.

The Committee thanked Sharon Pearce and her colleagues for attending the meeting.

136

CAPITAL PROGRAMMING: WITNESS EVIDENCE (Item B3)

Damian Dempsey, Group Leader – Quantity Surveyors, presented evidence on building inflation data, which provided further explanation of the evidence considered at the previous meetings.

The following main points were noted during the discussion:

- Following a query on wage increases contributing to significant building inflation in 2014, it was advised that this included wage increases at all levels in the building trade, not only at operative level. The Committee noted that many operatives had only received a modest wage increase, if at all, in recent years.
- The Committee noted that inflationary increases in the building market were significantly higher than those set out in the council's capital works contracts, and expressed concern that the cost of capital works would significantly increase when the council's current contracts were due for renewal.
- Dr Brian Potter of the Islington Leaseholders Association queried to what extent the capital programme schedules of rates were affected by inflationary increases, and in particular the suggestion by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors that tender prices were expected to increase by 28% over the next five years. In response, it was clarified that the schedules of rates were fixed for the duration of the contracts, aside from the contractual RPI inflationary increases, however inflation would have an impact when the capital works contracts were re-tendered in future.
- Contractors were required to submit tender bids against a national schedule of rates. Due to competitive tendering practices it was not expected that contractors would apply a blanket percentage increase to their schedules of rates when the capital works contracts were re-tendered.
- Officers confirmed that leaseholders were able to visit the council's offices to view the schedule of rates related to the capital works carried out to their own property.*

The Committee thanked Damian Dempsey for his attendance.

It was noted that John Sweeney of the UCATT trade union had been invited to give evidence however was unable to attend the meeting.

The Committee noted that the Islington Leaseholders Association had circulated a report on capital programming and it was commented that this would be considered as witness evidence at the next meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the witness evidence be noted.

137

UPDATE ON THE HOUSING BILL (Item B4)

Maxine Holdsworth, Service Director for Housing Needs and Strategy, made a presentation, copy interleaved, on changes to housing legislation proposed through the Housing and Planning Bill and the Welfare and Work Bill, and the possible implications for Islington.

The following main points were noted during the discussion:

- The extension of Right to Buy to housing association tenants was to be financed by the sale of high value council-owned properties. Whilst Right to Buy was popular with tenants, the council was opposed to the financing mechanism which disadvantaged local authorities.
- London boroughs were lobbying the government to earmark Right to Buy sales receipts for housing investment in the borough or region they originated from. This would ensure that housing associations reinvested capital receipts into meeting London's housing need.
- Councils were to be required to sell high value properties when they became vacant and return the proceeds to central government. Due to the very high property prices

in the borough, it was thought that transferring the council's housing stock to private ownership could alter the social mix of the borough.

- It was estimated that the council would be required to sell 300 properties per year; the London boroughs of Islington and Camden were expected to be the two areas most affected by the scheme due to the high numbers of valuable council-owned homes. Islington had previously agreed to retain the ownership of its high-value street properties, whereas other boroughs had transferred the ownership of their most valuable properties to other organisations.
- There were 26,000 council owned properties in Islington, with 40% of the population living in social housing. The council had a considerable housing waiting list and 900 people living in temporary accommodation. Officers were concerned that the sale of high-value properties would increase the difficulty of housing families with several children requiring multiple bedrooms. It was suggested that the mandatory sale of properties could decrease council lettings by up to a third.
- The Committee considered the impact of starter homes being offered to first time buyers at a 20% discount. Although it was acknowledged that this would help first time buyers, it was expected that developers would be able to provide starter homes in lieu of social housing, without any corresponding Section 106 contribution. As the council required developers to provide 50% social housing or shared ownership in new developments, it was thought that the scheme could reduce the number of new affordable homes developed in the borough.
- 'Pay to Stay' would require households earning over £40,000 to pay market rent on their council or housing association property. It was thought that 9% of households in Islington would be affected by the legislation and, whilst housing associations would be permitted to retain the additional income, all additional income received by local authorities would be returned to the Treasury. London boroughs were lobbying the Government to raise the income threshold to £71,000 in London, the same as the Local Housing Allowance level. It was also noted that housing providers did not routinely collect data on household incomes and there would be an administrative cost to collect the data.
- The Committee noted the implications of the 1% annual reduction in social rents over the next four years as set out in the Welfare and Work Bill. Officers explained that the council did not yet charge target rent on all properties and the council's 30 year housing business plan was predicated on gradual rent increases and re-letting at target rent. As a result the 1% annual decrease was expected to have significant financial implications, with the council losing £15 million income over the next four years, or one fifth of the Housing service's controllable budget. It was noted that a large proportion of the Housing service's budget was on costs the service could not control, such as repaying debt on council developments.
- The Committee commented on the reduction in the benefit cap for non-working families from £26,000 to £23,000. This was expected to have a significant impact on some council tenants and it was thought that this would increase the demand for discretionary housing payments and reduce levels of rent recovery.
- The Committee expressed concern at the proposed Pay to Stay legislation, and cited examples of tenants with a household income of over £40,000 who earned considerably less when they moved into their properties many years ago. It was commented that market rent in Islington was excessively high. It was thought that £40,000 was not a high family income inside London and it was reported that some tenants had considered giving up employment to ensure they could afford to remain in their family home. It was suggested that the Government would not intend for the policy to act as a disincentive to employment, and such issues required further consideration by the Government.
- As the council's most valuable properties were street properties managed by Partners for Improvement in Islington, the Committee highlighted the additional issue

of the council being required to compensate Partners for any properties sold, while also forfeiting the capital receipts from the sales to central government and losing an asset which would otherwise be used to alleviate housing need in the borough. It was hoped that the Government would grant local authorities flexibility in regards to their property sales.

