

## Appendix A (ii)

**SHP Delivery Plan – Housing, Economy and Business Committee,  
Task & Finish Group  
Meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> May at 9.30 – 11.30am, Civic Offices**

**Attendees:**

*Councillors:* Jayne McCoy (Chair)  
Jean Crosby,  
Nick Emmerson  
David Hicks  
Neil Garratt

*Officers:* Brendan Crossan (SHP)  
Simon Latham (LBS)  
Neil Pryor (LBS)  
Roz Morrison (Notes) (LBS)

*Apologies:* Councillor Melican  
Andrew Taylor (SHP)  
Trevor Hart (LBS)

**1. Apologies**

- Councillor McCoy noted the above apologies

**2. Minutes of meeting held on 17 April 2015**

- Correction to spelling of Councillor Crosby's name.
- Correction to last paragraph on Page 2 – Service development: delete 'and' high quality housing management etc.
- Otherwise minutes were approved.

**3. Review of draft SHP Delivery Plan 2015/16**

BC gave a quick update since last meeting took place as follows:

- The Plan is in four parts, with the original 3-year plan updated.
- *Financial Plan* – not changed since the initial draft. This reflects the HRA budget and Capital Plan.
- *Improvement Plan* – has changed the most. Key actions are now linked to priority areas of the Plan.
- *Risk Register* – Task and Finish Group to discuss whether this should be included as an appendix (see below).
- *Performance Plan* – amended as per initial meeting and still covers three years for targets – 2015/16 have changed back to the original three year target for each indicator but the two years will just show the 'direction of travel' going forward. These will be reviewed following the new five year plan. One area

which is still under active discussion (see below) relates to income collection targets and the impact of Universal Credit.

The Chair opened up SHP Delivery Plan 2013-16 for discussion. The Chair noted that there are no significant changes to the current Plan but there will be more changes going forward and targets will be reviewed yearly. The following points/issues were raised:

- Page 20 – *customer access, outcome of telephone calls* – agreed it is more important that telephone calls are dealt with accurately by directing to the correct person rather than just being quick at picking up the calls. Also customers need to be called back within a certain timescale if they are required to do so.
- JC asked for representation by SHP at the Resident Association (RA) meetings as issues are being raised by residents but it is felt that they are not being addressed. JC noted that SHP staff are being notified of these meeting dates with plenty of warning. SHP Neighbourhood Managers (NMs) also receive copies of RA minutes but it was felt that they do not have the ability or power to solve issues that they could be empowered to solve. BC responded by noting that NMs would not be expected to resolve any issues relating to repairs, but the Chair felt that the NMs should be in a position to respond more positively and be able to monitor outstanding issues going forward.
- *Councillor and SHP walkabouts*: these are still taking place but issues are not being followed-up within expected timescales. NG suggested having an issues tracker as currently being used by Local Committees.
- *Resident surveys each quarter*: NM's receive an independent report from the RA's following the walkabouts – e.g. communal lighting problems which require feedback from SHP. There is a problem with receiving positive feedback from SHP which is causing residents to get disappointed, leave the RAs and not return. This is making it difficult for residents to be motivated to stay involved and therefore try to make a difference.
- *Anti-Social behaviour at Shanklin Village*: problems relating to 1-bed flats took a long time to get actioned. The NM has the responsibility for brokering the actions necessary re anti-social behaviour.
- SHP needs to address satisfaction levels as they are not as high as required.
- Regarding the Improvement Plan, the targets on p17 are the original 2015/16 ones. Satisfaction outcomes and views of residents reflect the service in question – 'reputation' is an indirect measure. Broadly the targets are not being changed.
- BC confirmed that once consultation with residents has taken place, then residents' priorities will shape the PIs, but we need to check how these are measured. The information will then go to a joint meeting of the HEB Committee members and the SHP Board for approval.

A discussion then took place specifically regarding income collection in relation to Universal Credit:

- It was agreed that it is better to create 'soft' targets for income collection than not having any targets at all. The Chair noted that the aim is to collect as much rent as possible but also give an explanation, with evidence as to why the target

may not be fully met. It was agreed that the targets set for 2015/16 should be the same as last year.

- The Group was advised that the average council rent is now £107 per week. NG asked that data on tenants in arrears who are in receipt of Universal Credit be presented separately from other arrears data.
- It was noted that there will always a proportion of tenants in arrears but it would be useful to see if the overall level of arrears is rising. SL proposed that for tenants in receipt of Universal Credit who are in arrears, it should be possible to identify those who had arrears already, as opposed to those who had fallen into arrears following their transfer to Universal Credit. BC advised that it should be possible to do this but that it would not be straightforward.
- So far 19 claimants are in receipt of Universal Credit. Concerns arise from the fact that Universal Credit is paid monthly in arrears. SHP will need to clarify which arrears are due to this factor. DH asked, since there is uncertainty relating to time of implementation and how this is being rolled out, that any information available should be shared.
- Currently there are on average 10% of people in arrears in the Universal Credit pilot areas. It was noted that SHP can ask the DWP for Universal Credit to be paid straight into their rent account if the tenant is two months in arrears or if there were pre-existing arrears.
- There was a discussion about the point at which the level of arrears has an impact on the revenue estimates in the budget. Additional bad debt provision has been built into the estimates for 2015/16 (£200k approx compared to £150k approx previously), and in the HRA Business Plan provision for future bad debt increases incrementally until it stabilises at a fixed level.
- There are three trial postcode areas in the borough - SM5 2, SM6 7 and SM6 8 - with two more (SM6 9 and CR0 4) commencing on 10<sup>th</sup> June, with the trials applying to single people or couples without children whose circumstances have changed recently. Some of these people accrue five weeks arrears while they are waiting for their first Universal Credit payment.

The discussion moved on to how customer satisfaction was measured:

- In relation to day to day repairs BC stated that post-works surveys cover two levels of satisfaction: firstly whether you have had any repairs carried out - yes or no. Secondly, the satisfaction of the repair/service, which is measured on a five point scale. This measurement remains consistent, and so satisfaction can be compared year on year. The annual surveys give a more global picture.
- Tenant satisfaction targets on services carried out (e.g. gas servicing) relate to steady state measures where a ceiling 96% has been agreed as the target but this on the understanding that SHP will always aim to achieve the best possible outcome
- BC pointed out that the 85% satisfaction target in relation to major works reflects the contractual position. SL added that as these contracts were let by SHP on behalf of the Council (as opposed to the repairs and maintenance contract which is between SHP and the contractor) he would need to check the position.

- A question was raised as to whether major works targets could or should exceed 96%. The Chair commented that targets cannot keep on increasing as they would become unrealistic, thus they become a 'steady-state' measure.

Two further points raised were:

- After discussion, it was agreed that the risk register should be included within the Delivery Plan, with as much information as possible as this would be more meaningful.
- With regard to Customer Care actions (p11) the Chair agreed with these targets but wanted an explanation relating to the use of TPAS.

#### **4. Report to HEB Committee on 23 June 2015**

- This report will be written by TH and will recommend/ ratify the work the Task and Finish Group has carried out and will include the minutes of the meetings.
- The Resident Consultation Plan is also to go to the HEB Committee in June, the document to be circulated by 1<sup>st</sup> June for comments in time for Chair's Briefing on 8 June and then committee despatch on 11 June.

#### **5. Further work for Task and Finish Group**

- The Chair will clarify membership of T&F Group at the June HEB Committee meeting.
- It was agreed that the T&F Group would also scrutinise the following:
  - Rent setting report (before January 2016)
  - Draft SHP Plan 2016/17 (before March 2016)
  - HRA Business Plan (before March 2016)