



Leicester
City Council

MEETING OF THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMISSION

DATE: MONDAY, 20 MARCH 2017

TIME: 6:15 pm

PLACE: Meeting Room G.01, Ground Floor, City Hall, 115 Charles Street, Leicester, LE1 1FZ

Members of the Scrutiny Commission

Councillor Newcombe (Chair)
Councillor Alfonso (Vice Chair)

Councillors Aqbany, Byrne, Cank, Dawood and Joshi
1 Un-allocated Non-Group Place

Members of the Scrutiny Commission are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed overleaf.

For Monitoring Officer

Officer contacts:

Angie Smith (Democratic Support Officer):

Tel: 0116 454 6354, e-mail: Angie.Smith@leicester.gov.uk

Jerry Connolly (Scrutiny Support Officer):

Tel: 0116 454 6343, e-mail: Jerry.Connolly@leicester.gov.uk
Leicester City Council, City Hall, 115 Charles Street, Leicester, LE1 1FZ

Information for members of the public

Attending meetings and access to information

You have the right to attend formal meetings such as full Council, committee meetings & Scrutiny Commissions and see copies of agendas and minutes. On occasion however, meetings may, for reasons set out in law, need to consider some items in private.

Dates of meetings and copies of public agendas and minutes are available on the Council's website at www.cabinet.leicester.gov.uk, from the Council's Customer Service Centre or by contacting us using the details below.

Making meetings accessible to all

Wheelchair access – Public meeting rooms at the City Hall are accessible to wheelchair users. Wheelchair access to City Hall is from the middle entrance door on Charles Street - press the plate on the right hand side of the door to open the door automatically.

Braille/audio tape/translation - If you require this please contact the Democratic Support Officer (production times will depend upon equipment/facility availability).

Induction loops - There are induction loop facilities in City Hall meeting rooms. Please speak to the Democratic Support Officer using the details below.

Filming and Recording the Meeting - The Council is committed to transparency and supports efforts to record and share reports of proceedings of public meetings through a variety of means, including social media. In accordance with government regulations and the Council's policy, persons and press attending any meeting of the Council open to the public (except Licensing Sub Committees and where the public have been formally excluded) are allowed to record and/or report all or part of that meeting. Details of the Council's policy are available at www.leicester.gov.uk or from Democratic Support.

If you intend to film or make an audio recording of a meeting you are asked to notify the relevant Democratic Support Officer in advance of the meeting to ensure that participants can be notified in advance and consideration given to practicalities such as allocating appropriate space in the public gallery etc.

The aim of the Regulations and of the Council's policy is to encourage public interest and engagement so in recording or reporting on proceedings members of the public are asked:

- ✓ to respect the right of others to view and hear debates without interruption;
- ✓ to ensure that the sound on any device is fully muted and intrusive lighting avoided;
- ✓ where filming, to only focus on those people actively participating in the meeting;
- ✓ where filming, to (via the Chair of the meeting) ensure that those present are aware that they may be filmed and respect any requests to not be filmed.

Further information

If you have any queries about any of the above or the business to be discussed, please contact Angie Smith, **Democratic Support on (0116) 454 6354** or email Angie.Smith@leicester.gov.uk or call in at City Hall, 115 Charles Street.

For Press Enquiries - please phone the **Communications Unit on 0116 454 4151**

PUBLIC SESSION

AGENDA

FIRE/EMERGENCY EVACUATION

If the emergency alarm sounds, you must evacuate the building immediately by the nearest available fire exit and proceed to area outside the Ramada Encore Hotel on Charles Street as Directed by Democratic Services staff. Further instructions will then be given.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare any interests they may have in the business to be discussed.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Appendix A

The minutes of the meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Commission held on 30th January 2017 are attached, and Members are asked to confirm them as a correct record.

4. PETITIONS

The Monitoring Officer to report on the receipt of any petitions received in accordance with Council procedures.

5. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS OR STATEMENTS OF CASE

The Monitoring Officer to report on the receipt of any questions, representations or statements of case received in accordance with Council procedures.

6. AREA MANAGERS' PRESENTATION - SOUTH AREA HOUSING MANAGEMENT

Appendix B

A presentation will be delivered to provide information to Commission Members on the South Neighbourhood Area of the City.

7. RENT ARREARS PROGRESS REPORT

Appendix C

The Director of Housing submits a quarterly rent arrears progress report to the Housing Scrutiny Commission for the period 3rd October 2016 to 1st January 2017, as requested. Members are asked to note the report.

8. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER-OCCUPATION PROJECT

Appendix D

A presentation will be delivered to provide information to Commission Members on a project to identify levels of overcrowding and under-occupation of Council tenancies.

9. COUNCIL HOUSING VOIDS - A TASK GROUP REPORT TO THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Appendix E

The Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Commission submits a report on issues relating to void council properties and recommendations to the Commission.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

11. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS



Leicester
City Council

Appendix A

Appendix A

Minutes of the Meeting of the HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: MONDAY, 30 JANUARY 2017 at 6:15 pm

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Newcombe (Chair)
Councillor Alfonso (Vice Chair)

Councillor Aqbany
Councillor Byrne

Councillor Cank
Councillor Dawood

Councillor Joshi

In Attendance

Assistant Mayor for Housing – Councillor Connelly

* * * * *

64. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

65. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any interests they might have in the business to be discussed.

Councillor Aqbany declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting in that family members were council tenants.

Councillor Byrne declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting in that family members and herself were council tenants.

Councillor Cank declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting in that family members were council tenants.

Councillor Joshi declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting in that family members were council tenants.

Councillor Newcombe declared a Prejudicial Interest in the report at Appendix

D, Review of the Housing Register / Housing Allocations Policy – Feedback of the Consultation Exercise, in that he was for the time being on the Council's housing waiting list, though with a very low priority. He stated as this item only dealt with feedback from consultation, he did not consider it necessary to leave the meeting, but would hand over the Chair to the Vice-Chair during consideration of the item and would take no part in the discussions.

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, the interests were not considered so significant that they were likely to prejudice the Councillors' judgement of the public interest. Councillors were not therefore required to withdraw from the meeting during consideration and discussion of the agenda items.

66. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

An amendment was made to previously circulated minutes of 15th November 2016, Minute Item 52, third paragraph to read 'The Chair commented it was a really good piece of work undertaken in order to ascertain the background and effect of gambling on *residents*', word amended from 'constituents'.

AGREED:

Subject to the amendment above, that:

1. The minutes of the Housing Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 15 November 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.
2. The minutes of the Special Housing Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 19 December 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

The Chair drew attention to Minute Item 50, and the request that consultation results on the Homelessness Strategy be re-presented. He asked when the information would be available. The Director of Housing confirmed the information would be provided to the Commission Members.

AGREED:

That the Director of Housing provide re-presented results on the Homelessness Strategy to Commission Members.

67. PETITIONS

In accordance with the Council procedures, it was reported that no petitions had been received by the Monitoring Officer.

68. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS OR STATEMENTS OF CASE

In accordance with the Council procedures, it was reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received by the Monitoring Officer.

69. AREA MANAGERS' PRESENTATION - 12 MONTH CHANGES AND CHALLENGES

Suki Supria, Head of Service, delivered the presentation on the West Neighbourhood Area. The following points were covered during the presentation:

- Marie Murray was District Manager for the area.
- Schemes were going to plan, and the £400k spend for environmental and community projects should be achieved.
- Key tasks were outlined in the presentation for the new organisational structure.

In response to questions from the Chair and Members, the following information was given:

- The Environmental and Communal Project budget was always historically and remained split dependent on how many properties were in each estate
- In a number of cases, it became extremely difficult to take action against perpetrators of anti-social behaviour for a number of reasons, for example, human rights or disability. Processes could take a significant amount of time with complex meetings taking place with other agencies. The Council had to clearly demonstrate that any action taken had been reasonable and just. Barristers' advice was sought to ensure the Council was not at risk of legal challenge.
- Rent arrears share for the area at 38.9% of the city's total was high, and historically the west area had higher rent arrears due to the make-up of people in the area, i.e. families had less income, there were many vulnerable people entitled to benefits. It was noted the rent collection rate for the city was 99%.
- The Council had a robust system to minimise evictions which were a last resort, and wherever feasible tenants were referred to other agencies for assistance, but the Council had a statutory responsibility to maximise its income. The increase in the number of evictions from 17 to 21 in the past year was not considered to be significant, with the majority of people evicted being single.
- The Council was proactive rather than reactive and conducted welfare visits to certain tenants to identify vulnerable people in the tenancies. For example, someone not paying their rent might be an indication there were other issues for the tenant, such as poor health. Assistance given to tenants to maintain their home meant less voids and cost less money in repairs and maintenance.
- Under the Housing Transformation Programme, there would be a review on how anti-social behaviour was managed.
- Flexible tenancies were expected around September 2017, which were different to secure tenancies, requiring the Council to set a fixed time for the tenancy and then towards the end of the period review the persons eligibility to retain and renew the tenancy. A paper would be presented to the Commission later in the year.

- Staff had recently gone through significant changes, and motivation and support would ensure they were skilled up to focus on their service areas and deliver the best possible service.
- Following Transforming Neighbourhood Services and the Using Buildings Better programme, the New Parks Centre had now reopened. It still had had housing on site. Self-service kiosks provided a digital offer, with assistance provided from floor walkers. Likewise in Beaumont Leys, staff had seen an increase in customer numbers with the movement of libraries and STAR into one hub building. Face-to-face support was also available at the Customer Services Centre on Granby Street. The Chair stated it would be useful to receive customer feedback on the new centres in 12 months.
- There were 160 Homecome properties in the city. Figures for those in the West of the city would be provided to Commission Members, and a future report on the properties would be brought to a future Commission meeting.
- There had been an increase in the number of Right to Buy properties, with slightly over 500 purchased in the city for 2016/17 financial year, resulting in a loss of rental income. Limited funding was available to replace social housing properties. There could potentially be a change in the level of staffing required as the number of tenancies was reduced.
- An issue with the call centre not recognising that the Council was responsible for District Heating service would be looked into further.
- The estate warden service would be structured to ensure it was aligned to new District areas was due to start and it was also considered as an opportunity for work placements on the service and an apprenticeship programme. Estates did not attract the levels of rubbish as in earlier years, and the cleansing team also operated on the estates.
- Members requested a report on how the three Gypsy and Traveller sites were being used, if there had been any issues, and further detail on management arrangements for each site.

The Chair thanked the officers for the presentation.

AGREED:

that:

1. The report be noted;
2. The Director of Housing to provide to the Commission customer feedback on the centres in 12 months;
3. The Director of Housing to circulate figures on the number of Homecome properties in the West area to Commission Members, and a future report on the properties to be brought to a future Commission meeting;
4. The Director of Housing to provide a report on how the three Gypsy and Traveller sites were being used, if there had been any issues, and further detail on management arrangements for each site.
5. The Head of Service to look into issues around the call centre not recognising the Council's responsibility for the District Heating service.

70. CUSTOMER SERVICE - HOUSING CONTACT

The Director of Finance submitted a report that provided the Commission with an overview of Housing contact for the Tenants Advice and Repairs Service (TARS). The report also reflected customer activity for the period January 2016 until December 2016 as requested by the Commission and explained the future channel shift opportunities for tenant customer interaction. The Commission were invited to comment on the report. It was recommended that a report be brought to the Commission every six months on current performance and improvements made.

Alison Musgrove, Service Manager Revenue and Customer Support, presented the report, and made a number of points in relation to staffing, performance, customer satisfaction and changing options for customer engagement. Members were informed that information on repeat calls for one issue would be manually gathered over the next few months, and a report brought to the Commission at a future meeting.

In response to Members' questions, the following information was given:

- The service would commence a staff review in the next few weeks;
- The service was looking to see what messages could be put on the phone line to reduce the abandonment of calls;
- People struggling with language would be supported. Where the language could not be supported online, a translation could be provided at Granby Street, though customers would be guided towards Citizens Advice Bureau for assistance with form completion;
- Depending on circumstances, visits would still be offered to residents, or meetings arranged at centres out of the city;
- Through the 'Channel Shift' programme, efficiencies would be made, and the Housing Revenue Account contribution to the telephone service would be reduced;
- School Admissions and Electoral Services provided funding contributions for the call centre service.