- The Committee noted the new local authority duties and powers proposed to be introduced as part of the Pay to Stay legislation; the duty to require income details as a condition of tenancy, the power to charge market rent if no income details were provided, and the power to check employment information with HMRC.
- It was noted that London boroughs of all political-makeups had expressed concern at the proposed legislation. It was advised that the Government was currently consulting on the plans.
- Officers advised of the proposed £450,000 cap on the price of starter homes and speculated that there would be relatively few starter homes built within Islington due to land values. It was suggested that greater numbers of starter homes would be developed in outer London boroughs.
- It was confirmed that the proposed 'Pay to Stay' £40,000 household income threshold did not take into account household expenditure, such as student debt.
- It was commented that housing associations often had mortgage debt on their properties and any Right to Buy receipts would first need to be spent paying back lenders, as opposed to investing all capital receipts in new development.
- The Committee considered the possible demographic changes arising from the legislation, and how this could potentially affect employment to lower paid jobs inside London.
- A member of the public queried if leaseholders would receive priority for buying the freehold of adjoining properties if the council was required to sell them. It was advised that the council was awaiting the finer details of the scheme.

The Committee thanked Maxine Holdsworth for her attendance.

138 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A7)

A member of the public advised of noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour affecting her local area and queried why the council would not enforce conditions of tenancy and lease covenants on problematic neighbours.

In response, Maxine Holdsworth, Service Director for Housing Needs and Strategy, advised that while she could not comment on specific issues, counter-complaints were often submitted in such instances and the council had a responsibility to consider both sides of neighbour disputes. It was confirmed that the council did enforce conditions of tenancy and lease covenants if there was a breach, however these situations were often complicated and substantial evidence was required before action was taken.

The Chair advised that it may be appropriate to discuss specific issues with the relevant Executive Member. It was suggested that the Committee could consider scrutinising how the council handles housing-related noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour complaints in 2016/17.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

CHAIR

****Note further to minute 136***

At the meeting officers advised that leaseholders were able to visit the council's offices to view the schedule of rates related to the capital works carried out to their own property.

However, since the meeting, officers have advised this statement was made in error. The schedule of rates is a commercially sensitive document and the council is contractually obliged not to divulge its details. Officers are developing proposals to assist leaseholders with their understanding of their bills without the need to directly disclose the schedule of rates.

As a result, the offer to leaseholders to visit the offices to inspect the rates used in the calculation of their Section 22 bill is no longer available. Officers have offered a full apology for this oversight.

Agenda Item B1

Housing Scrutiny Committee 2015/16

Capital Programming – Witness Evidence Plan

Aim: To investigate how contractors are selected; to look at opportunities for using local labour; to explore who determines what works are undertaken.

7 September 2015		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Damian Dempsey, Group Leader, Quantity Surveyors – Report / Presentation	Report providing introductory information on several areas set out in the SID.	To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the different types of work carried out, how capital works contractors are procured, the roles of the council acting as a client and a delivery team, how works are communicated to tenants and leaseholders, the overall costs of the service.
Guarantee policies and other written evidence	Providing information on the guarantees received on capital works, roofs, windows, cavity wall insulation, etc.	
Key performance indicator data	To provide the Committee with the latest performance indicator data; to discuss the usefulness of this data; and to consider how the performance of the service can be best evaluated.	To include the known levels of local employment used by the capital works contractors, in accordance with SID.

8 October 2015		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Tenants and leaseholders	To inform the Committee of their views on capital programming. In particular, how works are planned, prioritised and communicated.	The views of tenants and leaseholders to be received through – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents' Improvement Taskforce Major Works Consultation (January 2014) and up-to-date action plan. Results of major works telephone survey (September 2015). Summaries of ward councillor case work.
Ward councillors		
Andrew Hunter, Programme Manager (Housing Investment) and Aiden Stapleton, Consultation & Asset Manager – Report / Presentation	To advise the Committee on how the Council's housing assets are managed and how capital works are planned and prioritised.	

Updated key performance indicator data	To provide the Committee with the updated performance indicator data; to discuss the usefulness of this data; and to consider how the performance of the service can be best evaluated.	To include the known levels of local employment used by the capital works contractors, in accordance with SID.
Building inflation data	To provide a general overview of inflation in the building trade, and how this has increased since the capital works contracts were let in 2010.	

16 November 2015

Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Building inflation data	Further detail and analysis of the building inflation data considered at the previous meeting.	

26 January 2016

Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Representatives of the Council's capital works contractors – Presentation	Mears Projects and Breyer Group. To provide the Committee with the contractor's perspective of the Council's capital programming.	Contractors may be able to compare their experiences of working with other local authorities, the different types of contract they carry out, further information on their use of local labour, and their own planning, prioritisation and communication processes. To include comparisons with other local authorities capital programmes.
Evidence submitted by Islington Leaseholders Association		

Key dates:

Draft recommendations: 26 January 2016 – *Discussion paper to be circulated in advance of meeting*

Final report: 29 February 2016

Housing Scrutiny Committee

26 January 2016

Responsive Repairs Scrutiny 2016 – Witness Evidence

1. Synopsis

Further to the Scrutiny Initiation Document considered last year, this document sets out the background and information to assist the Housing Scrutiny Committee. The report sets the scope and current performance of the repairs service, and considers the current ways the service engages with customers and the most common feedback received. The report details improvements already in place or in progress which are aimed at addressing these issues.

2. Proposed Process for Scrutiny

The Scrutiny process is planned to consist of seven sessions between January and June. Below is the proposed timetable for evidence and a visit:

Date	Planned Activity
26 th January	Introduction - Paul Lightfoot/Matt West
29 th February	Resident Panel Evidence
Possible March Meeting (TBC)	Kwest Resident Survey Evidence Tom Barnes Customer Services Accreditation Provider Evidence
Proposed Scrutiny Visit (w/c 14 th March TBC)	Site Visit Brewery Road Office, Stores, Joinery Shop and Training Centre
19 th April	Camden Council Witness Evidence
26 th May	Draft Recommendations
June	Final Report

3. Current Service Delivery

There are approximately 55,000 repairs reported annually which are completed by the Repairs Team's 105 in-house trade staff along with support from contractors where demand requires. The repairs range from 2 hour Emergency work such as no power to the property, 24 hour Urgent work such as repair to a door, 20 calendar day non-urgent work such as re-plastering a wall and high value works over £5,000 such as renew a boundary wall.

The delivery of the repairs service (excluding Gas and Estate Maintenance) consists of seven teams located at 33-37 Brewery Road which are:-

Housing Direct – taking telephone calls reporting all repairs and making appointment times with tenants.

Schedule Planning Team – receive the appointed repairs from Housing Direct and allocate each job to trade staff and contractors.

Technical Surveying Team – attend properties to diagnose and scope up more complex works to be completed such as damp and structural defects within properties.

Direct Works Trade Staff – multi-trade teams attend agreed appointment timeslots with the tenant to complete the reported repair.

The following three teams, based at Brewery Road, support the management of the repairs and maintenance service and are excluded from this review.

Legal Disrepair Team – work with the council’s legal team to manage any disrepair claims by surveying the property and manage any repairs identified.

Customer Excellence Team – deal with complaints and enquiries from tenants, residents, leaseholders, councillors, and MPs for all services delivering repairs and liaise with the corporate complaints team.

Procurement and Contract Management Team – procure contracts and monitor the delivery of these to ensure value for money is achieved.

4. Current Performance

Our customer satisfaction levels have been monitored by Kwest, a business which specialises in collecting survey information, who have a large team of directly employed, highly trained interviewers with wide experience in repairs. They complete approximately 3,000 surveys per month. Below is the percentage satisfaction levels achieved for the whole repairs service for 2015/16.

April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	Year to date
73.0 %	72.0%	70.0%	70.0%	73.0%	70.0%	73.0%	73.0%	72.88%

Satisfaction with the actual quality of the repair is higher and measured as part of the same survey.

April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	Year to date
91 %	90%	92%	92%	90%	91%	91%	91%	91%

We also measure the percentage of repairs that are completed correctly the first time.

April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	Year to date
84 %	83%	82%	83%	83%	85%	85%	84%	84%

5. How the service learns from casework and customer feedback

It is important that the Repairs Team listens to tenants and residents regarding the service they receive and use this information to target areas of improvement. It is also important that given the scope of the service this engagement is with as many residents, from varied experience and background, as possible to provide an accurate image of the service.

The service engages with tenants and residents in several ways, such as attendance at local Tenant and Resident meetings, case work meetings with councillors, and has established repairs reference groups to specifically consider service improvements.

The outcomes of investigations following complaints and data from the independent satisfaction surveys provides additional useful information.

The feedback received over the last 12 months from the tenants and resident's experience of the service has been constructive, giving a clear direction to what changes the service users feel needs to occur. Regular themes are included below and have been categorised.

Ref	Theme	Area	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	16+
1	Repairs do not get finished off after first visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduler Planner Operative Supervisors 											
2	It takes too long to get through to Housing Direct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner 											
3.	You sent the wrong trade out to do my repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner Repairs Supervisor Operatives 											
4.	I have to chase up my repair by telephoning in again	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduler Planner Housing Operative Supervisors 											
5.	I don't know who is dealing with my repair Islington or contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisors Contract Management 											
6.	I don't know who to speak to about my on-going repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner Supervisor 											
7.	I keep getting passed on to different managers for my repair.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner Supervisor 											
8.	Staff could be more customer friendly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Teams 											
9.	You should put things back when they moves things in my home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operatives Supervisors 											

10.	You don't let me know if you are not coming to an appointment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operatives Scheduler Planner Supervisors 																	
11.	You just turn up without an appointment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operatives Scheduler Planner Housing Direct Supervisors 																	
12.	You send two trade staff to do a repair when one would do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner Operatives Supervisors 																	
13.	You don't let me know when you are coming back to complete the repair or what is happening next	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operative Scheduler Planner Supervisors 																	
14.	You ask me if I am a vulnerable person when I phone in my repair, you should already know this, it's makes the call longer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner 																	
15.	Repairs are outstanding for a long time to get completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduler Planner Operatives Supervisors 																	
16.	You don't have the materials to do the job when you come	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduler Planner Operative Supervisors 																	
17.	You sent a surveyor out to look at a simple repair, why could you not have sent a trade out to do the repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Direct Scheduler Planner 																	

18.	I had to wait for another trade staff to come back to complete my repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervisors • Operative • Scheduler Planner • Housing Direct 	
-----	--	---	--

The above comments have been used in manager development sessions, local team meetings and 1-to-1's to discuss how the service can improve in these areas. These comments have also been used in the redesigning of the future repairs service and IT systems requirements.

6. Improvements implemented to date

Below are some of the improvements that have already been put in place. How these are related to service feedback is indicated in the table above.

Ref	Change Implemented
A	All repairs staff (excluding gas and estate maintenance) have been relocated to Brewery Road which has brought improved team working, sharing of knowledge and understanding of what each team brings to the service.
B	A reorganisation of back office staff
C	Currently there is an on-going operative reorganisation taking place, that includes pay levels to come in line with the council's pay scales, the creation of working charge-hands to give continuity of service for when supervisors are not at work, introduction of flexible working arrangements to provide evening appointments and multiskilling requirements to enable an increase in first visit fix repairs.
D	A programme is underway for tendering new improved contracts that have been awarded to contractors to assist the in-house team in managing the demand changes in repairs raised, particularly for legal disrepair and high value works. This programme will be completed in 2016.
E	Monthly tool box talks have introduced for trade staff to discuss health & safety and gain feedback on operational issues.
F	Monthly meetings are in place with inter-department teams including Gas and Estate Maintenance to discuss improvements, high level cases and provide support for each other.
G	An improvement plan is in place for the current IT system "Callsys", which include improving stores management and imprest stock, management of repair works orders and to provide performance information.
H	Performance boards have been erected in the open office to provide managers, supervisors and staff with the daily performance levels achieved against targets, this enables managers and supervisors to identify and make changes to staff levels as required.

I	A joiner shop and training centre has been built in Tufnell Park which has been in operation since October 2015. The joinery Shop now provides the entire bespoke joiner required such as doors and windows, with the future option to provide this service externally to customers if the council wish to pursue this option. The training centre has recently provided a successful taster session in joinery to eight Year 11 school girls from Elizabeth Garret Anderson School. Further sessions are planned in for other schools to attend in 2016.
J	The Handyman service that was previously provided by an external contractor has now been brought back in-house and managed by the repairs teams. Our handyman service is designed to assist customers in carrying out small jobs around the home. They provide the materials, e.g. curtain poles, door chains, locks etc. and we will provide the skilled person to carry out these jobs.

7. Repairs improvement plan 2016/17

Further changes are planned within the next financial year; these are part of the Repairs and Maintenances Business Plan and will form targets for managers' and teams' Personal Development Reviews. Where possible they are linked to addressing the common issues outlined above.

Ref	Change to be Implemented	Area Affected
L	New IT System	1/2/3/4/5/6/7/9/10/11/ 12/13/14/15/16/17/18
M	Online Repairs Reporting	2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10/14
N	Apprenticeship Programme	8/12/15/17/18
O	Review of 'Out of Hours' Repairs Service	1/2/3/5/6/7/8/11/13/15/16/18
P	Transport Review	1/12/15/16/18

New IT system

Since the service came back in-house in August 2014, it was clearly evident that the current IT system "Callsys" is not fit for the council's purposes. Although an improvement plan is in place to improve the system, its capabilities to deliver the full requirements for the future cannot be realised to assist staff in providing an excellent service to our customers. The feedback from tenants and residents, councillors and staff have been used to specify the IT requirements. A procurement exercise has taken place and a new IT supplier "Oneserve" has been appointed. A project team is working to have the new system operational from the autumn of 2016.

Some of the key features of the new system are:-

A true diagnostic system to enable Housing Direct staff to consistently diagnose repairs correctly. The questions within the diagnostic system will be designed in conjunction with the trade staff that will lead to a priority and schedule of rate for the individual repair taking into account vulnerability of tenants.

Appointment times will still be made on the initial call with the tenant reporting their repair, but the improvement will be that the appointment allocated will be based on the resources available to carry out that appointment. This will improve appointments being made and kept, reducing further telephone calls having to be made to tenants.

The current system is not automated; it relies on staff allocating the 55,000 jobs manually. The new IT system will provide an automated allocation to trade staff based upon their skill set, vastly reducing manual intervention and getting the right trade to attend the repair. The automation will also reduce costs for service.

The schedule planning team will have improved visual status of jobs enabling them to improve communication with trade staff and tenants, ensuring timely completion of the repair leading to the primary goal of improving performance and customer satisfaction.

The members of the trade staff will be issued with one job at a time through the use of the mobile technology ensuring the control of jobs is maximised. Trade staff will have the ability to access the system to order materials, make and book appointments for follow-on works and raise further repairs where required with the tenant whilst in their home. This will bring efficiencies through reducing the number of telephone calls back to the planning team and by providing real time information.

Online repairs reporting

Property services have been working with the council's IT department to introduce reporting of repairs through the internet, this is expected to go live during 2016. This will make it easier for some tenants to report non-emergency repairs 24/7. The tenants reporting the repair will be able to make their own appointment to suit their needs. At the point of launch this new service will be publicised through multimedia channels and roadshows.

Apprenticeship Programme

When the repairs service transferred back into the council it came without any apprentice programme in place. Is it important that we have investment in the people of Islington. It has been agreed that ten apprenticeship placements will be available for school leavers to apply for in 2016.

Links have been created with the council's Business Support team (BEST) to offer work based experience and training placements. We have one trainee starting a 12 week course in with the direct works team in February 2016. This gives the individual an experience of working in a trade environment with the possibility of applying for the future full apprenticeship programme.

Review the “Out of Hours” repairs service

Property Services provide an Out of Hours service for repairs where staff work from 4pm to midnight Monday to Friday, 7am to midnight Saturday and Sundays, and on a call out basis throughout the night mainly dealing with emergency repairs. This is a valued service by the tenants; consultation with the tenants and staff is planned to take place in the last quarter of 2016.

Transport review

The service uses 120 vehicles that have imprest stock on them to complete responsive repairs. A full review of type and size of vehicle will take place. This review aims are to reduce non-productive time, improve first visit fix and reduce costs of the service.

Date 13th January 2016

Report author: Paul Lightfoot
Email: paul.lightfoot@islington.gov.uk
Tel: 020 7527 7326

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY REVIEW INITIATION DOCUMENT (SID)

Review: Responsive Repairs

Scrutiny Review Committee: Housing Scrutiny Committee

Director leading the review: Simon Kwong

Lead Officers: Matt West

Overall aim: To consider resident experiences of the Responsive Repairs service.

Objectives of the review:

- To identify the different types of responsive repairs carried out
- To measure the satisfaction of residents with responsive repairs, and to evaluate the utility of the metrics used
- To consider how works are reported, planned, prioritised, responded to, and communicated to residents
- To evaluate how the service compares to the services of other London Boroughs and registered providers
- To confirm that the services are designed to deliver customer focused outcomes
- To identify any areas for improvement

How is the review to be carried out:

Scope of the Review

The review will focus on:

1. Responsive Repairs
 - The types of repair carried out
 - Reporting and planning processes, including accessibility for those with disabilities
 - How responsive repairs are prioritised and methods of triage employed
2. Resident Satisfaction
 - How resident satisfaction can be measured
 - Current levels of resident satisfaction
 - Communication with residents
 - How resident satisfaction can be improved, if required
3. Other considerations
 - Comparisons to other London Boroughs

Types of evidence:

1. Documentary evidence including
 - Contextual report/presentation
 - Service policies and strategies
 - Service evaluations and performance indicators
2. Witness evidence including
 - Presentation from officers
 - The views of tenants and leaseholders from the repairs Reference Group
 - Presentation from Kwest regarding how impartial data is collected
 - Presentation from external Call Centre Customer Excellence Accreditor
3. Visits
 - Visit to the Brewery Road Site to see the operation in progress (*optional*)

Additional Information:

Programme	
Key output:	To be submitted to Committee on:
1. Scrutiny Initiation Document	13 July 2015
2. Draft Recommendations	26 May 2016
3. Final Report	June 2016 (Date TBC)

Housing Scrutiny Committee 2015/16

Responsive Repairs – Witness Evidence Plan

Aim: To consider resident experiences of the Responsive Repairs service.

26 January 2016		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Matt West & Paul Lightfoot – Presentation and Report	Introduction to the responsive repairs service and the scrutiny review.	To cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the different types of responsive repairs carried out • how works are reported, planned, prioritised, responded to, and communicated to residents

29 February 2016		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Representatives from the Resident Panel.	To hear resident views on the service, including satisfaction, communication, and how satisfaction can be improved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To measure the satisfaction of residents with responsive repairs, and to evaluate the utility of the metrics used

March 2016 <u>[TBC]</u>		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Representative of KWest	To consider evidence from the council's resident surveying contractor, including current levels of satisfaction, surveying methods and data collection, and potentially comparisons to other housing providers.	To cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To measure the satisfaction of residents with responsive repairs, and to evaluate the utility of the metrics used • To confirm that the services are designed to deliver customer focused outcomes
Call Centre Customer Excellence Accreditor	To consider matters related to customer service.	

19 April 2016		
Who / What	Organisation / Purpose	Other key information
Representative from LB Barking or Camden	To compare the service against that of another borough.	To cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To evaluate how the service compares to the services of other London Boroughs and registered providers

Scrutiny Visits:

Location	Purpose	Other key information
Brewery Road Site, Stores, and Training Facility	To enable members to see the responsive repairs service at work.	w/c 14 th March (17 th ?) Mini-bus required.

Key dates:

Draft recommendations: 26 May 2016

Final report: June 2016 (Date TBC)



Report of: **Service Director, Housing Needs and Strategy**

Meeting of	Date	Agenda Item	Ward(s)
Housing Scrutiny Committee	26 th January 2016	B4	All

Delete as appropriate	Exempt	Non-exempt

SUBJECT: 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey Results – Housing Services

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report sets out the background the customer satisfaction survey carried out during the summer of 2015 and highlights the key areas of feedback from residents.
- 1.2 This report outlines the action Housing Services will take to address the feedback and respond to residents' service priorities.
- 1.3 The full survey results are available on the council's website.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the content of the report be noted.

3 Background

3.1 How we engage with residents

- 3.1.1 The two-yearly customer satisfaction survey is part of a wider programme of feedback opportunities that are used to improve and design our housing services.
- 3.1.2 In addition to this survey, targeted surveys and more focused customer feedback exercises are carried out through discussion groups, service reviews, on-line, paper and telephone surveys covering all aspects of housing services. In the past year, customer feedback has been gathered on learning from complaints, satisfaction with major works, responsive repairs, Right to Buy services and homeowner and housing management services. The two-yearly survey is the opportunity to hear from a larger number of residents on what they think about key aspects of our service. It provides a health-check and benchmark on how we are doing.
- 3.1.3 The council procured KWEST Research, an independent organisation, to carry out the satisfaction survey. Six tailored surveys were carried out by Kwest and these surveys were sent out to a random sample of residents selected from the following groups:

- Tenants whose homes are managed directly by the council
- Tenants whose homes are managed by Partners for Improvement in Islington (Partners)
- Tenants whose homes are managed by a resident-led organisations (TMO)
- Homeowners whose homes are managed directly by the council
- Homeowners whose homes are managed by Partners for Improvement in Islington (Partners)
- Homeowners whose homes are managed by a resident-led organisation (TMO)

3.1.4 The six surveys are tailored to the groups identified above. Wording of some questions has changed across the years to ensure that feedback reflects resident priorities and the changing services that the council provides. Therefore, it is not always possible to compare trends in satisfaction over time in every instance.

Table 1 – Number of residents surveyed

Resident Group	Residents surveyed	Surveys completed	Response rate 2015 (%)
Tenants	8022	1717	21%
Homeowners	8304	1629	20%

3.2 Benchmarking

3.2.1 To allow results to be placed in a meaningful context, findings for Islington's residents were combined and a comparison was undertaken using data published by HouseMark, one of the main benchmarking organisations for the social housing sector. Results are compared using data bands known as quartiles. Upper quartile (average of top 25%), median quartile (average of middle 50%) and lower quartile (average of bottom 25%).

3.2.2 Table 2 (below) shows that the combined results for Islington's tenant groups lay in the median quartile for most of the core feedback measures, with the exception of satisfaction with neighbourhoods, where satisfaction levels are above average. The combined results for Council, Partners and TMO homeowners lie in either the median or lower quartiles on these measures. However, it should be noted that the HouseMark figures for homeowners (table 3, overleaf) are national benchmarks and it is widely recognised that satisfaction levels in London are generally lower than average.

Table 2 – Comparison against HouseMark data for general needs tenant surveys in London

Description	Upper Quartile	Median Quartile	Lower quartile	Number of landlords in sample	Combined Islington tenants' result	Islington tenants' quartile position
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the overall service provided by their social housing provider	80%	76%	74%	20	74%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the quality of their home	79%	75%	73%	18	76%	Median Quartile

Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	81%	78%	74%	20	81%	Upper quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the way their social housing provider deals with repairs and maintenance	76%	70%	64%	20	70%	Median quartile

Table 3 – Comparison against HouseMark data for homeowners surveys nationally

Description	Upper Quartile	Median quartile	Lower quartile	Number of landlords in sample	Combined Islington homeowners' result	Islington homeowners' quartile position
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the overall service provided by their social housing provider	72%	62%	48%	22	43%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	80%	75%	69%	18	75%	Median quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied that their service charge provides value for money	52%	41%	30%	18	30%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the way their social housing provider deals with communal repairs and maintenance	61%	46%	34%	19	32%	Lower quartile

3.3 Key survey results

3.3.1 The findings on key housing services reveal that overall satisfaction for tenants is going up (table 4) and overall satisfaction with homeowner services remains the same as in 2013 (table 5).

Table 4 - Tenant satisfaction with key housing services

Area of Service	Satisfaction 2011	Satisfaction 2013	Satisfaction 2015
Overall Satisfaction	72%	72%	74%
Repairs & Maintenance	66%	68%	70%
General condition of home	71%	73%	76%
Rent as Value for Money	72%	70%	74%

Table 5 - Homeowner satisfaction with key housing services

Area of Service	Satisfaction 2011	Satisfaction 2013	Satisfaction 2015
Overall Satisfaction	40%	44%	43%
Neighbourhood as a place to live	70%	76%	75%
Value for Money of Service Charge	31%	28%	30%

3.3.2 Repairs and maintenance is recognised as being a key driver of satisfaction and remains the consistent top priority for both tenants and homeowners. Tenants identified the overall quality of their homes and being kept informed as their second and third most important priorities. Homeowners place a much higher priority on value of money for service charge than having their views taken into account.

