

HOUSING SERVICE BENCHMARKING RESULTS 2012/13

Cabinet Member Cllr Ray Stanley
Responsible Officer Head of Housing & Property Services

Reason for Report: To inform members how the Housing Service year end performance for the financial year 2012/13 compares to that of other housing providers.

RECOMMENDATION(S): That the Policy Development Group note the report

Relationship to Corporate Plan: The Council must run the housing Service efficiently and effectively.

Financial Implications: None to this report, however any financial implications arising from future improvements would be financed through the Housing Revenue Account.

Legal Implications: None to this report.

Risk Assessment: Failure to achieve satisfactory performance against other housing providers may result in an increase in complaints about service delivery and have both financial and reputational implications.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report uses the Housemark benchmarking service , which is subscribed to by over 500 social landlords, including 75% of stock retaining councils. The data is collected using standard methodology and is independently validated, in order to ensure that the information provided is reliable and transparent.
- 1.2 Benchmarking is primarily used as a tool for internal performance management and self assessment and can be used to understand current levels of performance in comparison to other organisations. This in turn helps us to understand where we need to improve and how we can learn from other organisations about how to improve the quality of the service.
- 1.3 In order to ensure that Mid Devon Housing Service are compared to a similar group of providers comparisons are made with other stock retaining Local Authorities.

2.0 Presentation of Benchmarking Data

- 2.1 Our performance compared with other organisations is presented in terms of both rank (out of how many members provided data) and quartile. Quartile divide a range of data – in this case performance for each benchmarking group member against a given indicator – into four equal parts. These parts are expressed as the Lower Quartile (within which lies the bottom performing 25%of members), the Middle Lower Quartile (members below the median but

above the bottom 25%), the Upper Middle Quartile (data above the median but below the top 25%) and the Upper Quartile (the top performing 25% of members). A summary of our results is detailed on Appendix A.

- 2.2 In addition to the detailed benchmarking information, Housemark also provides a helpful Value for Money (VFM) Summary. The VFM summary is organised in such a way as to illustrate how the Council's housing performance in terms of cost and quality compares with other local authorities in respect of the four specific areas of the previous Tenants Services Authority's National Standards covering:

Tenant Involvement and Empowerment
Home
Tenancy (including allocations, rents and tenure)
Neighbourhood and Community

A summary of our results is detailed on Appendix B

- 2.3 A full 43 page copy of the Local Authority Benchmarking Report is available in the members room at Phoenix House.
- 2.4 Officers are currently analysing benchmarking data that fall within the lower quartile to identify the reasons why they are in the lowest quartile and what, if any improvements to remedy this can be made for the forthcoming year.

Contact for more Information: Nick Sanderson, Head of Housing & Property Services Tel: 01884 234960 (nsanderson@middevon.gov.uk)

Circulation of the Report: Councillor Ray Stanley (Cabinet Member for Housing)

List of Background Papers: Housemark Summary of Benchmarking results for 2012/13

HOUSEMARK: LOCAL AUTHORITY BENCHMARKING REPORT - SUMMARY OF RESULTS 2012/13

Appendix A

CATEGORY	2012/13				2011/12				QUARTILE	D U
	UPPER	MEDIAN	LOWER	RESULT	RANK	OUT OF	RESULT	RANK		
BUSINESS WIDE MEASURES										
Percentage of staff turnover for the year	6.00	8.10	10.30	9.10	18	28	5.90	7	Middle Lower	↓ ↵
Average number of days lost to sickness absence per employee	7.80	10.70	13.10	8.70	10	28	9.30	12	Middle Upper	↔
LETTING MANAGEMENT										
Total Cost per property of Lettings Management	32.54	40.83	56.98	37.40	21	47	44.17	27	Middle Upper	↑
% of units that were vacant and available for letting at the end of the year	0.34	0.65	0.93	0.23	4	36	0.13	1	Upper Quartile	↔
% of units that were vacant but unavailable for letting at the end of the year	0.25	0.57	0.96	0.52	18	36	0.81	25	Middle Upper	↑
Average time in days to re-let empty properties	26.00	30.00	37.98	17.18	2	37	13.34	1	Upper Quartile	↔
Rent Loss - amount due to empty properties (voids) as % of rent due	0.77	1.32	1.77	0.62	4	38	0.6	4	Upper Quartile	↔
HOME										
Total Cost per property of Major & Cyclical Maintenance	1127.09	1362.31	1768.80	1306.37	20	47	1195.08	15	Middle Upper	↔
Percentage of dwellings that are non-decent	0.00	10.00	5.00	15.00	30	35	15.50	31	Lower Quartile	↔
Average SAP rating of dwellings	70.10	67.70	64.80	69.90	10	32	67.10	19	Middle Upper	↑
Percentage of dwellings that have a valid gas safety certificate	99.99	99.90	99.51	99.90	16	32	99.71	22	Middle Upper	↑
Total Cost per property of Responsive Repairs & Void Works										
Total Cost per property of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	586.27	695.24	808.58	913.44	45	47	863.04	41	Lower Quartile	↔
Average number of calendar days to complete repairs	6.97	8.80	11.10	6.55	2	35	12.77	29	Upper Quartile	↑
Priority 1 & priority 2 as a % of total repairs	28.20	49.90	59.80	32.10	6	35	31.1	5	Upper Quartile	↔
% of respondents satisfied with the overall quality of their home	86.50	83.00	79.00	89.00	3	29	89.00	3	Upper Quartile	↔
% of residents satisfied with repairs and maintenance	83.90	80.00	74.00	86.00	4	29	86	4	Upper Quartile	↔

CATEGORY	UPPER	MEDIAN	LOWER	RESULT	RANK	OUT OF	RESULT	RANK	QUARTILE	D	U
TENANCY											
Total Cost per property of Rent Arrears & Collection	66.16	83.15	106.79	126.03	41	47	71.27	15	Lower Quartile	↓	↔
Current tenant rent arrears as % of rent due (excluding voids)	1.34	1.77	2.48	0.86	3	38	0.84	3	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
Former tenant rent arrears as % of rent due (excluding voids)	0.80	1.34	2.03	0.40	7	38	0.39	7	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
Gross rent arrears written off as % of rent due	0.22	0.33	0.55	0.15	5	35	0.19	9	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
% of tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears during the year	0.13	0.22	0.33	0.10	7	39	0.29	26	Upper Quartile	↑	↔
Total Cost per property of Tenancy Management											
Total Cost per property of Anti-Social Behaviour	59.63	75.04	107.38	60.15	14	47	73.07	21	Middle Upper	↔	↔
% of tenants satisfied with the overall service provided	88.00	83.30	81.00	90.00	3	29	90	3	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
Total Cost per property of Anti-Social Behaviour											
% of anti-social behaviour cases resolved successfully	95.57	88.75	81.31	94.83	10	30	82.48	23	Middle Upper	↑	↔
% Satisfied with anti-social behaviour case handling	85.93	75.50	67.50	82.05	8	18	81.48	9	Middle Upper	↔	↔
% Satisfied with anti-social behaviour case outcomes	82.93	69.30	60.83	80.77	6	16	75.93	8	Middle Upper	↔	↔
NEIGHBOURHOOD AND COMMUNITY											
Total Cost per property of Estate Services	74.88	114.44	174.73	64.85	10	47	58	7	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
% satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	87.70	84.00	81.00	91.00	3	47	91	3	Upper Quartile	↔	↔
TENANT INVOLVEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT											
Total Cost per property of Resident Involvement	26.29	39.26	47.66	34.05	17	47	57.77	40	Middle Upper	↑	↔
Percentage of tenants on whom the organisation has diversity information	76.40	60.00	54.20	59.10	17	31	56.1	23	Middle Lower	↔	↔
% of residents satisfied that views are listened to and acted upon	68.90	62.20	58.00	70.00	6	31	56.1	29	Upper Quartile	↔	↔

D = Direction of performance compared to last year
 U = Under target of Middle Upper or Upper Quartile

HouseMark: Local Authority Benchmarking Results for 2012/13 - Value for Money Summary

Appendix B

Business Activity	Cost KPI	Cost KPI Quartile			Quality KPI	Cost KPI Quartile			
		MDDC 2012/13	MDDC 2011/12	MDDC 2012/13		MDDC 2012/13	MDDC 2011/12	D	U
Overheads	Overall costs as % adjusted turnover	Middle Lower	Middle Lower	Middle Lower	Overhead costs as % direct revenue costs	Middle Lower	Middle Lower	↔	↔
Major Works & Cyclical Maintenance	Total CPP of Major Works & Cyclical Maintenance	Middle Upper	Middle Upper	Middle Upper	Percentage of tenants satisfied the overall quality of their home	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	
					Percentage of dwellings that are non-decent	Lower Quartile	Lower Quartile	↔	↔
Responsive Repairs & Void Works	Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	Lower Quartile	Lower Quartile	Lower Quartile	Percentage of tenants satisfied with repairs and maintenance	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	
					Average number of calendar days taken to complete repairs	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↑	
Housing Management	Total CPP of Housing Management	Middle Lower	Middle Lower	Middle Lower	Average re-let time in days (standard re-let)	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	
Estate Services	Total CPP of Estate Services	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	Percentage of tenants satisfied with service provided	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	
					Percentage of anti-social behaviour cases resolved successfully	Middle Upper	Middle Lower	↑	
					Current tenant rent arrears as % of rent due (excluding voids)	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	
					Percentage of tenants satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	Upper Quartile	Upper Quartile	↔	

D = Direction of performance compared to last year

U = Under target of Middle Upper or Upper Quartile Summary Cost KPIs:

All stayed the same as last year

Two have improved and others stayed the same

Quality KPIs: