

**HOUSING & NEW HOMES
COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item 54

Brighton & Hove City Council

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| Subject: | Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 2 2017/18 | | |
| Date of Meeting: | 15 November 2017 | | |
| Report of: | Executive Director Neighbourhoods Communities & Housing | | |
| Contact Officer: | Name: | Ododo Dafé | Tel: 01273 293201 |
| | Email: | ododo.dafe@brighton-hove.gov.uk | |
| Ward(s) affected: | All | | |

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 The housing management performance report covers Quarter 2 of the financial year 2017/18. The report is attached as Appendix 1. Notable performance information from the report includes:

- **Rent collection and current arrears** – 98.97% of rent collected.
- **Customer services and complaints** – Housing customer services answered 95% of calls and 85% of complaints were responded to within 10 working days.
- **Empty home turnaround time** – 140 homes re-let in an average of 23 days (excluding time spent in major works).
- **Repairs and maintenance** – 96% of appointments were kept and the repairs helpdesk answered 97% of calls.
- **Estates service** – 100% of inspected cleaning tasks and mobile warden jobs passed their quality inspections.
- **Anti-social behaviour** – 55 cases closed and 82% of people surveyed were satisfied with way anti-social behaviour complaint was dealt with.
- **Tenancy management** – 35 people helped to keep their tenancies which were at risk and five properties returned to stock due to housing fraud.
- **Seniors housing** – 96% of residents have been visited at home within the last year.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Housing & New Homes Committee notes and comments upon the report, which went to Area Panels in October and November 2017.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The report continues the use of the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

- 4.1 A draft version of this report went to Area Panels on 26, 30, 31 October and 1 November 2017. As a result of feedback, the tables relating to anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents have been amended to provide more clarity about the sorts of incidents which are being reported in them -- these are incidents that relate to or create an ASB case where the complainant or alleged perpetrator is a council resident such as a tenant or leaseholder.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The area of performance with the most significant financial impact is the ability to collect rents from tenants. The report shows that during the second quarter 2017/18, the collection rate has decreased by 0.02% when compared with quarter 1, although is still higher than the target rate. The amount of rent collected has a direct impact on the resources available to spend on the management and maintenance of tenants' properties. Therefore, collection rates are closely monitored so that appropriate action can be taken to minimise arrears and target intervention to where it is most needed. This is especially important given the government plans to continue the roll out of Universal Credit in Brighton and Hove during the next few months.

Finance Officer Consulted: Monica Brooks

Date: 20/10/17

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no significant legal implications to draw to members' attention arising from this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 23/10/17

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 There are no direct sustainability implications arising from this report.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report. Cases of anti-social behaviour involving criminal activity are worked on in partnership with the Police and other appropriate agencies.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 There are no direct risk and opportunity implications arising from this report.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.7 There are no direct public health implications arising from this report.

Corporate or Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 There are no direct corporate or city wide implications arising from this report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix 1. Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 2, 2017/18.

Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 2 2017/18

This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 2 of the financial year 2017/18. It uses the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

| Status | | Trend | |
|---|--|---|--|
|  | Performance is below target (red) |  | Poorer than previous reporting period |
|  | Performance is close to achieving target, but in need of improvement (amber) |  | Same as previous reporting period |
|  | Performance is on or above target (green) |  | Improvement on previous reporting period |

A total of 46 performance indicators are measured against a quarterly target:

- 34 are on target
- 7 are near target
- 5 are below target.

Explanations of performance have been provided for indicators which are near or below target.

The icons used throughout the report are sourced from www.flaticon.com and were designed by 'Freepik.'

1. Rent collection and current arrears

|  Rent collection and current arrears indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.1 | Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year | 98.40% | 98.99% (£50.0m of £50.5m) | 98.97% (£50.0m of £50.5m) | Ⓞ | ↓ |
| 1.2 | Total current tenant arrears | For info | £507k | £527k | - | - |
| 1.3 | Tenants served a Notice of Seeking Possession | For info | 140 | 132 | - | - |
| 1.4 | Tenants evicted because of rent arrears* | 20 | 0 | 1 | - | - |
| 1.5 | Rent loss due to empty dwellings | Under 1% | 0.83% (£417k of £50.3m) | 0.75% (£378k of £50.3m) | Ⓞ | ↑ |
| 1.6 | Former tenant arrears collected during the year* | 25% | 7.27% (£40k of £554k) | 14.17% (£76k of £538k) | - | - |
| 1.7 | Rechargeable debt collected during the year* | 20% | 3.01% (£4k of £131k) | 6.97% (£9k of £123k) | - | - |

*These Indicators are accumulative throughout the year and their targets are set for the year end. Therefore, the status and trend symbols will be applied in the Quarter 4 report, once performance for the year is known.

| DWP Welfare reform information | | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1.10 | Universal Credit – affected tenants | 79 (0.7% of all tenants) | 82 (0.7% of all tenants) |
| 1.11 | Universal Credit – arrears of affected tenants | £25k (6% of total arrears) | £30k (6% of total arrears) |
| 1.12 | Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – affected tenants (under occupiers) | 647 (6%) | 631 (6%) |
| 1.13 | Under occupiers – arrears of affected tenants | £51k (10%) | £49k (9%) |
| 1.14 | Benefit Cap – affected tenants | 46 (0.4%) | 47 (0.4%) |
| 1.15 | Benefit Cap – arrears of affected tenants | £6.4k (1%) | £7.4k (1%) |

1.16 Area breakdown of rent collected

|  Rent collection area | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Trend since last quarter |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| North (includes Seniors housing) | 99.21% (£14.2m of £14.3m) | 99.19% (£14.2m of £14.3m) | ↓ |
| West | 98.99% (£10.3m of £10.4m) | 98.93% (£10.3m of £10.4m) | ↓ |
| Central | 98.78% (£9.0m of £9.1m) | 98.76% (£9.0m of £9.1m) | ↓ |
| East | 98.96% (£16.5m of £16.7m) | 98.93% (£16.5m of £16.7m) | ↓ |
| All areas | 99.01% (£50.0m of £50.5m) | 98.97% (£50.0m of £50.5m) | ↓ |

1.17 Tenants in arrears by amount

|  Amount of arrears | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| No arrears | 76% (8,628) | 81% (9,253) |
| Any arrears | 24% (2,742) | 19% (2,113) |
| ... £0.01 to £99.99 | 13% (1,489) | 8% (952) |
| ... £100 to £499.99 | 9% (992) | 8% (901) |
| ... £500 and above | 2% (261) | 2% (260) |
| Total tenants | 11,370 | 11,366 |

2. Customer services and complaints

|  | Customer services and complaints indicators | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| 2.1 | Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST) | 90% | 91% (8,160 of 8,971) | 95% (8,661 of 9,146) |  |  |
| 2.2 | Customer satisfaction with HCST (very or fairly satisfied) | 87% | 85% (March 2017) | 79% (222 of 282) |  |  |
| 2.3 | Ease of effort to contact HCST (very or fairly easy to contact) | 89% | 87% (March 2017) | 83% (234 of 282) |  |  |
| 2.4 | Stage one complaints responded to within 10 working days | 80% | 83% (71 of 86) | 85% (83 of 98) |  |  |
| 2.5 | Stage one complaints upheld | For info | 40% (34 of 86) | 43% (42 of 98) | - | - |
| 2.6 | Stage one complaints escalated to stage two | 10% | 15% (13 of 86) | 10% (10 of 98) |  |  |
| 2.7 | Stage two complaints upheld | 17% or under | 15% (2 of 13) | 0% (0 of 10) |  |  |
| 2.8 | Housing Ombudsman Complaints upheld | 18% or under | 0% (0 of 4) | 0% (0 of 1) |  |  |

NB The targets for the complaints indicators have been amended to match those set by the corporate Customer Feedback Team.

How we are using this information to improve services – Customer services and complaints

Two indicators are below or near target:

Customer satisfaction with HCST (very or fairly satisfied) – target 98%

Performance from the September survey was 79% and has declined compared to the previous result of 85% in March 2017. A key area of dissatisfaction was around queries being referred to other teams and departments and then not being followed up upon and as a result the Housing Customer Service team are leading on implementing a communications strategy between teams. The team is also reviewing their correspondence around the discretionary gardening scheme as this need for this was raised in the survey comments, all of which will be discussed at their next team meeting. In general comments left were positive (eg staff were polite and listened, were professional in dealing with the query and gave good advice).

Ease of effort to contact HCST (very or fairly easy to contact) – target 89%

The perceived ease of contacting the Housing Customer Services team was 83% as of the September 2017 survey, down from 87% previously in March. As a result of customer feedback from the survey, work is being done to improve the web pages (to make key information such as contact details clearer) and staff training sessions are being planned to help the team better understand the needs of visually impaired customers.

3. Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

|  | Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchange indicators | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 3.1 | Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days) | 21 | 21 (151 lets) | 23 (140 lets) |  |  |
| 3.2 | ... as above for general needs properties | 21 | 18 (126 lets) | 17 (116 lets) |  |  |
| 3.3 | ... as above for Seniors Housing properties | 30 | 33 (25 lets) | 52 (24 lets) |  |  |
| 3.4 | Average re-let time, including time spent in major works (calendar days) | For info | 53 (151 lets, 98 major) | 54 (140 lets, 78 major) | - | - |
| 3.5 | Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within 42 calendar days (statutory timescale) | 100% | 100% (18 of 18) | 100% (37 of 37) |  |  |

How we are using this information to improve services – Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

Two indicators are below or near target:

Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days) – target 21 days

The average time to re-let an empty home was 23 days during Quarter 2, missing the target of 21 days or less. This was due to a sharp increase in the Seniors housing re-let time, which increased from 33 to 52 days since the previous quarter, whilst the general needs re-let time decreased from 18 to 17 days.

Average re-let time for Seniors housing properties, excluding time spent in major works – target 30 calendar days

Performance was 52 days during Quarter 2 and missed the target, with the average re-let time sharply increasing compared to the previous quarter's performance of 33 days. Many of the 24 Seniors housing homes were 'hard to let' with only 10 accepted on the first offer – this equates to 42% of Seniors lets compared to 77% of general needs homes. This is generally because there are fewer people on the waiting list who are eligible for Seniors housing (eg because they've not been assessed for it or don't have the assessed mobility need for the property) and because many such properties are unpopular because they are small in size – works have been taking place at several schemes to convert these into larger properties.

3.6. Long term empty dwellings by ward (empty six weeks or more as of 1 October 2017)

| Ward name (excludes those with no long term empty properties) | No. dwellings | Average days empty | Range of days empty | Comment |
|--|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| East Brighton | 3 | 101 | 50-204 | 1 Seniors studio flat ready to let, 1 house ready to let and 1 house undergoing an extension. |
| Hangleton and Knoll | 2 | 253 | 239-267 | 2 houses due to undergo extensions. |
| Hanover and Elm Grove | 11 | 473 | 148-813 | 1 house undergoing major works, 1 house undergoing an extension, and 9 studio flats within Stonehurst Court (a decommissioned Seniors housing scheme). |
| Hollingdean and Stanmer | 1 | 127 | 127-127 | 1 Seniors studio flat to be converted. |
| Moulsecoomb and Bevendean | 3 | 479 | 43-708 | 1 house ready to let, 1 house undergoing an extension and 1 due to undergo an extension. |
| Patcham | 2 | 134 | 43-225 | 1 Seniors studio flat to be converted and 1 house due to undergo an extension. |
| Queens Park | 2 | 50 | 43-57 | 1 flat ready to let and 1 flat undergoing major works. |
| South Portslade | 2 | 393 | 71-715 | 1 flat ready to let and 1 house due to undergo an extension. |
| Wish | 1 | 57 | 57-57 | 1 flat undergoing major works. |
| Woodingdean | 1 | 43 | 43 | 1 house ready to let. |
| Total | 28 | 315 | 43-813 | Of the 28 properties, 6 are ready to let (21%), 8 are extensions (29%), 2 are conversions (7%) 3 are in major works (11%) and 9 are due to be decommissioned (32%). |

4. Repairs and maintenance

|  Repairs and maintenance indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| 4.1 | Emergency repairs completed in time | 99% | 99.5% (2,527 of 2,539) | 99.8% (2,761 of 2,767) |  |  |
| 4.2 | Routine repairs completed in time | 99% | 99.4% (5,746 of 5,778) | 99.6% (5,955 of 5,980) |  |  |
| 4.3 | Complex repairs completed in time | For info | 91.5% (86 of 94) | 100% (82 of 82) | - |  |
| 4.4 | Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days) | 15 days | 15 days | 13 days |  |  |
| 4.5 | Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made | 97% | 96.9% (9,835 of 10,146) | 96.1% (11,429 of 11,889) |  |  |
| 4.6 | Tenants satisfied with repairs | 96% | 98.4% (1,445 of 1,469) | 98.5% (965 of 980) |  |  |
| 4.7 | Responsive repairs passing post-inspection | 97% | 94.5% (911 of 964) | 94.7% (570 of 602) |  |  |
| 4.8 | Repairs completed at first visit | 92% | 86.1% (7,163 of 8,317) | 87.5% (7,600 of 8,685) |  |  |

|  Repairs and maintenance indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 4.9 | Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard | 100% | 100% (11,485 of 11,485) | 100% (11,475 of 11,475) |  |  |
| 4.10 | Energy efficiency rating of homes (out of 100) | 65.6 | 66.0 | 66.3 |  |  |
| 4.11 | Planned works passing post-inspection | 97% | 100% (314 of 314) | 99.7% (298 of 299) |  |  |
| 4.12 | Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates | 100% | 100% (10,038 of 10,038) | 100% (10,032 of 10,032) |  |  |
| 4.13 | Empty properties passing post-inspection | 98% | 100% (60 of 60) | 99.0% (102 of 103) |  |  |
| 4.14 | Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond | 2 hours | 3h 35m | 3h 6m |  |  |
| 4.15 | Lifts restored to service within 24 hours | 95% | 97.9% (145 of 148) | 97.8% (131 of 134) |  |  |
| 4.16 | Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours | 7 days | 6 days (24 days, 4 lifts) | 6 days (24 days, 4 lifts) |  |  |

|  Repairs and maintenance indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 4.17 | Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered | 90% | 98% (19,320 of 19,759) | 97% (18,602 of 19,149) |  |  |
| 4.18 | Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds | 75% | 86% (16,560 of 19,320) | 79% (14,643 of 18,602) |  |  |
| 4.19 | Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time | 5 mins | 5m 57s | 8m 56s |  |  |
| 4.20 | Estate Development Budget main bids – quality checks | 90% | 95% (40 of 42) | 100% (24 of 24) |  |  |
| 4.21 | Estate Development Budget main bids – completions (year to date) | For info | 40% (34 of 86) | 70% (60 of 86) | - | - |
| 4.22 | Estate Development Budget main bids – average duration of work | For info | 13 days | 10 days | - | - |

How we are using this information to improve services – Repairs and maintenance

Five indicators are below or near target:

Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made – target 97%

Performance here was 96.1% during Quarter 2 and has decreased by 0.8% since the previous quarter. Of the 460 appointments that were late, 194 (42%) were up to an hour late and 40 (9%) were over 24 hours late. Operatives are being reminded to confirm as soon as possible after arriving at a property to enter on the PDA (small handheld device) that they have arrived at the job. This automatically generates the date and time and therefore whether the appointment was kept or late.

Responsive repairs passing post-inspection – target 97%

Performance for Quarter 2 was 94.7%, which even though it remains below target, has increased by 0.2% from the previous quarter. The reasons for jobs failing post-inspection are 20 due to poor quality work, 2 required extra work to finish the job and 10 needed corrections to either the volume of labour or materials used (Schedule Of Rates codes).

Repairs completed at first visit – target 92%

Quarter 2 performance was 87.5% and has improved compared to the previous two quarters results of 83.1% and 86.1%. This improvement in performance has been anticipated following from the introduction of the new 'Complex responsive repair' category and process in April 2017. Mears are now reviewing the standard items and materials that their vans are stocked with, to see whether changes can be made in order to increase the number of fixes in a single visit and therefore improve performance.

Lifts – average time taken to respond – target 2 hours

Quarter 2 performance missed the target by 1 hour and 6 minutes. There were seven occasions which involved passenger trap-ins and all were responded to within the target time of two hours.

Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time – target 5 minutes

The longest time that any caller has waited for their call to be answered during Quarter 2 was 8 minutes and 56 seconds. This was on a day with three call agents not at work due to illness. The average time that a caller waited was 21 seconds.

5. Estates Service

|  Estates Service indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|--|---|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 5.1 | Cleaning quality inspection pass rate | 99% | 100% (125 of 125) | 100% (169 of 169) | ⓐ | ↔ |
| 5.2 | Estates Response Team quality inspection pass rate | 99% | 100% (77 of 77) | 100% (173 of 173) | ⓐ | ↔ |
| 5.3 | Cleaning tasks completed | 99% | 99% (13,176 of 13,356) | 98% (13,436 of 13,649) | ⓐ | ↓ |
| 5.4 | Bulk waste removed within 7 working days | 92% | 98% (898 of 912) | 99.8% (1,190 of 1,192) | ⓐ | ↑ |
| 5.5 | Light replacements/ repairs completed within 3 working days | 99% | 99% (251 of 253) | 100% (269 of 269) | ⓐ | ↑ |
| 5.6 | Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days | 96% | 97% (1,425 of 1,464) | 99% (1,183 of 1,196) | ⓐ | ↑ |
| 5.7 | Incidents of drug paraphernalia collected | For info | 23 | 38 | - | - |

How we are using this information to improve services – Estates Service

One indicator is near target:

Cleaning tasks completed – target 99%

Performance at 98% is slightly below target, possibly because fewer staff were available during the school holidays. Estates Service have also taken on communal way clearances following the Grenfell Tower fire and are working hard to keep the common ways permanently clear of trip and fire hazards, putting up warning notices and delivering information letters explaining why this work is being carried out.

6. Anti-social behaviour (ASB) and tenancy management

|  ASB and tenancy management indicators | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 6.1 Victim satisfaction with way ASB complaint dealt with | 92% | 100% (8 of 8) | 82% (14 of 17) |  |  |
| 6.2 Tenants evicted due to ASB | For info | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| 6.3 Closure orders obtained | For info | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| 6.4 ASB cases closed without need for legal action | For info | 89% (47 of 53) | 89% (49 of 55) | - | - |
| 6.5 Tenancy fraud -- properties returned to stock | For info | 5 | 5 | - | - |
| 6.6 Closed Tenancy Sustainment Officer cases where tenancy sustained | 98% | 100% (35 of 35) | 100% (35 of 35) |  |  |
| 6.7 Tenancy visit to general needs tenants within last 5 years | 90% | 92% (9,404 of 10,197) | 95% (9,618 of 10,171) |  |  |
| 6.8 Estate inspections completed (year to date) | 95% | 97% (75 of 77) | 99% (126 of 127) |  |  |

How we are using this information to improve services – Anti-social behaviour (ASB) and tenancy management

One indicator is below target:

Victim satisfaction with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with during the year to date ('very satisfied' and 'fairly satisfied') – target 92%

Performance at 82% is below target, with 14 people satisfied out of a total of 17 who were surveyed over the phone after their ASB case was closed. Dissatisfaction was primarily due to a perceived lack of action by the council. This issue has also been picked up through formal complaints and as a result officers have been recommended to maintain a minimum level of telephone contact as a set agreement with the customers so they feel they are kept informed and are made to feel safe and re-assured.

6.8 ASB incidents by type

This table presents incidents that relate to or create an ASB case where the complainant or alleged perpetrator is a council resident such as a tenant or leaseholder.

|  Type of ASB incident | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Change between quarters |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Harassment / threats incidents | 47% 103 | 47% 95 | -8 |
| Noise incidents | 12% 26 | 11% 23 | -3 |
| Drugs incidents | 8% 18 | 11% 23 | +5 |
| Other criminal behaviour incidents | 11% 25 | 7% 15 | -10 |
| Domestic violence / abuse incidents | 5% 12 | 6% 12 | 0 |
| Other violence incidents | 5% 10 | 4% 9 | -1 |
| Pets / animals incidents | 8% 18 | 6% 13 | -5 |
| Vandalism incidents | 0% 0 | 0% 0 | 0 |
| Hate-related incidents | 2% 4 | 2% 5 | +1 |
| Alcohol related incidents | 1% 3 | 4% 9 | 6 |
| Prostitution / Sex incidents | 0% 1 | 0% 0 | -1 |
| Total ASB incidents | 100% 220 | 100% 204 | -16 |

6.9 ASB incidents by ward

This table presents incidents that relate to or create an ASB case where the complainant or alleged perpetrator is a council resident such as a tenant or leaseholder.

|  Ward name | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Change between quarters |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Brunswick and Adelaide | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Central Hove | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| East Brighton | 32 | 35 | 3 |
| Goldsmid | 8 | 11 | 3 |
| Hangleton and Knoll | 27 | 24 | -3 |
| Hanover and Elm Grove | 6 | 8 | 2 |
| Hollingdean and Stanmer | 25 | 26 | 1 |
| Hove Park | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moulsecoomb and Bevendean | 29 | 25 | -4 |
| North Portslade | 13 | 9 | -4 |
| Patcham | 9 | 5 | -4 |
| Preston Park | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Queen's Park | 39 | 33 | -6 |
| Regency | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rottingdean Coastal | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Portslade | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| St. Peter's and North Laine | 12 | 8 | -4 |
| Westbourne | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Wish | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Withdean | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Woodingdean | 8 | 6 | -2 |
| Total | 220 | 204 | -16 |

7. Seniors housing

|  Seniors Housing indicators | | Target 2017/18 | Q1 2017/18 | Q2 2017/18 | Status against target | Trend since last quarter |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 7.1 | Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months | 98% | 97% (836 of 861) | 96% (836 of 869) |  |  |
| 7.2 | Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities | 95% | 100% (861 of 861) | 100% (869 of 869) |  |  |
| 7.3 | Residents living in schemes offering regular health and wellbeing activities | 65% | 85% (735 of 861) | 80% (695 of 869) |  |  |
| 7.4 | Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations | 90% | 100% (22 of 22) | 100% (22 of 22) |  |  |

How we are using this information to improve services – Seniors housing

One indicator is near target:

Seniors housing residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months – target 98%

Performance was 96% at the end of Quarter 2 and has decreased by 1% since the previous quarter. Of 869 Seniors housing residents, 33 have not had a tenancy visit within the past year – 13 residents declined, two were unavailable and 18 require a visit because they are new tenants or a year has recently passed since their last visit. Of the latter group, six have since been visited at the time of writing.