Table 6 - Service priorities - tenants

2013	%	2015	%
Repairs and Maintenance	65%	Repairs and Maintenance	73%
Keeping tenants informed	42%	Overall quality of home	48%
Overall quality of home	41%	Keeping tenants informed	45%

Table 7 - Service priorities - homeowners

2013	%	2015	%
Repairs and Maintenance	57%	Repairs and Maintenance	65%
Value for Money of Service Charge	53%	Value for Money of Service Charge	60%
Taking homeowners' views into account/ Dealing with anti-social behaviour	37%	Taking homeowners' views into account	41%

3.3.3 Tenants were asked to identify three services that they felt most need to be improved. Similar to the top priorities identified, the majority of tenants selected repairs and maintenance and overall quality of homes as the services they would most like improved. However, the percentage of tenants who feel that services need to improve in all three of these areas has decreased considerably since 2013 (table 8).

3.3.4 Similarly, homeowners were also asked to identify three services that they felt most need to be improved. The highest proportion of homeowners chose value for money of service charge and repairs and maintenance as the services they would most like to see improved. Since 2013, a growing percentage of homeowners seem to think that services in all three areas need improvement (table 9).

Table 8 - Areas most in need of improvement for tenants

Areas most in need on of improvement in 2013	%	Areas most in need of improvement in 2015	%
Taking residents' views into account	78%	Repairs and Maintenance	51%
Repairs and Maintenance	73%	Overall quality of home	47%
Overall quality of home	76%	Keeping tenants informed	40%

Table 9 - Areas most in need of improvement for homeowners

Areas most in need of improvement in 2013	%	Areas most in need of improvement in 2015	%
Value for Money of Service Charge	65%	Value for Money of Service Charge	73%
Repairs and Maintenance	42%	Repairs and Maintenance	48%
Taking homeowners' views into account	41%	Taking homeowners' views into account	45%

3.3.5 The council recognises that there are low satisfaction ratings on value for money of service charge and that it is the highest priority for homeowners, and an area identified by them as needing improvement. This means that this is very likely to be a key factor in low satisfaction rates.

3.3.6 In order to gain a better understanding of neighbourhood problems, tenants and homeowners were asked to prioritise problems in their local area. The following tables show the main issues identified.

Table 10 - Problems are in the area - Tenants

Neighbourhood problem	Tenants
Litter and rubbish in the street	56%
Dogs	48%
Drug dealing	37%

Table 11 - Problems are in the area - homeowners

Neighbourhood problem	Homeowners
Litter and rubbish in the street	75%
Dogs	57%
Noise from outside property	50%

3.4 What the survey tells also us

- The percentage of both tenants and homeowners satisfied with the overall service provided falls into the lower quartile when compared to other social landlords in London for tenants and nationally for homeowners.
- Repairs and maintenance is the most important service for both tenants and homeowners. Tenants are more satisfied than homeowners with the service provided by their landlord.
- Both tenants and homeowners are generally satisfied with their neighbourhoods as a place to live.
- Both tenants and homeowners view litter and rubbish in the streets and dogs as the top two problems in the area. It should be noted that it is not clear from the survey whether residents are referring to issues on their immediate estates or the wider area where they live.
- Less than 50% of tenants and homeowners are satisfied with the opportunities to take part in management and decision making.
- There is no significant difference in the data bands (gaps between quartiles) in the key areas of service for tenants. As there is no readily available comparative information on specific areas of service with other landlords; further investigation and benchmarking may be required to work out how Islington satisfaction levels compare to other landlords.
- Homeowners' satisfaction is low and has not improved in line with tenant satisfaction. This may be because homeownership overall in London is expensive, and residents have high expectations of the services their landlord can deliver and how much they are happy to pay for this.

3.5 What are we doing with the survey results?

- 3.5.1 The full KWEST report has been distributed to all divisional management teams in Housing for their consideration and action.
- 3.5.2 A summary action plan is attached as Appendix 1 to this report. This picks out the resident priorities and key areas of feedback from this report.
- 3.5.3 In the past year, three resident reference groups (housing management, leasehold management and repairs) have been set up to give on-going feedback on housing services and suggest improvements to working practices. The results of the survey will be fed back to these groups at their next meetings and this will be an opportunity for residents to have real input into how the survey results are used to progress service improvements.

3.5.4 The day to day resident engagement work listed in section 3.1.2 of this report will be used to gather further resident satisfaction information and compliment feedback provided by the KWEST survey.

4. Resident profile

4.11 The following is a summary breakdown of our resident profile. Understanding the make-up of residents assists the council in tailoring its services and ensuring everyone is treated fairly. Knowing what residents we are hearing from allows us to identify where there are gaps and the need to address these by targeting other feedback opportunities at particular groups or making opportunities more accessible.

4.1.2 Analysis of customer satisfaction identified a link between the age of the resident and satisfaction with services. For example, in terms of overall satisfaction with housing services; 82% of tenants aged 65 and over were satisfied compared to 71% of those aged 25-44. For homeowners 58% of those aged 65 and over were satisfied compared to 50% of those aged 25-44.

Table 12 - Tenants' profile

Age	Over 65 years	36%	45-64 years	42%	Under 44 years	23%	
Gender	Male	41%	Female	58.5%	Trans	0.5%	
Religion	Christian	65%	Muslim	13%	No Religion	13%	Other 9%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	80%	LGBT	6%	Prefer not to say	15%	
Ethnicity A	White	74%	Black/Mixed Heritage/Asian	26%			
Ethnicity B	British	61%	Other	38%			
Long term illness, disability or impairment	Yes	49%	No	51%			

Table 13 - Homeowners' profile

Age	Over 65 years	19%	45-64 years	38%	Under 44 years	43%		
Gender	Male	48%	Female	51.8%	Trans	0.2%		
Religion	Christian	49%	Muslim	4%	No Religion	29%	Other	18%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	78%	LGBT	8%	Prefer not to say	14%		
Ethnicity A	White	84%	Black/Mixed Heritage/Asian	16%				
Ethnicity B	British	67%	Other	33%				
Long term illness, disability or impairment	Yes	15%	No	85%				

4. Implications

4.1 Financial implications

There are no specific financial implications for this report.

4.2 Legal implications

There are no specific legal implications for this report.

4.3 Environmental Implications

There are no specific environmental implications for this report.

4.4 Resident Impact Assessment

The council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations, between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it (section 149 Equality Act 2010). The council has a duty to have due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages, take steps to meet needs, in particular steps to take account of disabled

persons' disabilities, and encourage people to participate in public life. The council must have due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

No resident impact assessment was carried out as part of the customer satisfaction survey. Impact assessments will be carried out as appropriate, in relation to any actions carried out as a result of the survey.

Background papers: None.

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Resident Satisfaction Survey Summary Action Plan

Final Report Clearance:

Signed by	18 January 2016
	Maxine Holdsworth, Service Director – Housing Needs and Strategy Date

Received by	18 January 2016
	Head of Democratic Services Date

Report author: Wendy Gajadhar, Resident Engagement Officer
Tel: 020 7527 4141
E-mail: Wendy.Gajadhar@islington.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey Feedback

Priority areas for improvement – Summary Action Plan

Service Area	What the survey told us	Action (s)	Lead	Due by
Repairs and maintenance	Satisfaction with repairs and maintenance is increasing but it remains the main service priority for both tenants and homeowners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the Repairs Reference Group to get on-going feedback on residents’ expectations of the repairs service and use this to drive service improvements. • Continue to use feedback received through on-going major work, day to day repairs and gas-servicing customer satisfaction surveys that are carried out on a rolling programme across the year, to improve services. • Build on the outcomes from the recent review of complaints handling, carried out by the Service Review Group, to ensure this is embedded in services. 	Property Services	
Customer Care and Access to Services	<p>Telephone contact continues to be the preferred method of contact.</p> <p>Usage of internet increasing.</p> <p>Overall satisfaction with services for tenants has increased slightly (74%).</p> <p>Overall satisfaction with services for homeowners remains the same as previous survey (43%).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Repairs, Housing Management, Leasehold Management reference groups to identify customer care improvements needed. • Continue mystery shopping programme to assess standard of customer care provided and feedback to management teams to drive improvements. • Feed results of survey into transformation programme aiming to make more services easily available on line. • Implement recommendations from recent review of complaints handling carried out by Service Review Group. • Continue to review areas and types of complaints to direct service improvement initiatives 	All Housing Services	

	Slight decrease in satisfaction for some feedback areas (e.g. ease of getting hold of right person and satisfaction with outcome of query).			
Communication and resident engagement	<p>Keeping tenants informed was identified as a key priority.</p> <p>Taking homeowners views into account was identified as a key priority.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure residents are kept informed about housing services by making best use of Your Homes magazine; ensuring that articles are of interest to both tenants and homeowners. • Review Tenant and Homeowner pages on the council's website to ensure information meets the requirements of residents. • Use Repairs, Housing Management, Leasehold Management Reference Groups as channels to ensure that residents are kept up to date. 	All Housing Services	
Satisfaction with neighbourhood	Both tenants and homeowners view litter, rubbish and dogs as priority problems in their local area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share information held in report with Street Environment Services as the issues raised reflect both services. • Use Housing Management and Leasehold Reference groups to get clearer information on whether these issues relate to the immediate environment on estates or to the wider surrounding area. 	Housing Operations	
Caretaking and estates services	<p>Overall satisfaction with caretaking service is high and broadly the same as previous survey (80%).</p> <p>Decrease in satisfaction from tenants with certain parts of caretaking service (e.g. helpfulness of staff and keeping internal and external areas tidy).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate issues further through discussion at the Housing Management Reference Group. • Re-introduce caretaking inspections by residents to get regular feedback on key aspects of the caretaking service. • Housing Operations Management Team to investigate the reasons for the decrease in satisfaction for certain areas of service. 	Housing Operations	

Resident Satisfaction Survey – Appendix 1

<p>Value for money</p>	<p>Value for money for service charges is a key priority for homeowners.</p> <p>The majority of tenants are satisfied that their rent is value for money (74%).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss at Leasehold Management Reference Group to identify what specific value for money improvements they would like to see made. • Improve communications with homeowners on how service charges are calculated and the financial impact and other implications of buying a leasehold property from the council. • Improve notes that accompany bills and/or bill layout to provide more detailed information on how service charges are calculated. 	<p>Home Ownership Services/Partners Home Ownership Services</p>	
------------------------	---	---	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank