

**Appendix A (i)****SHP Delivery Plan – Housing, Economy and Business Committee Task & Finish Group****Meeting 17<sup>th</sup> April 9.30 – 11.30****Attendees** Councillors: McCoy (Chair), Crosby, Emmerson, Garratt, Melican

Officers: Andrew Taylor, Brendan Crossan (SHP), Simon Latham, Neil Pryor (LBS)

**1. Purpose of the Task & Finish Group**

Councillor McCoy clarified the purpose of the Task & Finish Group as being to help SHP shape and deliver initially the 2015/16 Delivery Plan to go to the HEB Committee meeting in June and then to help shape the new Delivery Plan for 2016/17 onwards ensuring that residents' views and priorities are the key drivers going forward.

**2. Terms of reference**

The draft terms of reference were agreed by all attendees.

**3. Delivery Plan 2013 – 16**

Brendan Crossan gave an outline of the background and context of the Delivery Plan. In the management agreement (or contract) between LBS and SHP, SHP is due to produce a delivery plan on an annual basis and this was the case up to 2013. In 2013 it was agreed with LBS that SHP would produce a 3 year plan with annual updates. This plan ends in 2015/16 and so a new plan will be needed for 2016/17 onwards.

When producing the 2013/14 plan SHP carried out various consultation exercises with residents to enable them to gauge what tenants saw as the key priorities. SHP also, where possible, linked their plan to the various relevant LBS strategies to show how they could contribute to achieving the goals in these.

On an annual basis the plan is reviewed and in consultation with LBS Officers, and where applicable performance indicators have been amended or deleted and targets updated. The plan is then submitted to the relevant Council Committee (now the Housing, Economy and Business Committee) for members' comments and agreement. Internally within SHP the risks highlighted in the report are monitored on a quarterly basis.

**4. Proposals for development of SHP's new Delivery Plan 2016 /17 onwards**

It was agreed that the next SHP Delivery Plan should be for five years rather than three as this would align it with the contract it has to manage and maintain the housing stock for LBS. This contract runs until 2021 but there is a review of the terms of the agreement between the Council and SHP due to take place in 2015/16. Also it was agreed that all performance indicators, including priority indicators would be reviewed and targets updated where applicable on an annual basis.

SHP will produce a Resident Consultation Plan detailing how it intends to consult with residents on the shape and priorities of the new Delivery Plan by June. This will include, but not be restricted to, surveys, postal and online communication, meetings with residents groups, events (such as the St Helier Festival), focus groups, and through the Resident Scrutiny Group and the SFTRA. It must, as much as possible, ensure that those involved in the consultation reflect the makeup of the residents as a whole.

Councillors want to see what questions will be asked of residents before consultation begins but believe a key question should be 'What do you want from your housing service?' SHP confirmed once the initial consultation is complete it will put together the priorities and take this back to the residents to ensure that it reflects the feedback provided by residents.

Members thought that TPAS (Tenant Participation Advisory Service) should be involved and SHP should refer to the CIH Estate Management Standards. Any focus groups should be facilitated by an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party to ensure neutrality. Cllr Crosby cited an example of how customer access priorities should be focussed upon the outcome of a telephone call, not whether the phone was answered within a specified timescale. There was also discussion about how residents who had taken the step of complaining often provide information about how services could be improved and so any learning from complaints should be included in the plan.

Andrew Taylor pointed out that SHP are continually trying to improve and so some suggestions may already be in the process of being implemented and therefore would not become part of a future delivery plan.

All service areas are currently being benchmarked for VFM but the new Delivery Plan should reflect the fact that a review of major works investment priorities could mean capital resources are carried over from one year to the next to ensure best value. VFM could mean helping groups to become self-sustaining through support to start and then enabling them to take ownership in the future.

Service development: and high quality housing management should address what should/could be provided by SHP beyond 'bricks & mortar'.

Resident priorities need to be compared with Council priorities and SHP's Delivery Plan should reflect both. There needs to be clarification as to why using resources to support residents provides a particular benefit (for example, reducing isolation or loneliness, or supporting vulnerable people, both or which are wider Council priorities but have also been seen as priorities for investment in services by residents when consulted.)

Members stressed that it is very important that Housing Economy and Business Committee members are involved early in this process of shaping priorities reflecting the outcome of consultation with residents. Feedback to the SHP Board could be provided in a joint meeting including Councillors.

##### **5. The proposed structure of the Delivery Plan and its constituent elements**

The structure of the Delivery Plan going forward should distinguish between priority indicators, which will measure the outcome for the resident (often reflecting the level of satisfaction), those that are just measures of performance, those that reflect statutory or regulatory requirements (for example, gas servicing) where a required

standard has to be maintained, and those where there is a need to set targets for improvement.

Members were clear that when three-year targets had been set these should not be adjusted downwards to reflect difficulties or challenges in delivery. SHP should rather provide explanation about why it was proving difficult or not possible to achieve the target in commentary to the Council. There was discussion about the need to ensure staff responsible for service delivery remained motivated and recognition that for management purposes different performance measures and targets might be applied. It was agreed that improvement should be focussed upon the key areas where this was most evidently needed, and there was recognition that for some indicators, if high performance had already been achieved, it might be more appropriate to maintain performance at this level rather than always striving to achieve improvement, as the cost of further improvement might pull resources from higher priority areas of the service.

#### **6. Follow up actions**

SHP to circulate revised draft of the 2015/16 Delivery Plan by Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May

The focus of this meeting will be reviewing the Delivery Plan for 2015/6 and in particular the Performance Plan.

#### **7. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting was set for Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> May 9.30-11.30

This page is intentionally left blank