



AGENDA FOR THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee are summoned to Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on, **28 March 2017 at 7.30 pm.**

Stephen Gerrard
Director of Law and Governance

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 020 7527 3308
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 20 March 2017

Membership

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan (Chair)
Councillor Marian Spall (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Gary Doolan
Councillor Aysegul Erdogan
Councillor Osh Gantly
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche MBE
Councillor Una O'Halloran
Councillor Angela Picknell

Rose Marie McDonald
(PFI Managed Tenants Observer)

Substitute Members

Councillor Gary Heather
Councillor Olly Parker
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Raphael Andrews
Councillor Alex Diner
Councillor Satnam Gill OBE
Councillor Dave Poyser

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 - 4

B.	Items for Decision/Discussion	Page
1.	Service Review Group: Management of External Communal Areas	5 - 24
2.	Housing Services for Vulnerable People: Notes of Scrutiny Visit & Draft Recommendations	25 - 32
3.	Housing Performance - Quarter 3 2016/17 & Annual Executive Member Presentation	33 - 36
4.	Update on Tenant Led Organisations	37 - 50
5.	Housing and Planning Act Update (presentation)	

C. Urgent non-exempt items (if any)

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

D. Exclusion of press and public

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 press and public during discussion thereof.

E. Confidential/exempt items

F. Urgent exempt items (if any)

Any 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.

The next meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee will be on 16 May 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Islington

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 2 February 2017

Minutes of the meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 2 February 2017 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** O'Sullivan (Chair), Gantly, Hamitouche, O'Halloran, and Picknell.

Observer: Rose-Marie McDonald

Also present: Cllr D Ward

Councillor Michael O'Sullivan in the Chair

246 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gary Doolan, Marian Spall and Aysegul Erdogan.

Councillor O'Halloran submitted apologies for lateness.

247 DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)

None.

248 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Item A3)

Rose-Marie McDonald declared a personal interest in Item 3, Housing Services for Vulnerable People: Witness Evidence, as she was a Partners resident.

249 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

250 CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A5)

The Chair commented that the evidence received from the Housing Disability Panel at the previous meeting had been extremely useful. It was noted that members of the Committee would meet with members of the Panel to discuss draft recommendations in advance of the next meeting.

It was noted that a representative of Homes for Haringey was due to present their evidence to the Committee however unfortunately they were unable to attend the meeting.

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

No changes were proposed to the order of business.

252 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A7)**

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

253 **RSL SCRUTINY (Item B1)**

The Chair noted that Family Mosaic Housing Association was not able to attend the meeting, and led a discussion on how the Committee scrutinises housing associations.

It was advised that there were around 15,500 properties managed by housing associations in Islington. The Committee considered that its previous scrutiny of housing associations had been successful; and commented that best practice in terms of services for residents tended to be demonstrated by smaller housing associations.

The National Housing Federation had developed a 'sector scorecard' to evaluate the performance of housing associations. The Chair expressed concern that this was disproportionately focused on commercial measures and considered residents as 'customers'.

The Committee noted the trend of housing associations merging and raised concerns that this could lead to housing associations becoming more remote and losing their connection to local communities. Concern was also expressed about staff terms and conditions in the social housing sector. It was advised that Cllr John Gray of LB Newham Council was campaigning on such issues and it was suggested that the Committee could consider this also.

254 **HOUSING SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE: WITNESS EVIDENCE (Item B2)**

(a) Evidence from Partners for Improvement in Islington

The Committee received a presentation from Tom Irvine, Service Improvement and Engagement Manager at Partners, on the organisation's work in supporting vulnerable people.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- Partners managed and maintained 6,400 properties owned by Islington Council. 70% of these properties were tenanted and 30% were leasehold properties. The organisation had more information on its tenants than its leaseholders.
- Partners was aware that 21% of its tenants had a disability or impairment, however thought that the true number would be higher as some residents would have vulnerabilities which were not known to the organisation. Partners only knew the specific details of one third of tenants with an identified disability or impairment, with around a third choosing not to disclose this information to Partners.

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 2 February 2017

- All Partners' properties were general needs housing and were not specifically designed for those with support or care needs, although many tenants did have such needs.
- Partners acknowledged that it was not a specialist in providing support services and worked to develop relationships with other agencies, including Islington Council Social Services, to make referrals when required. Referrals were made with resident consent in the majority of situations. The organisation maintained a directory of staff to refer to; this helped to ensure that referrals were effective and reached the best possible contact.
- Partners staff received training on vulnerability awareness and identifying vulnerabilities, as well as specific sessions on mental health and safeguarding.
- The Committee noted examples of referrals made by Partners; for example, the repairs team identified that holes in a resident's door were a result of domestic violence and made a referral to the council. Repairs staff had also identified evidence of illegal drug use and had reported this to both the Police and social services.
- Partners prioritised heating and hot water repairs for vulnerable people, aiming to respond to these within 24 hours. The organisation also had a budget for discretionary repairs for vulnerable people, installed adaptations, and provided some internal decorations and gardening works through the council's Assisted Decorations Scheme.
- Partners had a programme of visiting older and vulnerable tenants to assess their needs. This was focused on identifying risks in their home.
- Following a question, it was advised that it was difficult to manage instances of antisocial behaviour when the perpetrator had a mental health condition. It was advised that Partners would seek a pragmatic solution to such scenarios and would need to balance the interests of the perpetrator and those affected by the behaviour. It was advised that in some situations Partners had managed moves for tenants as a result of antisocial behaviour.
- Partners had carried out 45 repairs to date in 2016/17, and more would be carried out by the end of the year.
- Partners' annual budget for assisted decorations was £25,000.
- The Committee noted that many street properties had damp and condensation issues, commenting that this could have a particularly severe effect on vulnerable people. It was queried how Partners dealt with having such a large number of properties with such issues. In response, it was advised that Partners worked with the council to assess the impact of damp and condensation and referred severe cases to a specialist to investigate. A number of Partners' older properties with damp problems were listed buildings and it could be difficult to obtain planning consent to carry out remedial works. Partners did take into account resident vulnerabilities when assessing the impact of damp and did move tenants out of damp properties when necessary. It was advised that the number of complaints about damp and condensation in Partners' properties had decreased over the past two years.
- It was advised that three Partners' properties had been damaged in the Upper Street Flood in December 2016. Two had been damaged significantly. Repairs and temporary accommodation was being funded through Thames Water's insurance. It was advised that one household would likely be in temporary accommodation for the next 12 months.
- A member highlighted that the majority of Partners tenants were aged 40 to 60 and queried what provision there was to support these people to continue live independently as they aged. In response, it was advised if a property became unsuitable for a tenant then a referral would be made to the council's transfer team.

Housing Scrutiny Committee - 2 February 2017

Partners did not manage allocations, however was aware that many tenants wanted to stay in their own home for as long as possible.

- Although they received many complaints related to noise nuisance, it was advised that Partners did not routinely soundproof properties.
- A member of the public queried how Partners identified vulnerable tenants. In response, it was advised that Partners largely relied on self-identification, however was proactively working to identify vulnerable people through a rolling programme of visits to residents. It was commented that Partners took this responsibility seriously.
- A member of the public queried if Partners' complaints procedure was made public. In response, it was advised that the complaints procedure mirrored the council's; a response to a stage one complaint would be made within 15 days, and stage 2 complaints were referred to the Chief Executive. It was commented that residents could complain to the Housing Ombudsman if their complaint was not resolved to their satisfaction and complaints were scrutinised by the council.
- A member of the public commented on the importance of the relationship between tenants and housing officers, and queried what would happen if this relationship broke down. In response, it was advised that management would consider if a different housing officer could be assigned to work with the individual, however this was not always possible as staff were deployed on a geographic basis. It was emphasised that not all complaints received by Partners were upheld; it was the responsibility of Partners staff to ensure that residents complied with tenancy conditions and this could generate complaints about individuals. However, if it was found that its staff were at fault then action would be taken.
- A member of the public highlighted instances of Partners making repairs which were ineffective or unsuitable for vulnerable residents, including ineffective extractor fans and a smoke alarm which a vulnerable woman was unable to access. Residents with specific issues were invited to contact Partners outside of the meeting.
- It was advised that Partners' tenancy conditions were the same as the council's.
- The Committee queried if Partners ever evicted vulnerable people. In response it was advised that this did happen occasionally, but only as a last resort. It was highlighted that evictions had to be agreed by the courts and there was very strict criteria which had to be met before a request for eviction was granted.

The Committee thanked Mr Irvine for his attendance.

(b) Evidence from Homes for Haringey

The Committee considered the written evidence submitted by Homes for Haringey.

Officers advised that the services provided by Homes for Haringey were similar to those provided by Islington Council, although Homes for Haringey was an arm's length management organisation with a different business model and therefore commissioned certain services from others rather than providing them in-house.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR



Report of: Corporate Director of Housing and Adult Social Services

Meeting of	Date	Ward(s)
Housing Scrutiny Committee	28 March 2017	All

Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt
-----------------------	--	------------

SUBJECT: Service Review Group: Management of External Communal Areas

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 The Service Review Group (SRG) identified the management of external communal areas as an area that would benefit from review in May 2016. This report sets out the background to the review and the recommendations made by SRG members.
- 1.2 The review was resident-led and facilitated by the Principal Resident Participation Officer and Principal Housing Manager, Estate Services.
- 1.3 The purpose of the review was to look at how Islington Housing Services manages external communal areas on estates and measure how effective we are in dealing with the following issues:
 - Dog nuisance/fouling
 - Bulk refuse collection, flytipping and the general cleanliness of common parts including litter management, flowerbed and shrubs

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the recommendations of the Service Review Group be received by the Committee.

3. Recommendations from the Service Review Group (*set out in detail in Appendix 1*)

- 3.1 Develop and improve working relationship between Estates Services and Mechanised Services (MS) to improve collection of bulk refuse and deal with fly tipping more effectively.
- 3.2 Take action to reduce dog fouling to lessen the impact it has on residents and in particular residents with disabilities (e.g. use of Community Protection Notices, better publicity re: proper disposal of dog mess and provision of bags for the disposal of dog mess)
- 3.3 Revise and streamline the dog nuisance policy and procedure.

- 3.4 Improve publicity for residents around the costs of not recycling and dealing with flytipping and dog mess.
- 3.5 Staff training to include putting people ahead of processes and improve dealing with members' enquiry and complaints.
- 3.6 Benchmark with and learn from other good-practice authorities

An action plan has been developed based on the recommendations and is set out at Appendix 2.

4. Background

- 4.1 The SRG first met with officers on 5 May 2016 to scope out the review and identify the activities that that would be undertaken by members of the SRG and officers. Appendix 3 sets out the programme of activities. At the first meeting, the following timetable was agreed:

Agreed task	Task completed
Scope the review	25 May 2016
Gather the evidence	May to July 2016
Evaluate the evidence	July to September 2016
Agree recommendations	29 September 2016
Present recommendations to panel of officers	3 November 2016 and 29 November 2016
Report to Housing Scrutiny	28 March 2017

4.2 Evidence gathering

- 4.2.1 A desktop review was carried out and included the following activities:

- Reviewing the monitoring processes of Estate Services/Tenancy Management teams
- Reviewing the Dog Nuisance policy and procedure
- Reviewing sample complaints and members enquiry responses
- A benchmarking exercise looking at websites of other organisations

- 4.2.3 To test the desktop research, members of the SRG:

- Visited St Luke's and Hillside Estates and spoke to Caretakers and Estate Services Coordinators
- Spoke to Estates Services and Tenancy Management staff from the Upper Street Area Housing Office
- Spoke to various staff from Public Protection and Public Realm including a Street Care Manager, an Animal Welfare Officer and a Compliance Team Manager
- Met members of the Repairs, Housing Management and Leasehold Reference Groups to ask them about their experience of flytipping and dog fouling and how the housing service deals with these problems
- Spoke to an officer from Hackney Council about their processes
- Carried out a survey by email of members of the Resident Involvement Register
- Met with members of the Disability Housing Panel
- Carried out a Mystery Shop

5. Summary of findings

- 5.1 SGR members highlighted areas of good practice. On examining the evidence and conducting interviews; SRG members found a number of examples where the service provided for residents worked really well and they wanted to highlight some of the good practice, as follows:

5.2 Estate Services/Mechanised Services:

- Staff on the whole take responsibility and are concerned about giving a good service
- Staff are aware of green issues and are concerned about the environment
- The area housing offices share good practice.
- Use technology to make reporting and monitoring easier.
- Work smarter rather than asking for more staff.
- Development of a smart phone app (GO system) to reduce manual updating of systems.
- The focus group as a whole felt that the good work of caretakers should be recognised as quite often they only hear complaints. A good relationship between residents and caretakers was reported in some areas.
- The SRG visited to St Luke's Estate with the caretaker where first impressions of the estate were good. The caretaker has a good relationship with residents on the estate and communication with the area office was good.
- The SRG visited Hillside Estate where the main issue was flytipping. The estate is well maintained and there is a good relationship between caretakers, residents and the area office.
- Metal screens conceal the bin areas and improve the look of the area.

5.3 Dog Nuisance/ Public Realm

- Relationship between Caretakers/ASB teams/Welfare Officer is good regarding dog nuisance.
- Over the last 18 months an Animal Welfare Officer has started receiving all intelligence and complaints from the Out of Hours Teams and area housing offices. This partnership working has improved the service for residents.
- Concierge teams send over intelligence they see on CCTV cameras and the images are then used to identify perpetrators and take necessary action.
- Dog Exclusion Designated zone signs for play areas have been installed and are all in place.

5.4 SRG members also highlighted where improvements could be made. The table below shows the SRG's findings and suggested improvements.

SRG findings based on tasks carried out by the group	Suggested improvements
<p>Staff meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm the service level agreement/working arrangements; including defining and agreeing the meaning of 24 hours (Mechanised Services define 24 hours as three working days). However, it is important to be realistic with residents about what the service can offer rather than setting targets that are very difficult to achieve. • Mechanised Services (MS) to prioritise getting operation licenses for both Randolph Road and Cottage Road sites. MS staff are based at Randolph Road and vehicles are based at Cottage Road so time is wasted in travelling form one location to another. • Carry out a service needs analysis to see if there are sufficient numbers of vehicles to support the service level agreement. 	<p>Develop and improve working relationship between Estates Services and Mechanised Services (MS).</p> <p>Housing Operations have offered funding to Mechanised Services for additional vehicle to improve collection of bulk refuse.</p>
<p>Staff Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estate Services to monitor missed collections and raise concerns at monitoring meetings. • Residents to be given a reference number so they can follow up on calls they have made. • Public Protection suggested, and members of the SRG agreed, that Housing Services should consider appointing a specialised officer to investigate fly tips and take legal action or expand an existing officers role to deal with this issue 	<p>Improve collection of bulk refuse and deal with fly tipping more effectively</p>

<p>Mystery Shopping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Islington app will take time to bed in for staff and residents and technical difficulties including the track location need to be improved. <p>Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage near bin areas should be improved. <p>Site Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Housing Offices to agree the type of screening they wish to use and then tender to get best possible materials and price. • The Council should enforce clauses with their contractors ensuring that they do not flytip or leave their waste after carrying out repairs. 	
<p>Disability Housing Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog fouling is a problem for residents with disabilities, particularly for the partially sighted and wheelchair users. The area housing office should carry out impact assessments on affected residents and put appropriate measures in place. <p>Site Visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some caretakers did not see dog fouling as an issue. They will clear it up but not necessarily report it to the area housing office. <p>Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider placing more bins on estates and streets. • Consider preventative walkabouts with TRAs and Dog Patrol Wardens. • Put stencils on the pavements pointing the way to the nearest bin. • There should be more dog exercising areas with bins and bags should be provided. • Signs about dog nuisance should be bigger and more creatively designed to attract people's attention. 	<p>Take action to reduce dog fouling to lessen the impact it has on residents and in particular residents with disabilities (e.g. use of Community Protection Notices, better publicity re: proper disposal of dog mess and provision of bags for the disposal of dog mess)</p>
<p>Polices and processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area offices should keep better records of dog fouling so that incidents can be monitored and locations can be tracked. • There is a need to simplify the dog nuisance procedure 	<p>Revise and streamline the dog nuisance policy and procedure.</p>
<p>Website Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-social behaviour information on the Council's website needs simplification. • Information on Hackney's website is concise and to the point, <p>Survey and Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should publicise success stories about dealing with dog mess and flytipping. We should also publicise good news stories by using electronic notice boards and block letters. <p>Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . • There should be stronger messages about enforcement. These could be displayed on electronic notice boards with examples of how much it costs the Council to deal with refuse and flytipping. <p>Disability Housing Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents with dyslexia and with literacy issues or whose first language is not English would find pictorial signs easier to understand. 	<p>Improve publicity for residents around the costs of not recycling and dealing with flytipping and dog mess</p>

<p>Site Visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents to be advised on what to recycle and the consequences of contaminating recycling with non-recyclable materials. 	
<p>Disability Housing Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability awareness on site to help staff focus on the practical issues that have a day to day impact on disabled residents. Training should include walking around an estate to identify potential trip hazards, poor lighting, getting access to communal bins, disrepair and stepping on dog excrement and what this can mean for people who are blind/ partially sighted or wheelchair users. <p>Mystery Shopping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be better monitoring of email response times. . <p>Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about contact details for staff needs improving (e.g. estate notice boards). <p>Site Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Career progression for caretakers. <p>Review of sample complaints and members enquires responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider moving away from standard letters when it comes to responding to complaints. Make complaint responses more personalised. The phrase "I'm sorry we are not able to give you a more positive response to your complaint" does not always feel appropriate. 	<p>Staff training to include putting people ahead of processes and improve dealing with members' enquiry and complaints.</p>
<p>Benchmarking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Hackney the Street Cleansing Teams and Estate Services Teams are being moved into one division so they can liaise with each other and deal with issues effectively. (Whilst Hackney Council are merging these two sections there is a recognition that what may work well with one council does not necessarily do so for another) 	<p>Benchmark with and learn from other good-practice authorities</p>

5.4 A summary of findings is set out in Appendix 4.

6. Implications

6.1 Financial Implications

No direct financial implications that arise as a result of the recommendations:

6.2 Legal Implications

No direct legal implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

6.3 Environmental Implications

No direct environmental implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

6.4 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.

A Resident Impact Assessment has not been completed as the Service Review Group is a resident-led body which is making recommendations to the council. The recommendations made are intended to improve the communications with residents in the new build process. Services would need to consider any resident impacts arising from implementing the recommendations.

7. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

- 7.1 The recommendations reflect the key issues and areas for improvement identified by the SRG during the review. The recommendations identify that while there are good areas of practice in the management of external communal areas, there are areas where improvements can be made.
- 7.2 The recommendations have been developed into an action plan for consideration and agreement.

Background Papers: None

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Detailed recommendations
- Appendix 2 - Action Plan
- Appendix 3 - Programme of activities carried out by the SRG
- Appendix 4 - Summary of findings

Final report clearance:

Signed by:



.....
Corporate Director of Housing and
Adult Social Services

20 March 2017
Date

Report Author: Nalini Trivedi, Principal Resident Participation Officer
Tel: 020 7527 4079
Email: Nalini.trivedi@islington.gov.uk

Appendix 1- Service Review – Management of External Communal Areas
Detailed recommendations

	Objective	Recommendations
1.	Develop and Improve relationship between Housing Estate Services Teams and Mechanical Services Team	<p>Housing Services – Estate Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirm service level agreement/working arrangements; including defining and agreeing the meaning of 24 hours (Mechanised Services define 24 hours as three working days). However, it is important to be realistic with residents about what the service can offer rather than setting targets that are unrealistic. b. Carry out a service needs analysis to see if there are sufficient numbers of vehicles to support the service level agreement. c. Monitor missed collections and raise concerns at monitoring meetings as per current procedure. d. Housing Services to be given a reference number for telephone and email requests to Mechanised Services. <p>Mechanised Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Residents to be given a reference number so can chase a call. f. Enhance the GO Power system so it can automatically produce reports when calls are logged and completed. g. Ensure GO Power system can be supported by the Council's Digital Services Team. h. Mechanised Services (MS) to prioritise getting operation licenses for both Randolph Road and Cottage Road sites. MS staff are currently based at Randolph Road and vehicles are housed at Cottage Road.
2.	Reduce and improve management of flytipping and lumber on Council estates	<p>Housing Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Officers to check fly tips to identify alleged perpetrators and contact the Public Protection Team to increase the number of prosecutions. b. Consider a reporting back mechanism that allows residents to follow up on calls they have made. c. Look to increase the service level agreement with Public Protection to cover day time activity.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Improve signage near bin areas. e. Research better design of bin areas to inform new and improved areas to make them difficult to conceal flytips, while remaining visually appealing. f. The three area housing offices to agree the best type of screening they wish to use and then get best possible for materials and price. g. Enforce financial penalty clauses to prevent contractors and the in-house Repairs Service from flytipping and/or leaving waste after carrying out work on estates. h. Ensure that all directly managed accommodation has access to bins including those above shops. i. Consider asking TLC (Voids Contractor) to remove lumber and rubbish left outside the property. j. Investigate the possibility of increasing the number of gardening groups with Greenspace <p>Mechanised Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> k. Environmental Services to consider reinstating the free pick up of for bulky items/white goods service, which was removed in April 2016. l. The Clean Islington app is taking time to bed in for staff and residents. Technical difficulties including the track location need to be improved. m. Public Protection suggested, and members of the SRG agreed, that Housing Services should consider having a dedicated officer to investigate fly tips or expand an existing officer's role to deal with this issue.
3.	Reduce incidents of dog fouling on Council estates and manage the impact it has on residents, particularly those with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Area housing offices should carry out impact assessments on how dog fouling impacts residents especially those with disabilities (partially sighted and wheelchair users) and put appropriate remedial measures in place. b. Caretakers to report dog fouling and area housing offices to keep records so that incidents can be monitored and locations can be tracked as per current procedure. c. Area housing offices to have consistent approach in tackling dog fouling, taking guidance from the Animal Welfare Officer (e.g. in St John Street area, long grass is used to keep dogs at bay whilst the Animal Welfare Officer and other Estate Services Managers do not think this is the best way forward). d. Agree timescales to implement arrangements for tenancy management staff to issue Community Protection Notices.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Consider preventative walkabouts with Tenants and Residents Associations and Dog Patrol Wardens f. Use electronic noticeboards to inform residents that an incident of dog fouling/ flytipping has been reported and action is being taken to deal with it. (this has now started) g. Consider stencils on pavements pointing the way to the nearest bin h. Consider painting the dog excrement in bright colours to draw attention to it and show that it has been noted and will be dealt with. i. Consider whether creating dog exercising areas with bins and dog mess bags provided is feasible j. Signs relating to dog nuisance should be bigger and more creative k. Carry out an analysis on whether there are sufficient bins in areas where there is high levels of dog fouling l. Consider placing more bins on estates and streets and impacts of doing this. m. Consider using brightly coloured bins
4.	Revise the dog nuisance policy and procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Simplify the dog nuisance procedure; at the moment it is too cumbersome and officers find it time consuming to use, especially all the iWorld codes b. Appropriate action should be taken when it is discovered that tenants own a dog without permission from the Council
5.	Better publicity and improved messages on dog fouling, flytipping and recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Work with the Communications Team to promote and publicise success stories regarding flytipping and dog fouling. b. Develop a pictorial signs to make issues around flytipping and dog fouling more widely understandable, especially for residents with dyslexia and/or literacy issues. c. Message to all residents that street/park bins can be used to dispose of dog excrement. It is no longer the case that only designated dog bins can be used. d. Promote responsible dog ownership guidance on the website. e. Educate residents about cost of dealing with litter and flytipping and how this impacts on the finances available for other essential services.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Residents to be advised on what to recycle and the consequences of contaminating recycled materials with non-recyclable materials. g. Consider getting libraries to distribute bags for dog owners (similar to the provision of recycling bags).
6.	Develop staff training which is on-site rather than classroom based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explore on-site disability awareness training rather than classroom training for estate based staff focusing on practical issues that have a day to day impact on disabled residents. b. This training can be part of the induction process with regular refresher courses. c. Practical “putting yourself into a residents shoes” training for front line staff, e.g. walking around an estate to identify potential trip hazards, poor lighting, access to communal bins, disrepair and stepping on dog excrement and what this can mean for people who are blind/partially sighted or wheelchair users d. Better training and performance monitoring for caretakers to ensure they carry out their duties as per their job description. e. Staff to respond to emails within agreed timescales f. Contact details for staff should be made more widely available g. Consider provision of career progression paths for caretakers (if they want this) h. Consider moving away from standard letters when it comes to responding to complaints. Make complaint responses more personalised the phrase “I’m sorry we are not able to give you a more positive response to your complaint” does not always feel appropriate. This was also picked out in previous SRG reviews (Learning from Complaints and New Build Communications). i. Carry out training which enables staff to issue Community Protection Notices (this training will take place in March 2017)
7.	Learn from work practices of near neighbours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Investigate if we can do something similar to Hackney Council’s protocol for flytipping (e.g. after initial report an investigation is carried out before it is removed by the Street Cleaning Team. b. Anti-social behaviour procedure on the Council’s website needs simplification (Hackney’s web page is simple and easy to understand) c. Consider developing closer working between Street Cleansing and Estate Services. (Hackney Council are merging these two sections).

**Management of External Communal areas
Action Plan – V2**

	Objective	Actions	Responsible officer / team	Target date	Milestones
1.	Develop and Improve relationship between Housing Estate services team and Mechanical Services Team	<p>Housing Services – Estate Services</p> <p>a. Confirm the service level agreement/working arrangements.</p> <p>b. Carry out a service needs analysis to see if there are sufficient numbers of vehicles to support the service level agreement. Housing Operations Division has agreed to fund an additional vehicle.</p> <p>c. Monitor missed collections and raise concerns at monitoring meetings as per current procedure.</p> <p>d. Housing Services to be given a reference number for telephone and email requests to Mechanised Services.</p> <p>Mechanised Services</p> <p>e. Residents to be given a reference number so can chase a telephone call.</p> <p>f. Enhance the GO Power system so it can automatically produce reports when calls are logged and completed.</p> <p>g. Ensure GO Power system can be supported by the Council's Digital Services Team.</p> <p>h. Prioritise getting operation licenses for both Randolph Road and Cottage Road sites.</p>	<p>Billy Wells, Principal Housing Manager</p> <p>John Mooteealoo, Cleaner Streets Programme Manager</p>		



<p>2.</p>	<p>Reduce and improve management of flytipping and lumber on Council estates</p>	<p>Housing Services – Estate Services to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Check fly tips to identify alleged perpetrators and contact Public Protection officers to increase the number of prosecutions.b. Consider a reporting back mechanism that allows residents to follow up on calls they have made.c. Look to increase the service level agreement with Public Protection to cover day time activity.d. Improve signage near bin areas.e. Take advice on designing new or improved bin areas to make them difficult to conceal flytips, while remaining visually appealing.f. Agree the type of screening they wish to use for bin areas and use the prototype for the whole borough.g. Enforce financial penalty clauses to prevent contractors and the in-house Direct Labour Organisation from flytipping and / or leaving waste after carrying out capital works/ repairs on estates.h. Ensure that all directly managed accommodation has access to bins including those above shops.i. Consider asking TLC (Voids Contractor) to remove lumber and rubbish left outside the property.j. Increase the number of gardening groups with Greenspace.			
-----------	--	--	--	--	--



	<p>Mechanised Services and Public Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">k. Environmental Services to consider reinstating the free pick up of for bulky items/white goods which was removed in April 2016.l. The Clean Islington app is taking time to bed in for staff and residents. Technical difficulties including the track location need to be improved.m. Public Protection suggested, and members of the SRG agreed, that Housing Services should consider appointing a specialised officer to investigate fly tips and take legal action or expand existing officers' role to deal with this issue.			
--	---	--	--	--



3.	Reduce incidents of dog fouling on Council estates and manage the impact it has on residents, particularly those with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Area housing offices should carry out impact assessments on how dog fouling impacts residents especially those with disabilities (partially sighted and wheelchair users) and put appropriate measures in place. b. Caretakers to report dog fouling and Area Housing Offices to keep records so that incidents can be monitored and locations can be tracked as per current procedure. c. Area housing offices to have a consistent approach in tackling dog fouling taking guidance from the Animal Welfare Officer. d. Agree timescales to implement arrangements for tenancy management staff to issue on the spot community penalty notices. e. Consider preventative walkabouts with Tenants and Residents Associations and Dog Patrol Wardens. f. Consider Use electronic noticeboards to inform residents an incident of dog fouling/ flytipping has been reported and action is being taken to deal with it. (this has now started). g. Consider stencils on pavements pointing the way to the nearest bin. h. Consider painting the dog excrement in bright colours to draw attention to it and show that it has been noted and will be dealt with. i. Consider whether creating dog exercising areas with bins and bags is feasible and how this might impact on other uses of this space. 			
----	--	---	--	--	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">j. Signs relating to dog nuisance should be bigger, consider with communications if more creative signage could have more impact, whilst adhering to legal requirements.k. Carry out an analysis on whether there are sufficient bins in areas where there is high levels of dog fouling.l. Consider placing more bins on estates and streets, taking into consideration additional costs.n. Consider using brightly coloured bins.			
--	--	--	--	--	--



4.	Revise the dog nuisance policy procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Simplify the dog nuisance procedure. b. Appropriate action should be taken when it is discovered that tenants own a dog without permission from the Council. 	Jackie Creighton, Housing Services Manager / Billy Wells		
5	Better publicity and improved messages on dog fouling, flytipping and recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Work with the Communications Team to promote and publicise success stories. b. Develop a pictorial signs to make issues around flytipping and dog fouling more widely understandable, especially for residents with dyslexia and/ or literacy issues. c. Message to all residents that street/park bins can be used to dispose of dog excrement. d. Promote responsible dog ownership guidance on the website. e. Educate residents about cost of dealing with litter and flytipping and how this could impact financing other essential services. f. Residents to be advised on what to recycle and the consequences of contaminating recycled materials with non-recyclable materials. g. Consider getting libraries to distribute bags for dog owners (similar to recycling bags). 	Billy Wells and Lyn Stratton, Deputy Head of Communications and Change		



<p>6.</p>	<p>To develop staff training which is operational rather than class room based</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Explore 'on the ground' based disability awareness training rather than classroom training for estate staff focusing on practical issues that have a day to day impact on disabled residents.b. This training can be part of the induction process with regular refresher courses.c. Practical putting yourself into a residents shoes training for front line operational staff.d. Caretakers to undergo training and performance monitoring so that duties as per the job description are carried out.e. Staff to respond to emails within set timescales with monitoring arrangements in place.f. Contact details for staff should be widely available.g. Consider providing career progression paths for caretakers.h. Consider moving away from standard letters when it comes to responding to complaints. Make complaint responses more personalised.i. Carry out training which enables staff to issue Community Protection Notices (this training will take place in March 2017).	<p>Billy Wells and Corporate Training Unit</p>		
-----------	--	---	--	--	--



7.	Learn from work practices of near neighbours	<p>a. Hackney Council's protocol for flytipping; after initial report an investigation will be carried out before it is removed by the Street cleansing team.</p> <p>b. Anti-social behaviour procedure on Council's website needs simplification (Hackney's web page is simple and easy to understand).</p> <p>c. Consider developing closer working between Street Cleansing and Estate Services. (Whilst Hackney Council are merging these two sections there is a recognition that what may work well with one council does not necessarily do so for another.</p>	Paul Byer, Service Improvement and Involvement Manager		
----	--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 3
Service review - Management of External Communal areas rev – Activities update
SRG Members
Peter, Annabel, Luigi, Helen, Deano, Lawrencia, Anne & Jim

	Activity and where / time	Type of activity	SRG Member	Update
1.	Desk top research Can be done from home	Look at polices and processes to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog nuisance policy / procedure • CPN's process • Role of the out of hours team/ estate services (caretakers/ QAO's/ Admin Officer) • How dog fouling/ letter/bulk refuse/fly-tipping reported • How dealt with - are there timescales • Partnership working • Number of FPNs / CPN's issued / enforced • Look at paperwork related to procedures • Look at any assessment carried out • Look at any complaints / members enquires made in period October 2015 to March 2016 • Look at monitoring processes re estate services and dog nuisance/ fouling • Look at websites – Islington, Westminster, Camden and Hackney 	Anne All	All tasks completed
2.	Meetings with staff-estate services Afternoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winston Morris – Estate Services Manager, Upper Street Area Housing Office • Milesh Patel, Estate Services Coordinator , Upper Street Area Housing Office • Leon Meredith - Street Care Manager, Public Realm 	Deano & Annabel	7 th June Agreed 16.5 2.00 to 4.00pm done
3.	Meetings with Staff – Dog Nuisance Early evening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Environmental Coordinator • Jackie Creighton, Housing Services Manager • Tenancy Management Advisor • Role of Our of Hours team • Joe Clarke, Animal Welfare Officer, Public Protection • Legal re notices 	Nicola & Luigi	8 June 5.00 TO 7.00PM done
4.	Site visit x 1 Morning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit estate with ESM/ ESC Sav Savva Estate Services Coordinator 	Helen & Annabel	24 June 9.30 to 11.30am done

	Site visit x 1 Afternoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit estate with ESM/ESC John Orlandi Estate Services Co-ordinator 	Anne, Peter & Deano	Tuesday 24 June 1.30 to 3.30pm done
5.	Focus Group meeting Evening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invite Reference Group members 	Lawrencia	Wednesday 6 July Report back on 14.7.16
6.	Mystery shopping - carry out an inspection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use mystery shoppers 	Annabel	Email 11.5 to Sara Done
7.	Disabled residents perspective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with members of the Disability Housing Panel on 13 July 2016, 1.30pm to 2.15pm 	Anne & Jim	Meeting 13 July 2016 Report back on 14.7.16
8.	Text Survey – not done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop survey questions for telephone survey 	Anne, Annabel & Lawrencia	Questions sent 20.6
9.	Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey residents who have reported issues under review 	Nalini	Done
10	Speak by phone to officers from Hackney and Camden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phoned named officer – Hackney Could not get named officer form Camden 	Lawrencia	Done
11.	SRG meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 May 2016 30 June 14 July 28 July 29 September 3 & 29 November 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree and review of activities 		Final meeting Presentation to J Farrant 29.11.16

HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVIEW OF HOUSING SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE

NOTES OF VISIT TO RECEPTION CENTRE – 28 FEBRUARY 2017

On 28th February 2017, members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee visited the reception centre accommodation at 305 Hornsey Road to meet reception centre officers and residents and inspect the premises.

The visit was attended by Councillors Mick O'Sullivan, Osh Gantly and Una O'Halloran, Rose-Marie McDonald, and a representative from Democratic Services.

During the visit the following main points were made:

The Reception Centre

- Reception centres provided temporary accommodation for people whose homelessness application was being processed. Reception centre residents were considered vulnerable for a range of reasons; they may have a physical or mental disability, be elderly and frail, have young children, have alcohol or substance misuse issues, or be at risk of harm for other reasons. Officers advised that some residents had been terminally ill or pregnant.
- The reception centre provided basic self-contained accommodation. Each unit had a bedroom, a bathroom, and a small kitchenette. Some units had two bedrooms and were suitable for families. There was shared laundry and waste disposal facilities.
- Each unit was spacious; it was commented that those leaving the reception centre to move into permanent accommodation would generally be moving to a smaller unit.
- Most residents were single adults; however there were five families in the reception centre. The centre's youngest single resident was 16 years old, the oldest was 90.
- Reception centre accommodation was only for residents who were capable of living independently. Reception centres did not provide 'supported accommodation', but staff commented on the need to support vulnerable people.
- The Hornsey Road reception centre had 38 units. The service operated two other centres, one with 17 units and another with 34, which included a flat with adaptations for those with disabilities. Three units at Hornsey Road were designated as 'out of hours' accommodation and were available to people presenting as homeless overnight. These were sometimes used by people fleeing domestic violence, or people in crisis situations due to fire or flooding. It was commented that more units were made available for out of hours use around Christmas.
- Residents usually stayed in the reception centre for a matter of days or weeks. In extreme circumstances residents had stayed for over a year. This was due to residents having very specific housing needs and a lack of suitable permanent accommodation was available. It was commented that single people were generally easy to house but it was much more difficult to house families.
- Most residents were working with social services or other support organisations. The reception centre did not make referrals to these organisations, as the referral would generally take place either before or alongside their referral to the reception centre.
- The Committee met with a single man in his 80s, and a single father with three young children, and spoke to them about their circumstances. Both commented that the reception centre was suitable for their needs, that they felt safe, and that the staff were helpful.

Staffing and services

- The reception centre was staffed by eight officers; a manager, a team leader, three officers, and three administrative and maintenance officers. It was commented that work in the reception centre was varied. As well as managing the centre accommodation; the centre staff provided all 'mainstream' housing services to those in the centre, including repairs and rent collection.
- The reception centre staff were not involved in processing homelessness applications. This was dealt with by a central team based at 222 Upper Street. Officers supported this division of responsibility, commenting that there should be a separation between the centre staff and those assessing the residents' applications. It was difficult to build trust with some residents and this would not be helped by centre staff being involved in the decision making process.
- The Committee heard that staff went the extra mile to support vulnerable residents. Staff had helped residents to redirect their post, apply for Freedom Passes, apply for benefits, and order items to the building. Staff also commented on the need to support people to live independently.
- Reception centre staff provided a care package to vulnerable tenants, which included a kettle, teabags, a plate, cutlery, soap, and toilet paper.
- A member commented that a recent Channel 4 dispatches documentary highlighted that some London boroughs were not providing a good service to vulnerable people in emergency situations. In response, it was advised that officers understood the pressures faced by housing departments across London, but the council worked hard to meet its legal responsibilities.
- Residents were able to bring their own possessions into the centre, but were discouraged from bringing too many of their own items. The centre did not have storage for personal items and having lots of possessions would delay the moving out process.
- The majority of residents paid their rent on time, but some were in arrears. The reception centre only evicted residents in extreme circumstances.
- Most voids were processed within four days; although if units were left in a very bad condition they could take up to ten days to process.
- The reception centre had screens displaying bus times, local news, and useful advice and contact numbers.

Security

- It was important to keep the reception centre secure. The reception centre had 24 hour security and guests were not allowed to stay overnight. Key security had been implemented, meaning that residents could only access the areas of the building they needed.
- Before being referred to the centre all residents were subject to a risk assessment. The centre did not accept high risk residents who would present a danger to the centre or other residents. It was commented that very few people were rejected for this reason.
- Some new residents initially struggled with the rules of the centre but most settled quickly. There was a low level of antisocial behaviour, and it was commented that the 24 hour security acted as a deterrent.
- All communal areas were covered by CCTV.

Identified issues

- Staff commented that one particular issue was hospitals directly discharging patients to reception centres. This may happen if the patient is homeless, or is unable to return to their own property. There had been instances where reception centre staff were not advised of what support or care these vulnerable people needed. It was advised that these people generally arrived without clothing or food and sometimes were not able to go out and get the supplies they needed. The situation was exacerbated if these residents arrived on Friday afternoon, sometimes it was difficult to liaise with the hospital or social services as staff had left for the weekend. The reception centre had started demanding that a care plan was provided in advance of these residents being accepted.
- Staff commented on the importance of liaising with other services, and indicated that communication between housing and social services, including children's social care, could be improved. An example was given of a homeless 18 year old in the centre, who had not lived independently before. Staff thought that this resident needed some additional guidance and support but found it difficult to action change in other services.
- During the visit one resident advised members that his application for re-housing had been accepted and he was awaiting a move date, however reception centre staff had not been made aware of this.
- Members commented on the financial challenges facing the council and asked if there was ever a "golden age" of providing support to homeless people. In response, it was advised that Islington Council used to have a greater supply of available homes and therefore more people were rehoused faster. Officers commented that some residents' applications for re-housing were denied and suggested that ten or twenty years ago people in similar situations were more likely to have their applications accepted.
- Officers commented on the financial pressures on the NHS and social care. It was reported that residents who needed support from social workers or district nurses received shorter and less regular appointments than in the past. As a result, it was advised that reception centre staff were providing ad hoc support and guidance to some residents when this was not strictly part of their role. Any support given by reception centre staff was informal and was not coordinated with other services.
- Staff commented on the difficulties posed by data sharing agreements and that the information they received on resident from social workers was inconsistent. Whilst staff appreciated the need for confidentiality, it was commented that staff needed to know some information on residents' needs to carry out their role effectively.
- Members commented that some rooms were cold and noted that the building was only single glazed. It was suggested that double glazing would keep the building warm and reduce spend on heating the building

The Committee thanked the residents and officers for their time.

This page is intentionally left blank

HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
REVIEW OF HOUSING SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Housing Services should clarify their definitions of vulnerability and disability, and how these relate to each other.
2. Housing Services should further publicise the shortage of council housing in order to set realistic expectations of what residents may be able to successfully bid for. It is recommended that anonymised case studies are used where appropriate to illustrate the shortage of housing and to help disabled and vulnerable people choose the 'best available option'.
3. That the information on housing services for vulnerable people be reviewed to provide a comprehensive resource, setting out the services provided by the council, eligibility criteria, any limits to that support, and advice on how to access services that the council does not provide. This should be provided in a range of accessible formats, as required by legislation.
4. Key online customer processes be reviewed to identify and close gaps in accessibility. All housing transactions should be able to be carried out without use of a telephone or having to visit council offices; the introduction of a webchat function would be welcomed. However, it should also be recognised that exclusively online services are not accessible to all.
5. The council should review its information governance responsibilities and data sharing agreements to ensure that the support needs of residents are known to the services that need this information. It is important that housing services and contractors can access residents' data securely to enable them to provide high quality services to vulnerable and disabled people.
6. Consideration be given to how the voices of vulnerable and disabled people can be heard earlier in decision-making processes on procurement, commissioning and designing services; and how vulnerable and disabled people can be further involved in service monitoring and evaluation.

7. Housing Services should review how staff are trained, kept up to date, and access information on how to best support tenants with additional needs. This review should be in conjunction with service users, to identify knowledge and skills gaps and agree how these should be resolved. Staff need to understand how additional needs will have a practical impact on their work and their interactions with residents.
8. A comprehensive needs matrix should be developed to enable housing services to record the needs of vulnerable and disabled people in greater detail. This will help to ensure that staff have the right resources and are aware of how they need to adapt their services for those with additional needs.
9. When moving into a council property, disabled and vulnerable tenants should be consulted on the repairs and adaptations that are required to the property. The works to be carried out should be confirmed in writing with indicative timescales to ensure that both the council and the tenant have mutually agreed expectations.
10. Housing services should publish the standards which they seek to meet when communicating and engaging with disabled and vulnerable people, and should consider reviewing service standards and feedback mechanisms with service users.
11. In order to develop the relationship between the council and local communities, consideration should be given to making the Housing Operations service more 'holistic', whereby a greater range of services are provided to residents on a more local basis.
12. Housing Services should set clear expectations for contractors about working with disabled and vulnerable residents; this should include standards for staff training and accessibility. Compliance should be enforceable and regularly monitored to ensure that contractors are compliant with relevant disability legislation and that they are responsive to the needs of vulnerable and disabled people. Housing contractors should also be required to report any welfare concerns they have to the Housing service.

13. Liaison between housing, social services and NHS services be reviewed in regards to hospital discharge arrangements; to ensure that reception centres and other relevant housing services are aware of care needs and that disabled and vulnerable people are fully supported.

14. Service user groups should be invited to participate in the forthcoming review of the council's housing management services, and other service reviews as appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of: Executive Member for Housing and Development

Meeting of	Date	Ward(s)
Housing Scrutiny Committee	28 March 2016	All

Delete as appropriate	Exempt	Non-exempt

SUBJECT: Housing Performance – Quarter 3 2016/17

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 Each year the council agrees a set of performance indicators and targets which, collectively, help us to monitor progress in delivering corporate priorities and working towards our goal of making Islington a fairer place to live and work.
- 1.2 Progress is reported on a quarterly basis through the council's Scrutiny function to challenge performance where necessary and to ensure accountability to residents.
- 1.3 This report sets out a progress update for those indicators related to Housing over the first half of 2016-17 (i.e. 1 April to 30 September 2016).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To note progress to the end of Quarter 3 against key performance indicators falling within the remit of the Housing Scrutiny Committee.

3. Background

- 3.1 The council routinely monitors a wide range of performance measures to ensure that the services it delivers are effective, respond to the needs of residents and offer good quality and value for money.
- 3.2 This year, rather than Policy & Performance Scrutiny Committee (PPS) scrutinising all quarterly performance reporting, a new approach was agreed whereby each of the four theme based scrutiny committees – Children's Services, Health and Care, Environment & Regeneration, and Housing – will be responsible for monitoring performance in their own areas.

4. Quarter 3 update on Housing performance

4.1 This report contains an update on Housing indicators for Quarter 3.

Objective	PI No	Indicator	Frequency	Q3 Actual Oct-Dec	Q3 Target Oct-Dec	Target 2016-17	On/Off target	Same period last year	Better than last year?
<i>Increase supply of and access to suitable affordable homes</i>		Number of affordable new council and housing association homes built	Q	72	N/A	460	N/A	113	No
		Number of severely overcrowded households that have been assisted to relieve their overcrowding	Q	99	45.5	78	On	N/A	N/A
		Number of under-occupied households that have downsized	Q	118	150	200	Off	122	No
<i>Ensure effective management of council housing stock</i>		Percentage of LBI repairs fixed first time	M	84.8%	85.0%	85.0%	Off	83.9%	Yes
		Major works open over three months as a percentage of Partners' total completed major works repairs	M	12.5%	1.0%	1.0%	Off	1.6%	No
		a) Rent arrears as a proportion of the rent roll - LBI	M	2.2%	2.0%	2.0%	Off	2.7%	Yes
		b) Rent arrears as a proportion of the rent roll - Partners	M	2.7%	2.0%	2.0%	Off	3.2%	Yes
<i>Reduce homelessness</i>		Number of households accepted as homeless	M	294	300	400	On	266	No
		Number of households in nightly-booked temporary accommodation	M	417	450	400	Yes	490	Yes

NB: Frequency (of data reporting): M = monthly; Q = quarterly

Increase supply of / access to affordable housing

- 4.2 As reported in the previous two quarters, we anticipate a significant slowdown in affordable housing completions for the remaining quarters due to large schemes being delayed and looking to complete in 2017-18. While it is highly unlikely 460 affordable homes will be delivered this financial year, 16 new council homes are completing this year, with another 239 on site and 237 due to start this year.
- 4.3 The majority of the borough's affordable housing development is undertaken by housing associations and private developers, and as such, the council has limited influence over timescales for delivery.

Effective management of council housing stock

- 4.4 The volume of major works over three months old as a % of Partners' total major works repairs has reduced from the last report to 13% up to the end of January 2017.
- 4.5 There are 28 major repairs over 3 months, the current status of which is identified as: 15 of the 28 work are now underway whilst 7 of the 28 are still delayed as a result of legal processes associated with leaseholders who can scrutinise proposed works under the section 20 process, planning requirements and Party Wall protocols, which are need to be completed with neighbouring properties. The remaining repairs are delayed due to operational issues such as problems arranging access to the property and difficulty accessing required materials.
- 4.6 Repairs performance continues to be strong with first time fix rates at 84.8% against a target of 85%. Performance is up on the last quarter and also when compared to the same quarter last year. This is top quartile performance nationally and better than that if compared to only London boroughs. Repairs managers scrutinise a range of PIs monthly, as well as a monthly learning report, to ensure that service improvements are made where appropriate. Satisfaction with the service, as measured by an independent telephone survey of a significant sample of residents who have had repairs undertaken in the previous month, is running at 90% year to date. Although the number of stage 1 complaints over the last six months has increased slightly, the number of upheld stage 1 complaints and the number of stage 2 complaints have both reduced in the same period.
- 4.7 Rent arrears increased at the end of quarter 3 to 2.2% as a percentage against the rent roll. The rent arrears trend is for the debt to increase due to the Christmas and New Year period.
- 4.8 The Income Recovery teams have continued to contact and support tenants by referrals to our Partners and utilised the Resident Support Scheme to assist tenants affected by welfare reform. Working with the IMAX team, all those affected by the new level of Benefit Cap, introduced from 7 November 2016, have been assisted with a Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) to cover the Benefit cap shortfall until 2 April 2017. During this period of time further support can be provided to either achieve exemption from the Benefit Cap or providing assistance to move into work.
- 4.9 We are confident that we will be below target at year end.
- 4.10 Rent arrears as a percentage of the rent roll at the end of Q3 was an overall figure of 2.70%; this increase occurred due to the fact that not all rent payments received between 23 December 2016 and 02 January 2017 had been credited to the rent accounts and therefore the figure reported is not a true reflection. However, the current rent arrears position is PFI 1 = 1.90% and PFI 2 = 2.71% resulting in a reduced overall figure of 2.41%.
- 4.11 At 6 March 2017 the percentage against the rent roll has been reduced to 1.78% against a target of 2.0% and remain confident that we will remain below target for year end.

Reduce homelessness

- 4.12 The number of households accepted as homeless in the first three quarters of this financial year are within target and we are now predicted to meet the annual target of less than 400 acceptances. This is due to successful work in preventing homelessness that the service is undertaking as preparation for the implementation of the Homelessness Prevention Bill. Nationally, homelessness acceptances in Quarter 1 of 2016-17 increased by 10% when compared with the same quarter in the previous year. Acceptances in London rose by 11% in the same period.
- 4.13 Nationally, homelessness acceptances in Quarter 2 of 2016-17 increased by 2% when compared with the same quarter in the previous year. The impact of welfare reform and changes in Local Housing Allowance (housing benefit) means that the private rented sector is no longer an affordable option for many Islington residents. The council is no longer able to procure sufficient affordable private rented accommodation in the borough to be able to offer to residents as an alternative to becoming homeless.
- 4.14 The impact of welfare reform and changes in Local Housing Allowance (housing benefit) means that the private rented sector is no longer an affordable option for many Islington residents. The council is no longer able to procure sufficient affordable private rented accommodation in the borough to be able to offer to residents as an alternative to becoming homeless. The housing needs service is working with iWork and iMax to support those affected by welfare reform.
- 4.15 Our initial target for reduction in the numbers of households in nightly booked TA was 421. This was met in Jan 2017 (429). The target was then revised down to 400. This was met in February (378). The reasons for this successful reduction are down to implementation of our TA reduction strategy, which includes increased move on to permanent accommodation, and a more rigorous approach at the front end, to minimise TA bookings and homeless acceptances.

Appendices: None

Background papers: None

Report author: Jo Fry, Performance Team Manager, Housing and Adult Social Services

Tel: 020 7527 2679

E-mail: jo.fry@islington.gov.uk



Report of: Service Director – Housing Needs and Strategy

Meeting of	Date	Ward(s)
Housing Scrutiny Committee	28 March 2017	All

Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt
-----------------------	--	------------

SUBJECT: Update on Tenant Led Organisations

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the Tenant Led Organisation delivering services on behalf of Islington Council

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the report is noted by the Committee

3. Background

- 3.1 Islington has the highest number of tenant led organisations known as Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs) and Tenant Management Co-operatives (TMCs) under one local authority in the country and we currently have 23 organisations delivering services on our behalf.
- 3.2 Our TMO/Cs were historically set up in two phases; first in the late 70's & early '80's and these are called Co-operatives or Estate Management Boards (approx. 10) under an early manifestation of the TMO principle by the GLC. The second phase came in the early '90's and were set up under the Right to Manage Act 1994. The current TMOs in Islington manage approximately 3,100 council owned properties.
- 3.3 All TMO's are established under the same principles that tenants have a right to form a constituted body with rules, agree a Management Agreement (contract) with the Local Authority and deliver some or all housing services to their homes with funding allocated from the Council.
- 3.4 The management agreement incorporates the TMO's rules, equal opportunities policy, financial and accounting procedures, employment procedures, key operational policies and procedures and the service specification and performance standards to which the TMO must operate.

- 3.5 Councils are required to pay TMOs an allowance for the services they provide and an allowance to cover their overheads and other running costs such as HR, utilities and management costs. The government has issued guidance on how allowances must be calculated for tenants and for leaseholders.
- 3.6 The allowance is different for tenants and leaseholders. For tenants, allowances are based on council's expenditure and include an amount for each of the services they provide, plus overheads. This is calculated on a unit cost basis per tenanted property and pays TMOs pro rata according to the number of properties it manages. For leaseholder expenditure, the council pays the amount that the TMO actually spend on these properties and recharges it back to leaseholders.
- 3.7 TMOs are not-for-profit companies registered with the FCA under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1965 or as a company limited by guarantee under the provisions of the Companies Act 1985. All residents on the estate, tenants and leaseholders, are entitled to be a members of the TMO on the purchase of a share at a nominal rate but it is not compulsory. Average TMO membership within each organisation is over 50% of residents.
- 3.8 TMOs are managed by an elected committee of an average 12 volunteers who live on the estate. The committee will include officers such as a chairperson, treasurer and a secretary and a number of other committee members. Committees normally meet monthly and TMOs hold an AGM's (Annual General Meetings) when officer elections are held and they tend to hold other general meetings throughout the year.
- 3.9 The TMO's within Islington are mainly small organisations, one is managed on a completely voluntary basis by committee members, the majority typically directly employ a TMO manager, sometimes with admin support and caretakers/handyman. They will also engage contractors to deliver services on the estate, such as specialist repairs and grounds maintenance companies.
- 3.10 The TMO Team within the council provides advice, support and guidance to TMOs and council staff working with TMOs. It also monitors and regulates TMO performance, undertakes project work relating to tenant management and any changes to the Management Agreement. The team works closely with the council's Internal Audit Team to understand changing responsibilities and emerging risks which may affect these organisations and work with TMOs to implement processes and systems to address. The team also shares best practise with a wider local authority working group made up of mainly London boroughs with TMOs.

4. Delivery of Services

- 4.1.1 TMOs can choose the level of services they wish to take over from the council and most TMOs decide to take on most of the day-to-day housing management functions such as repairs, caretaking, grounds maintenance whilst others have opted to take on rent collection, parking and garages, intercom repairs or management of CCTV.
- 4.1.2 Alongside the day to day management functions some TMO's, supported by the council have taken responsibility for the cyclical works to their estate.
- 4.1.3 **Cyclical works**
Stafford Cripps TMO had taken on the responsibility for cyclical works from the council and in 2015 successfully delivered these to a high standard and quality. This was new ground for the council and TMO, and a great example of partnership working for the benefit of the residents on the estate.
- 4.1.4 The TMO employed a consultant to provide expertise and support to the TMO in the delivery of the works. They oversaw the tender and procurement process and the contract was awarded to Beckford's Construction Limited.

- 4.1.5 The TMO developed a good working relationship their contractors, who delivered the works to a high quality within the agreed budget providing good value for the residents of the estate.
- 4.1.6 This was a positive example of local delivery and partnership working between the TMO and council. Following the success of these works the TMO is now taking on delivering tenant and communal door replacement programme and providing extra value for the council by making a contribution towards this cost of this works from the TMO's surpluses.
- 4.1.7 **Surpluses**
Through efficiencies in delivering services, TMO's have accrued substantial surpluses (Appendix 2). The council actively encourages TMO's to re-invest their surpluses back into their managed properties which not only improves residents homes and the councils stock but also means the TMO can offer more than the council would not normally be able to fund, avoiding available funding sitting there unused.
- 4.1.8 To reinvest the surpluses several TMO's have programmes of internal decorations for tenanted properties and schemes for improvements to communal areas.
- 4.1.9 A recent example of this is Brooke Park Co-op who has recently carried out a programme to replace all their tenanted front doors and the installations of new bathrooms and wet rooms for tenants. The Co-op was able to offer this as an additional service to leaseholders at a competitive cost.
- 4.1.10 The Co-op also identified that the walkways needed resurfaced and with match funding from the council has successfully carried out this work.
- 4.1.11 Examples of upcoming schemes include at Pleydell TMO, who will be replacing communal flooring throughout the estate. Quaker Court has been working with the council to contribute towards a front door replacement programme.
- 4.1.12 Surpluses are also being used to improve the community spaces on the estate through the installation of cycle storage, outdoor gym equipment and children's playground equipment, and considering the installation of CCTV systems.
- 4.1.13 Dixon Clark Court TMO intends to contribute to the new development of the estate by financing the improvement of the entrance to the block to coincide with new build development plans (see 4.2.4.)
- 4.2. New Build Schemes**
- 4.2.1 As part of the council priority to build new homes, alongside schemes on our directly managed estates, the council is looking at making better use of under-developed, unusual and unloved spaces on TMO estates.
- 4.2.2 The council has successfully completed a new build scheme on the Brunswick Estate in June 2016. This involved the demolition of around 40 existing garages and refurbishing 10 bedsits to create 13 new houses and various public realm improvements. The scheme delivered a mix of one, two and three bedroom homes all built to a high standard and some with wheelchair access.
- 4.2.3 Works are due to start on site in Autumn 2017 on the Redbrick Estate, this involves 55 new homes, of which 39 will be social rent, including a new estate office and Community Centre.
- 4.2.4 New build housing around Dixon Clark Court has been consulted on, and is in the pre planning stage. Early design options are being reviewed for Braithwaite and Quaker Court.

.4.3 Feedback from recent audits

- 4.3.1 The council's Internal Audit team periodically carries out audits on TMO's to ensure they comply with the legal and regulatory framework. This includes the requirements of the Management Agreement, such as compliance with their financial management and robust governance of their organisation.
- 4.3.2 Audit reports are risk rated, and where critical and high priority risks have been identified in a TMO, it is important they work to address these, and the council will support them to do that.
- 4.3.3 Reports are reviewed to identify individual issues and common themes to provide support. These audits provide a useful check to ensure these small organisations are complying with key requirements and also helps identify areas of improvement and support that the council's TMO team can highlight and work with TMO/Cs to overcome.
- 4.3.4 Of the 8 audits carried out on TMO's since April 2014, 2 TMO's were found to have No Assurance, 4, Limited Assurance, and 2 with Moderate Assurance.
- 4.3.5 Common themes identified from recent audits include:
- 4.3.6 IT & Data Protection – risk areas in TMO have been identified in IT support and data storage, weakness in management of information, standard policies in place, and weaknesses in protecting data. The council will work with TMO to find appropriate solutions to ensuring they are keeping resident data safe and complying with new legal requirements.
- 4.3.7 Keeping up to date – there are challenges for small organisations to keep abreast on of changes to new legislation and regulatory frameworks, in areas including the data regulations, guidance around CCTV, and HMRC rules on self-regulation.
- 4.3.8 DBS/Safeguarding – It has been identified that for some TMO's there has been a lack of understanding for the need for safeguarding requirements. The council recommends that TMOs seek a basic DBS check for all their staff as the council does in respect of those staff working in broadly comparable roles and functions to TMOs, and that it is good practice for volunteer committee members to undergo a DBS check.
- 4.3.9 The council has also delivered training and briefings on safeguarding to these organisations and guidance on processes to follow when concerns are identified. A recommendation has been made following a safeguarding investigation that TMO's should identify and train at least one board member to support the TMO's understanding of safeguarding issues.

4.4 Challenges going forward

- 4.4.1 As resident lead organisations, TMO's are reliant on strong and stable communities. The impacts of changes in Government legislation pose challenges for TMO's.

4.4.2 Changes to Benefits (Rent collecting co-ops)

The Government has introduced changes to welfare benefits which has changed the ways benefits are paid and the amounts that are paid. These changes could impact the rent collecting Co-ops and lead to higher unrecoverable arrears.

4.4.4 The Housing and Planning Act 2016

The Housing Act will bring in a number of changes which will not only affect council tenants in generally but could pose particular threat to the sustainability of TMO's.

4.4.6 Fixed Term Tenancies

The introduction of fixed term tenancies rather than lifetime tenancies and expected to be implemented later in 2017. New tenancies will be offered between two and ten years, which could impact community involvement if new tenants do not have long term investment in their homes or estates. The council will have a greater understanding of the impacts once the government regulations are issued.

4.4.8 Selling Higher Value Council Homes

This is likely to be introduced in April 2018, and is a requirement for councils to sell its higher-value council homes when they become empty. For Islington this could be as many as 300 properties each year, and will mean the council will end up with far fewer properties to let to people who need them.

The sale of properties will mean that a greater number of properties will be leasehold, which will have a financial impact on the level of allowances paid to TMO's (see 3.6), and change the social cohesion within the estate

4.4.10 Data Protection/IT

Rapid changes in technology have changed the landscape in which we work, the nature of TMO's as small organisations, responsible for delivering a wide range of functions mean that not all of our TMOs have been able to keep up to date with the impact of these changes, leaving TMO's and the council at risk of not being compliant with data requirements.

4.5 **A Year of Anniversaries**

4.5.1 2016 was a year of celebration for our TMO's. It was a landmark for residents living in the Charteris Neighbourhood Tenant Co-operative as they have now been delivering their own local housing services for 40 years. The Co-op, set up in 1976, manages 90 council-owned, Victorian street properties in the Finsbury Park area. It was one of the first local authority, tenant management co-operative established anywhere in the country.

4.5.2 Over the years, the Co-op's committee has changed as residents have come and gone, and it has had to respond to changes to housing policy, such as Right to Buy, that has changed how services have been delivered, and it's a real testament to the residents' hard work that 40 years on the Co-op is still going strong.

4.5.3 Also celebrating significant milestones were Half Moon Crescent Co-op celebrating the organisation's 30th Anniversary and Braithwaite and Quaker Court Estate reaching the 50th years since the development of the estate and the first tenants moving in.

5. **Implications**

5.1 **Financial Implications**

No direct financial implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

5.2 **Legal Implications**

No direct legal implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

5.3 **Environmental Implications**

No direct environmental implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

5.4 Resident Impact Assessment

No direct resident implications arise as a result of the recommendations.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 TMO's are well established organisations with experience of delivering services on council estates. They provide benefits to their residents through the local delivery of their services. As small organisations, some TMO's may face challenges in keeping up to date with changes to legislation and regulation in a rapidly changing environment. The council seeks to support TMOs to adapt and update through providing guidance, training and helping them review how they are meeting these challenges.

Background Papers: None

Appendices

- Appendix 1 - TMO details
- Appendix 2 : TMO Surpluses 15/16

Final report clearance:

Signed by:

.....
Service Director – Housing Needs and Strategy

20 March 2017
Date

Report Author: Joanne Walters, Tenant Management Team Leader
Tel: 020 7527 7103
Email: Joanne.waltersi@islington.gov.uk

Appendix 1: TMO Details

Organisation	Est.	Units
Arch-Elm Co-op	1980	95
Blackstock TMO	2002	185
Braithwaite House TMO	2003	108
Brooke Park Co-op	1980	111
Brunswick Close TMO	2003	268
Charteris Co-op	1976	124
Dixon Clark TMO	1999	60
Elthorne 1 st Co-op	1979	133
Gambier House TMO	2001	115
Halfmoon Crescent Co-op	1983	226
Harry Weston Co-op	1978	124
Holbrook Co-op	1979	103
Hornsey Lane EMB	1991 (LBI)	173
Miranda TMO	2001	148
Newbery House Co-op	1978	54
Pleydell TMO	2004	280
Quaker Court TMO	2001	76
Redbrick TMO	2001	112
Seaview Co-op		15
Spa Green TMO	1995	129
Stafford Cripps TMO	2000	180
Taverner and Peckett TMO	2000	165
Wenlake TMO	2000	119

This page is intentionally left blank

TMO	Properties managed		Delegated responsibilities	Annual operating income (2015/16 figure)	Annual operating costs (2015/16 figure)	Current surplus (to 31 March 2016)
	Tenant	Leasehold				
Arch Elm Co-op	54	41	Caretaking	£101,041	£62,350	£215,221
	Total	95	Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Entryphone systems			
Blackstock TMO	131	54	Caretaking	£168,872	£155,710	£181,091
	Total	185	Grounds maintenance			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Braithwaite House TMO	87	21	Caretaking	£223,417	£199,217	£135,446
	Total	108	Grounds maintenance			
			Concierge / CCTV			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Brooke Park Co-op	64	51	Caretaking	£134,873	£126,271	£451,542
	Total	115	Rent collection			
			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Brunswick TMO	226	42	Caretaking	£250,838	£216,023	£309,557
	Total	268	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids (<£2,000)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Charteris Co-op	57	33	Rent collection	£96,782	£64,398	£128,717
	Total	90	Voids			
			Allocations			

			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Heating repairs			
Dixon Clark Court TMO	43	17	Caretaking	£68,010	£44,963	£127,910
	Total	60	Grounds maintenance			
			Repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Elthorne 1st Co-op	71	68	Caretaking	£172,982	£123,434	£190,578
	Total	139	Rent collection			
			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Gambier House TMO	92	23	Caretaking	£121,517	£80,569	£276,205
	Total	115	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids			
			Repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Half Moon Crescent Co-op	111	117	Caretaking	£307,403	£256,673	£924,889
	Total	228	Grounds maintenance			
			Estate parking			
			Rent collection			
			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Heating repairs			
Harry Weston Co-op	47	77	Caretaking	£214,204	£237,221	£1,110,148
	Total	124	Grounds maintenance			
			Estate parking			
			Rent collection			

			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Heating repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Holbrook Co-op	66	37	Caretaking	£130,599	£140,979	£208,635
	Total	103	Estate parking			
			Rent collection			
			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Hornsey Lane EMB	126	48	Caretaking	£143,196	£176,318	£122,657
	Total	174	Repairs			
Miranda Estate TMO	101	47	Caretaking	£151,724	£126,113	£132,459
	Total	148	Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Newbery House Co-op	19	35	Caretaking	£60,924	£44,544	£154,656
	Total	54	Grounds maintenance			
			Estate parking			
			Rent collection			
			Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
Pleydell TMO	224	56	Caretaking	£255,284	£237,277	£246,123
	Total	280	Grounds maintenance			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			

Quaker Court TMO	39	37	Caretaking	£77,745	£67,252	£118,751
	Total	76	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids (<£2,000)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
		Cyclical maintenance				
Redbrick TMO	59	53	Caretaking	£112,495	£96,573	£173,161
	Total	112	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids (<£2,000)			
			Repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Seaview Co-op	10	5	Rent collection	£67,765	£89,307	£59,593
	Total	15	Voids			
			Allocations			
			Tenancy Management (limited)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
			Heating repairs			
Spa Green TMO	88	41	Caretaking	£116,616	£96,270	£56,966
	Total	129	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids (<£2,000)			
			Repairs			
			Out of hours repairs			
		Cyclical maintenance				
Stafford Cripps TMO	140	40	Caretaking	£148,503	£132,238	£163,330
	Total	180	Grounds maintenance			
			Voids (<£2,000)			
			Repairs			
			Cyclical maintenance			
Taverner and Peckett Square TMO	103	61	Caretaking	£154,516	£128,349	£272,584
	Total	164	Grounds maintenance			
			Repairs			
Wenlake TMO	92	27	Caretaking	£115,264	£119,627	£88,830
	Total	119	Grounds maintenance			

		Repairs			
TOTAL			£3,394,570	£3,021,676	£5,849,049

This page is intentionally left blank