The Chair requested that he be kept informed of the ongoing development of the service level agreements before they are formally reported to the Commission. He also asked that the Commission review the cost charged to the Housing Revenue Account for the service, and be provided with a list of all central costs charged to the Housing Revenue Account.

The Chair thanked the officers for the report.

AGREED:

that:

1. The report be noted;
2. The Chair receive updates on the ongoing development of service level agreements before periodic service performance updates were presented to the Scrutiny Commission;
3. The Commission review cost charged to the Housing

- Revenue Account for the service, and be provided with a list of all central costs charged to the Housing Revenue Account.
4. A report be brought to the Commission every six months on current performance and improvements made.

71. REVIEW OF THE HOUSING REGISTER / HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY - FEEDBACK OF THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

The Chair, Councillor Newcombe, handed the Chair to the Vice-Chair, Councillor Alfonso, as previously stated in his declaration of interest.

The Director of Housing submitted a report which provided the Commission with feedback on the consultation exercise in relation to the proposals that were contained in the report on the 'Review of the Housing Register / Housing Allocations Policy' that was presented to the Commission on 10th October 2016. It was recommended that the Commission consider the responses from the consultation exercise, and provide feedback to the Executive.

Caroline Carpendale, Head of Service, presented the report, and highlighted the rationale behind the review, some details of the responses to the consultation and future plans.

Members were informed that mapping of under-occupancy would commence, and a presentation on resolving housing needs, for example, Mutual Exchanges, and provision of further options for tenants would be brought to a future Commission meeting

In response to Members' questions, the following information was given:

- Registered social housing providers had given feedback to the consultation exercise, and their consultation responses were appreciated. Each provider had service level agreements and levels of stock used for nominations although registered providers did have their own registers and allocated directly to those. The intention was to keep the nomination process in place;
- The online consultation was held for a period of six weeks, and paper copies were provided on request. It noted that the majority of responses were agreement in principle with the proposals;
- In response to a comment regarding the removal of Bands 4 and 5, it was suggested that it may give the false impression that the remaining three bands would receive offers of accommodation quicker. The meeting was informed that average waiting times in the bands was provided to waiting list applicants at regular intervals, and the reduction of bands would not increase the number of properties to rent;
- The opportunity for those on the register that may be under or over occupying was being taken forward proactively by Housing in order to support people obtaining suitable housing;
- Waterloo Housing Group was a provider of affordable housing in the city, and in discussions with the authority about their hard to let stock that could be utilised and potentially made available to those on the Housing register;
- People due to be removed from the lower bands would be contacted before

being taken off the register to ascertain if their housing needs were the same. It was also noted that some people might be in unaffordable private sector housing, and might be placed in the higher bands.

Councillor Connelly, Assistant Mayor for Housing, responded to a question from the Vice-Chair on the licensing scheme for private landlords in Manchester. He informed the meeting the scheme was due to end soon, and they were not proposing to renew it due to its heavy burden. However, Nottingham were looking to introduce a licensing scheme which required government approval. Leicester City Council would wait for the outcome of Nottingham's application, and if successful, would look at the issue for Leicester again. It was noted the government believed landlord licensing penalised good landlords.

The Chair asked that the Commission be kept informed on the progress for Nottingham, and final result.

The Chair thanked the officer and Assistant Mayor for Housing for the information.

AGREED:

that:

1. The report be noted;
2. Information on the landlord licensing scheme in Nottingham be brought to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Commission;
3. A report be brought to the Commission with regard to under/over occupation and work to address this through the use of Mutual Exchanges.

Councillor Newcombe took the Chair.

72. HOUSING ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Director of Housing submitted a report which informed the Commission of Leicester City Council's approach to the provision of housing, advice and assistance to Armed Forces personnel. Caroline Carpendale, Head of Service, presented the report.

The Commission was informed the Council was proactive in framing the allocations scheme to support members of the armed forces, and in practice engaged with those who were leaving or planning to leave the armed forces during their last few months. It was noted that not all those leaving the forces approached the council, but had five years to make an application for accommodation within five years of discharge.

It was further noted that the numbers of armed forces personnel requesting assistance from the Council was low, and when they did they were usually placed in the Band 2 priority, though individual was looked at on a case by case basis where circumstances were looked at, for example, medical

conditions. The Chair asked if the numbers of people assisted could be provided.

AGREED:

that:

1. The report be noted;
2. Figures on the number of armed forces personnel assisted by the Council be circulated to Commission Members for information.

73. WORK PROGRAMME

The Chair asked that the work programme to be amended to show the next presentation to the Commission would be on the South Neighbourhood area.

AGREED:

that the Work Programme of the Commission be updated and noted.

74. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 8.31pm.

South Neighbourhood Area 2016/17

6



South Neighbourhood Area (NA) wards

Braunstone & Rowley Fields



Councillor Stephen Corral (Labour)
 Councillor Elaine Halford (Labour)
 Councillor Kulwinder Singh Johal (Labour)

Knighton



Councillor Inderjit Gugnani
 Councillor Dr Lynn Moore
 Councillor Ross Grant

Eyres Monsell



Councillor Virginia Cleaver
 Councillor Rory Palmer (Deputy City Mayor)

Saffron



Councillor Elly Cutkelvin
 Councillor Bill Shelton

Aylestone



Councillor Adam Clarke
 Councillor Nigel Porter

Castle



Councillor Patrick Kitterick
 Councillor Deborah Sangster
 Councillor Lynn Senior

Stoneygate




Councillor Aminur Thalukdar
 Councillor Kirk Master
 Councillor Lucy Chaplin

South NA Map

South Neighbourhood Area (NA)

- Council estates
- Council homes
- Wards



South NA – the whole area

- South NA contains 13 Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOA's)– they show the diversity of the area, including Braunstone, Eyres Monsell and Saffron MSOAs and West Knighton and South Knighton and city centre MSOAs.
- South NA as a whole contains around 43,000 households
- South NA has a higher proportion of multi student households than is the case for the city as a whole – almost 5% of households in South are multi student households, compared with 2.3% for the city. A quarter of residents aged 16 to 74 in South NA are students, compared to 17% for the city.
- The South area has a relatively high proportion of white residents compared to the City. 58.1% of residents described themselves as White British, compared to 45.1% for the City. There is a smaller proportion of Asian/British Indian residents.

12

South NA – the whole area


- South NA has 9 neighbourhoods in the top 5% of the most deprived neighbourhoods nationally – more than either of the other two neighbourhood areas.
- ↪ • South NA has the two most deprived neighbourhoods in Leicester. The most deprived neighbourhood is in North Braunstone – the area between Woodshawe Rise and Bendbow Rise - this area has a relatively high proportion of bungalows in its council stock (33%).
- The second most deprived area is The Fairway area on Saffron estate.

South NA - Council Housing


- There are around 7,000 homes in the South NA
- The council estates in the South NA are: Braunstone North, Braunstone South, Eyres Monsell, Saffron, St Andrews, Gilmorton Avenue, Kirby and Rupert.
- 85% of the tenants in South NA are white, compared to 69% for the city.
- ➔ • The age profile of South NA is similar to that of the city.
- South NA has a relatively high proportion of house accommodation. Also a slightly higher proportion of bungalows than is the case for the city. South has a relatively small proportion of flat accommodation.
- Over the last year there were 505 adverts for homes in the South area. 52 of the 55 homes with the most bids were 2 bedroom properties. Most of the properties with the fewest bids are 1 bed homes.

Council homes - Rent Arrears and ASB

Rent arrears



Anti Social Behaviour



15

31% of city arrears (2015/16)

- 13.9% (of city) Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields ward

18 evictions 2015/16

- 4 family, 12 single, 2 unknown

14 evictions 2016/17 (as at 27th Nov 2016)

- 9 singles and 5 family

For the calendar year 2015

- 246 cases of ASB

(917 overall city total)

35% nuisance

30% conflict with neighbours

In 2015/16 there was 1 ASB
eviction, and no ASB evictions in
2016/17



Leicester
City Council

South Neighbourhood capital spend 2016/17

	Boilers	Electrical Improvements	Kitchens/Bathr's	Upvc Windows/Doors	Re-roofing	Upvc Fascias/Soffits	Total Spend/properties
Braunstone	£481,786	£176,700	£330,000	£5,000	£5,000	£0	£998,486
Properties		114	66	1	1	0	182
Saffron	£343,208	£252,650	£160,000	£0		£159,800	£915,658
Properties		163	32	0		47	242
Eyres Monsell	£402,218	£198,400	£205,000	£5,000	£10,000	£10,200	£830,818
Properties		128	41	1	2	3	175
Total spend	£1,227,212	£627,750	£695,000	£10,000	£15,000	£170,000	£2,744,962
Total properties		405	139	2	3	50	599

16

Environmental and Communal Projects Neighbourhood South 2016/17

Braunstone

- Property conversions
- Garden boundary clarification and fencing scheme
- Communal area painting
- Installation of storage shed for mobility scooters

Saffron/Eyres Monsell

- Parking improvements
- Brick shed improvements
- Metal railings to improve safety



Parking improvements in Eyres Monsell and storage shed for mobility scooters in Braunstone



Conversions from 3 bedroom properties to much needed 2 bedroom properties in Braunstone. We replace the very small downstairs bathroom in these properties with a new bathroom from one of the bedrooms



The conversions have also helped a number of tenants by taking them out of the bedroom tax category, by reducing the property size

Any Questions



20

Housing Scrutiny Commission

Commission Meeting 20th March 2017

Rent Arrears Progress Report

3rd October 2016 to 1st January 2017

Assistant Mayor for Housing: Cllr Andy Connelly
Lead Director: Chris Burgin

Useful information

Ward(s) affected: ALL

Report author: Vijay Desor, Zenab Valli

Author contact details: Vijay.desor@leicester.gov.uk Ext 37 5177

Report version number: 1- FINAL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Housing Scrutiny Commission of progress in the above area of work on a quarterly basis, as requested.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report covers the period from the 02nd October 2016 to the 1st January 2017. The headline arrears figures for the previous quarters have been added to the table at 3.1 to show progress throughout the year 2016/17.
- 2.2 The cash amount owing as at 1st January was **£1,191m**, this is **5.54% higher than the same quarter last year** – see 3.1, table 1.
- 2.3 The number of tenants in rent arrears, (owing more than 7 weeks rent) is 1,124, which is 38.9% lower than this quarter last year.
- 2.4 For the current financial year from April '16 to March '17, c. £1.123m extra (based on latest estimates) rent will be collectable as a result of the "bedroom tax." See 3.12 below.
- 2.5 £240,052 was paid by Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP's) for all Council tenants, of which £170,596 was for those affected by the Bedroom Tax, from April to December 2016.
- 2.6 The arrears among those affected by the Bedroom Tax have decreased by £64,284 (35.1%) since 4th April 2016.

3. REPORT

Rent Arrears

- 3.1 Rent arrears at the end of the third quarter (1st January) of 2017 and at the end of the previous quarters of 2016/17 financial year are also shown.

Table 1. Quarterly Arrears

Financial year	Arrears at end of Quarter 3	Arrears at end of Quarter 2	Arrears at end of Quarter 1
2012 / 13	£ 1,084,656	£ 1,598,421	£ 1,459,851
2013 / 14	£ 1,322,406	£ 1,889,166	£ 1,625,503
2014 / 15	£ 1,300,041	£ 1,873,442	£ 1,843,279
2015 / 16	£ 1,129,210	£ 1,708,364	£ 1,571,769
2016 / 17	£ 1,191,775	£ 1,808,214	£ 1,793,931

- 3.2 There is a clear seasonal trend for rent arrears to increase in the first part of the year, falling rapidly towards the latter part of the financial year. The rent collection figures for Leicester remain good in comparison with other authorities.
- 3.3 Rents were reduced by 1% in April 2016. The increase in the arrears between Quarter 3 of year 2015/16 and Quarter 3 of the current year (2016/17) is 5.54%.
- 3.4 There has been a reduction of 34.1% from the end of the second quarter in 2016/17. This is in partly due to the non-payment weeks at Christmas.

Number of Cases

- 3.5 After removing monthly payers (i.e. Direct Debits, Wage Stops, Arrears Direct (DWP), Bank Standing Orders) the number of tenants with rent arrears is shown in table 2. below:

Table 2. Breakdown of Arrears Cases

Date	Owing 7 Weeks or more Net *
Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec) (2012/13)	1,210
Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec) (2013/14)	1,117
Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec) (2014/15)	1,617
Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec) (2015/16)	1,839
Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec) (2016/17)	1,124

N.B. Where no net rent is payable (i.e. on full benefit), full rent has been used as a default value to calculate number of weeks owing)

- 3.6 On a positive note, the number of serious cases in seven weeks or more arrears has decreased by 38.9% since the same point last year. This reverses the upward trend seen over the previous two years.

Arrears per Tenancy

3.7 The total arrears divided by the total number of tenancies are shown in table 3. below:

Table 3. Average debt

Date	Average Debt per tenancy
Quarter 3 (2012/13) (Oct to Dec)	£50.08
Quarter 3 (2013/14) (Oct to Dec)	£61.85
Quarter 3 (2014/15) (Oct to Dec)	£61.02
Quarter 3 (2015/16) (Oct to Dec)	£53.35
Quarter 3 (2016/17) (Oct to Dec)	£57.42

3.8 This figure reflects the increase in the actual rent arrears given in 3.1.

Highest 10% of Debt (by value)

3.9 Table 4. Below shows the highest 10% of arrears cases:

Date	No.Cases	Highest Case	Lowest Case	Average	Total Value
Quarter 3 (2012/13)	771	£2,986	£368	£618	£476,810
Quarter 3 (2013/14)	754	£3,378	£452	£727	£563,234
Quarter 3 (2014/15)	930	£3,790	£389	£659	£613,811
Quarter 3 (2015/16)	716	£3,195	£438	£675	£483,808
Quarter 3 (2016/17)	595	£2,995	£439	£732	£436,043

3.10 This shows that the highest number of arrears cases have decreased in total value and number since last year.

Rent Arrears Comparison with 2015/16

3.11 Rent arrears have increased across the year to date. The arrears were £62,564 more than at the same point last year.

3.12 Appendix 1 shows the detailed comparison of rent arrears this year with the last financial year.

Impact of the Bedroom Tax

3.13 On the 1st January 2017, 1,433 or 6.9% of our tenants (20,755 in total) were affected by the bedroom tax. The estimated extra rent collectable for 2016/17 is £1.123m for the full financial year.

3.14 From the 1,750 cases that were identified at the start of this financial year, by 1st January 2017 the number of active cases had reduced to 1,433. This is because the numbers affected are constantly changing as people come out of the bedroom tax, and new cases arise, due to changes in household composition or financial circumstances.

3.15 Further facts:

- 81 tenancies affected by Bedroom Tax had terminated from 1st April to 1st January 2017. Of these, 11 had completed mutual exchanges and 13 were transfers through the housing register. All moves through the register resulted in downsizing. There were 26 right to Buy terminations, seven tenants deceased, four evictions, four moved to Housing Associations, three moved in with family, one moved to a different country and 12 gave no reasons. Of the four evictions one was due to Anti-Social Behavior.
- By week 39, for those affected by the bedroom tax, the number of cases in arrears had fallen to 47.4% (679 out of 1433) since the start of the year. In week 1 this was 53.0%, so the number of affected tenants in arrears has decreased by 5.6% in the first three quarters.
- From April to December 2016, a total of £170,596 of Discretionary Housing Payments had been received on behalf of Council tenants affected by the Bedroom Tax.
- The arrears among those affected by the Bedroom Tax have decreased by £64,284 (35.1%) since the start of April 2016. It is normal for the rent arrears to increase in the first half of the year and decrease significantly during the two non-payment free weeks in December.
- These numbers will continue to change as the situation evolves.

Impact of Benefit Income Cap (BIC)

3.16 The BIC threshold decreased from £26k per year for families outside London to £20k per year. This change applied to all existing cases from November 2016, and newly affected cases in tranches from January 2017.

3.17 The number of LCC tenants affected by BIC was 38 at the 1st January '17, but it is likely to increase significantly when the lower cap is applied to those who were not previously affected. This will begin to be applied from January 2017.

Proportion of Rent Collected

3.18 The Income management team has a key performance management target to ensure the proportion of rent collected at the end of the financial year is 99.1%. The proportion of rent collected between April and December 2016 was 99.4%, which is well on target to achieve this.

Evictions

3.19 There were 48 evictions carried out for non-payment of rent from the 6th April to the 1st January 2017. At the same point in the previous year this figure was 40. The total number of evictions for the whole of 2015/16 was 52.

3.20 Of the 48 evictions, 12 were family cases, 1 childless couple and 35 were single people.

3.21 There were 4 evictions affected to some degree by Bedroom Tax issues.

3.22 Only 8 out of the 48 evictions (16.6%) were directly affected by the impact of Welfare Reform. Bedroom Tax and BIC cases account for about 7% of all tenants, but roughly 16.7% of eviction cases.

3.23 The majority of evictions, along with the majority of the rent debt, occurred among the 93% of tenants NOT directly affected by Welfare Reforms.

3.24 The cost of living crisis resulting from a range of economic impacts affects all households, and is thought to have been the biggest single factor in the increase in evictions seen in the 2016/17 financial year.

Challenges Ahead


3.25 There are further challenges facing the housing service and our tenants from continuing welfare reforms. Universal Credit remains the biggest immediate challenge, and is due to be extended in Leicester to all new claims and changes of circumstances from March 2018

3.26 The Income Management team is developing robust measures to assist tenants through this transition whilst maintaining a good rent collection rate. These include paperless direct debits, rent self-service module on a web-based application, looking at the use of mobile 'phone technologies to improve collection. We will continue to work in collaboration with our partners, including the D.W.P., to ensure a high level of service to our customers.

4. REPORT AUTHORS

4.1 Vijay Desor, Head of Service, tel.37 5177
Zenab Valli, Interim Income Collection Manager, tel.37 3573

Appendix 1 Rent Arrears Comparison With Last Year



GLOSSARY

Gross annual rent. This is the total amount due on a property over the course of a year. E.g. if the average rent is £78, times 22,000 properties, times 50 payable weeks = approximately £86m.

Collectable rent – the gross annual rent, plus the carried forward arrears, less Housing Benefit payments, less void loss or any other miscellaneous income. FOR EXAMPLE: £86m (gross rent), plus £1.3m arrears, minus £50m Housing Benefit, minus £2m void loss, less £250k miscellaneous income, EQUALS £35.05m actual cash to be collected from tenants.

The percentage of rent collected shown is based on the proportion of gross rent, less void loss and miscellaneous income that has been received. HB received is included in this calculation, as is the arrears carried forward. This figure is used for comparative purposes only.

Poly. (Polynomial) – a statistical function used to generate a curved target line that reflects the established annual trend.

Rent Arrears Progress Report

July 2016 to September 2016

Assistant Mayor Briefing (for info only)

Assistant Mayor for Housing: Cllr Andy Connelly
Lead Director: Chris Burgin

Useful information

Ward(s) affected: ALL

Report author: Vijay Desor, Zenab Valli

Author contact details: Vijay.desor@leicester.gov.uk Ext 37 5177

Report version number: 1

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is for information only, setting out the headline information for quarter 2 (July to October 2016).

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report covers the period from the 4th July 2016 to the 2nd October 2016.
- 2.2 The cash amount owing as at 2nd October was £1.808m, this is **5.85% higher than the same quarter last year** – see 3.1, table 1. At the end of June this year the amount owing was 14.1% higher than last year, so the gap has narrowed significantly.
- 2.3 The number of tenants in serious debt, (owing more than 7 weeks rent) is 1,494, effectively static at just 0.1% higher than this quarter last year.
- 2.4 For the current financial year from April '16 to March '17, c. £1.123m extra (based on latest estimates) rent will be collectable as a result of the “bedroom tax.” See 3.12 below.
- 2.5 £175,376 was paid by Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP's) for all Council tenants, of which £125,830 was for those affected by the Bedroom Tax, from April to October 2016.
- 2.6 The arrears among those affected by the Bedroom Tax have increased by £4,314 (2.3%) since 4th April 2016.

3.0 REPORT

Rent Arrears

- 3.1 Rent arrears at the end of the second quarter (2nd October) of 2016 and previous financial years were:

Table 1. Quarterly Arrears

Financial year	Arrears at end of Quarter 2
2012 / 13 Q.2 (July to Sept)	£ 1,598,421
2013 / 14 Q.2 (July to Sept)	£ 1,889,166
2014 / 15 Q.2 (July to Sept)	£ 1,873,442
2015 / 16 Q.2 (July to Sept)	£ 1,708,364
2016 / 17 Q.2 (July to Sept)	£ 1,808,214*

*includes weekend payments made 1st & 2nd October

- 3.2 There is a clear seasonal trend for rent arrears to increase in the first part of the year, falling rapidly towards the latter part of the financial year. The rent collection figures for Leicester remain good in comparison with other authorities.
- 3.3 Rents were reduced by 1% in April 2016. The increase in the arrears between September 2015 and September 2016 is 5.85%, compared to a decrease of 8.81% from September 2014 and September 2015.

Number of Cases

- 3.4 After removing monthly payers (i.e. Direct Debits, Wage Stops, Arrears Direct (DWP), Bank Standing Orders) the number of tenants with rent arrears is shown in table 2. below:

Table 2. Breakdown of Arrears Cases

Date	Owing 7 Weeks or more Net *
Quarter 2 (July to Sept) (2012/13)	1,586
Quarter 2 (July to Sept) (2013/14)	2,129
Quarter 2 (July to Sept) (2014/15)	2,063
Quarter 2 (July to Sept) (2015/16)	1,492
Quarter 2 (July to Sept) (2016/17)	1,494

N.B. Where no net rent is payable (i.e. on full benefit), full rent has been used as a default value to calculate number of weeks owing)

- 3.5 The number of serious cases was static, increasing by just 0.1%.

Arrears per Tenancy

3.6 The total arrears divided by the total number of tenancies are shown in table 3. below:

Table 3. Average debt

Date	Average Debt per tenancy
Quarter 2 (2012/13) (July to Sept)	£75.31
Quarter 2 (2013/14) (July to Sept)	£88.76
Quarter 2 (2014/15) (July to Sept)	£88.59
Quarter 2 (2015/16) (July to Sept)	£86.02
Quarter 2 (2016/17) (July to Sept)	£86.59

3.7 This figure reflects the increase in the actual rent arrears given in 3.1.

Highest 10% of Debt (by value)

3.8 Table 4. Below shows the highest 10% of arrears cases:

Date	No.Cases	Highest Case	Lowest Case	Average debt of top 10%	Total Value
Quarter 2 (2011/12)	1036	£ 2,504	£ 368	£ 558	£ 578,321
Quarter 2 (2012/13)	998	£ 2,837	£ 371	£ 613	£ 611,853
Quarter 2 (2013/14)	1023	£ 3,110	£ 432	£ 690	£ 706,007
Quarter 2 (2014/15)	1005	£3,532	£445	£744	£748,112
Quarter 2 (2015/16)	825	£2,670	£376	£846	£698,179
Quarter 2 (2016/17)	917	£2,846	£459	£732	£671,272

3.9 This shows that the highest arrears cases have decreased in total value since last year, although total arrears have increased. Likewise, the average arrears in this band have also fallen.

Rent Arrears Comparison with 2015/16

3.10 Rent arrears have increased across the year to date. They are £99,849 more than at the same point last year.

3.11 Appendix 1 shows the detailed comparison of rent arrears this year with the last financial year.

Impact of the Bedroom Tax

3.12 On the 2nd October 2016, 1,450 or 6.94% (20,882) of our tenants were affected by the bedroom tax. The estimated extra rent collectable for 2016/17 is £1.123m for the full financial year.

3.13 From the 1,750 cases that were identified at the start of this financial year, by 2nd October 2016 the number of active cases had reduced to 1,450. This is because the numbers affected are constantly changing as people come out of the bedroom tax, and new cases arise, due to changes in household composition or financial circumstances.

3.14 Further facts:

- 65 tenancies affected by Bedroom Tax had terminated from 1st April to 2nd October 2016. Of these, seven had completed mutual exchanges and 10 were transfers through the housing register. All moves through the register resulted in downsizing. There were 25 right to Buy terminations, seven tenants deceased, four evictions, four moved to Housing Associations, three moved in with family, one moved to a different country and four gave no reasons. Of the four evictions one was due through Anti-Social Behavior.
- By week 26, for those affected by the bedroom tax, the number of cases in arrears had increased to 57.3% (831 out of 1450) since the start of the year. In week 1 this was 53.8%, so the number of affected tenants in arrears has increased by 3.5% in the first two quarters.
- From April to October 2016, a total of £125,830 of Discretionary Housing Payments had been received on behalf of Council tenants affected by the Bedroom Tax.
- The arrears among those affected by the Bedroom Tax have increased by £4,314 (2.3%) since the start of April 2016. It is normal for the rent arrears to increase in the first half of the year and decrease during the two non-payment free weeks in December.
- These numbers will continue to change as the situation evolves.

Impact of Benefit Income Cap (BIC)

3.15 The BIC is decreasing from £26k per year for families outside London to £20k per year. This change will be applied to all existing cases from November 2016, and newly affected cases in tranches from January 2017.

3.16 An estimated 36 LCC tenants were affected by the BIC as at 07th November 2016.

3.17 The average loss of Housing Benefits for this group has changed from around £45 per week to over £85 per week per case.


Evictions

- 3.18 There were 40 evictions carried out for non-payment of rent from the 6th April to the 2nd October 2015. At the same point in the previous year this figure was 28.
- 3.19 At the end of June 2016 (Quarter 1), there had been 25 evictions. With another 15 this quarter, it can be seen that the rate of evictions has slowed significantly.
- 3.20 Of the 40 evictions, 12 were family cases and 28 were single people.
- 3.21 There were 4 evictions affected to some degree by Bedroom Tax issues.
- 3.22 Single people were almost 3 times as likely to be evicted as families.
- 3.23 Only 7 out of the 40 evictions were directly affected by the impact of Welfare Reforms. Bedroom Tax and BIC cases account for about 8.38% of all tenants, but roughly 12.5% of eviction cases. The majority of evictions, along with the majority of the rent debt, occurred among the 91.62% of tenants NOT directly affected by Welfare Reforms.
- 3.24 The cost of living crisis resulting from a range of economic impacts affects all households, and is thought to have been the biggest single factor in the increase in evictions seen in the 2016/17 financial year.

4. REPORT AUTHORS

- 4.1 Vijay Desor, Head of Service, tel.37 5177
Zenab Valli, Interim Income Collection Manager, tel.39 5550

Appendix 1 Rent Arrears Comparison With Last Year



GLOSSARY

Gross annual rent. This is the total amount due on a property over the course of a year. E.g. if the average rent is £78, times 22,000 properties, times 50 payable weeks = approximately £86m.

Collectable rent – the gross annual rent, plus the carried forward arrears, less Housing Benefit payments, less void loss or any other miscellaneous income. FOR EXAMPLE: £86m (gross rent), plus £1.3m arrears, minus £50m Housing Benefit, minus £2m void loss, less £250k miscellaneous income, EQUALS £35.05m actual cash to be collected from tenants.

The percentage of rent collected shown is based on the proportion of gross rent, less void loss and miscellaneous income that has been received. HB received is included in this calculation, as is the arrears carried forward. This figure is used for comparative purposes only.

Poly. (Polynomial) – a statistical function used to generate a curved target line that reflects the established annual trend.

Wrong size house.?



We can help!

Overcrowding and Underoccupation Project

Presented by Justin Haywood and Michał Nowaczyk



Background

- Housing Scrutiny Commission asked a question about the level of underoccupation of Council tenancies.
- Data sets provided interesting results.
- Opportunity identified to resolve Tenant's under-occupation/overcrowding problems via swaps.
- Why now? - Moves before Flexible Tenancies commence will allow Tenants to keep their existing rights.




What we know

The scale of overcrowding and underoccupation


- 962 Applications from under-occupied/overcrowded tenants.
- 37 627 (65%) overcrowded, looking for a bigger property.
- 335 (35%) under-occupied, looking for a smaller property.
- Majority of Tenants (over 50%) only needed 1-bed smaller, or 1-bed bigger than their current accommodation in order to be adequately housed.

What we know

A broad look across Areas



Under-occupying



Over-crowding

Potential swaps

- Number of potential swaps, based on complimentary need, identified as 172.
- Spread across the 6 main areas of the City:

39

Centre	B'Leys	B'stone	H'stone	N Parks	Saffron
41 (82 tenants)	29 (58 tenants)	7 (14 tenants)	38 (76 tenants)	29 (58 tenants)	28 (56 tenants)
24%	17%	4%	22%	17%	16%

- This means a potential for around 340 housing resolutions.

What we do now



HomeSwapper.

- A website where social tenants can arrange swaps with each other.
- No cost to tenant because cost covered by LCC as part of an annual subscription.
- No obligation for the customer to swap. The customer is in full control of how they make use of the website.

What we do now



HomeSwapper is a good, but under-used product.

- Our research shows there is potential for raising the level of use amongst tenants with housing problems.
- There were only 38 swaps via HomeSwapper in 2016.
- There is a potential for LCC to be more active in assisting tenants to use the website effectively.



What plan to do

- Launching a pilot scheme to facilitate more swaps for LCC tenants.
- No obligation for tenants to take part, but for those who do we will offer a better service.

42

Focus on:

- Increase number of tenants using HomeSwapper – mail shot to be sent to the 962 tenants identified.
- Helping tenants who want to use the website to resolve their housing situation - identifying potential swaps ourselves and suggesting them to tenants.



Advantages

- Increased potential for resolving housing need for Tenants who take part. In turn, slight reduction in people on the Housing Register.
- Makes better use of the HomeSwapper product. Pro-active process, meaning more exchanges likely to happen via HomeSwapper. Better value for money.
- Makes better use of stock. Less empty homes, reduced void costs.

Future possibilities



- Dependent on success of pilot - possibility of making this a mainstream service.
- Tenants identified through the Housing Register as being overcrowded or under-occupied could be directed to HomeSwapper as their primary housing solution.
- We would also work with HomeSwapper to improve the product and add more features that will benefit tenants who use the site.



Thank you.

Questions?

Leicester City Council

Scrutiny Review

Council Housing Voids

**A Review Report of the Housing
Scrutiny Commission**

Cllr Paul Newcombe

March 2017

Contents

1.	RECOMMENDATIONS	3
2.	REPORT	4
3.	CONCLUSIONS	12
4.	FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS	13
	APPENDICES	14
	APPENDIX A Membership of the Task Group	14
	APPENDIX B: TASK GROUP MEETING NOTES.....	14
	APPENDIX C: Scope of the review	31

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Assistant Mayor for Housing and the Executive are asked to consider the recommendations set out below.

- 1.1 Where possible, asbestos should be made safe in situ; where a home awaits asbestos removal, project management should address more recently-void homes with fewer problems to get them back into use more quickly.
- 1.2 When a void is made available for rent as much information as possible should be made available to those being offered a tenancy. There should be a more limited number of offers to those seeking a home, and a shorter time limit on deciding whether to accept a housing offer.
- 1.3 Debts for damage and vandalism should be strongly pursued by the department, and that neighbourhood housing officers (NHOs) should routinely inspect homes to ensure structural and other standards are maintained by tenants in the council's homes.
- 1.4 The Task Group commends the work, positive attitude and significant contributions from the apprentices working on voids repairs. It urges the department, and corporately the council, to continue to offer apprenticeships in the department's technical repairs and maintenance teams.
- 1.5 The stores reorganisation programme should not compromise the service provided to tenants by the council. In particular members are concerned that, if parts of the service are outsourced, contractors' systems are aligned with the requirements of tenants and housing, maintenance and repairs staff.
- 1.6 A letting standard shall be agreed for tenants coming into a new council home following full consultation with the tenants and leaseholders forum. Technical and estate management staff will work to that standard – and it will be observed and respected by existing tenants. Tenants will report repairs promptly and provide appropriate access to maintenance and repair staff as required by the tenancy agreement.
- 1.7 The existing decoration allowance scheme for new tenants should be reviewed, with the option of a paint pack scheme which has lower administration costs being considered when the current scheme contract ends. Decoration work should be inspected by estate management officers three months after the tenancy begins. Tenants should be made fully aware of their responsibilities (and rights) through a form of handbook or on tenancy agreements.
- 1.8 At least three sets of keys be available for access to voids to reduce delays caused by different teams or individuals accessing a home then failing to return the existing individual key.

- 1.9 The allocations scheme should be reviewed with the aim of increasing the speed of delivery of decisions on whether to take an offer for a vacancy. This should include reducing the number of offers available to a potential tenant or considering another system of allocation entirely. There should be an analysis of why offers are rejected – in particular why a major reason for rejection of an offer (35% of rejections) cited the offer being in the wrong area.
- 1.10 The current policy that tenancies can only start on a Monday should be reviewed. A pilot three month scheme with new tenancies could assess the advantages and problems of changing the policy.
- 1.11 Mobile data recording handsets should be available for voids operatives and repairs teams to improve the accuracy of data capture and reduce the number of data inputs required currently from at least three to just one.
- 1.12 The council should establish a city-wide energy performance standard in its council stock. This would help the council meet its carbon reduction targets and also mean energy costs would be more affordable for people who are in greatest financial need.
- 1.13 Short term and medium-term benchmarks for filling voids should be set and a project plan developed to achieve those objectives. The immediate target should be 45 days with a two year target to achieving a 28-day turn-round. Information on the project plan and annual updates on progress on voids reduction should come to the Housing Scrutiny Commission.
- 1.14 A separate Housing Scrutiny Commission should review the procurement, cost and effectiveness of the Northgate housing department software systems, including the way in which it relates to other relevant council IT systems.
- 1.15 The Department is requested respond to the recommendations within three months of the report's approval by the Overview Select Committee
- 1.16 The responses and actions referenced in 1.16 be reported to a future meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Commission.

2. REPORT

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 Social rented housing is one of Leicester City Council's most valuable public assets. In financial terms it brought income to the council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) of £77.9m in 2016-2017 from around 21,000 homes.
- 2.1.2 Rent income is set to drop in 2017-2018 to around £75m in the face of further stock losses through right to buy and the one per cent reduction in social housing rents imposed by the government.
- 2.1.3 That rent reduction has seriously damaged the department's long-term business plan which looked to provide housing upgrades, estate environmental improvements and new homes for rent. All of those objectives have been hit¹ by the government-imposed rent cap at a time when pressure on housing waiting lists because of homelessness and other housing stress has rarely been greater.
- 2.1.4 Councillors and members of the community have over time expressed concern at how long some council homes had remained empty. Every home that remains unoccupied is not being used to address the housing crisis which exists in Leicester and most major communities in England.
- 2.1.5. Against this background members of the Housing Scrutiny Commission investigated how the council has addressed the problem of empty homes in its housing stock.
- 2.1.6 Compounding the issue that an empty home does not bring in rent government rules require authorities to pay council tax on the vacant property after a time – currently a month. That payment goes from the HRA to the council's general funds.
- 2.1.7 The scrutiny Task Group looked at:
- The numbers of void properties and their nature (flat/house/other special needs housing)
 - Reasons for homes being empty
 - Reasons for delays in bringing them back into use
- 2.1.8 The Task Group broadly divided the issues into administrative and technical matters. It received extensive information and assistance from officers involved in the department's own voids task group. Staff from this group gave extensive support to scrutiny members and members wish to express their gratitude for the high levels of help and co-operation provided from all levels of the department.

¹ [Details are contained in the report to the council on 22nd February 2017](#)

2.1.9 During the review task group members visited a number of empty homes which were undergoing repair as well as one of the towers which was being renovated as part of a £10m upgrading of four tower blocks on the St Peter's Estate.

2.2 Setting the scene

2.2.1 Leicester City Council has a housing stock of more than 21,000 homes; in any one month more than 100 are likely to become vacant for a variety of reasons. Tenants move on, to other homes within the stock or to a non-council home; around a fifth of voids come about through the death of a resident and a little less than ten per cent involve evictions or tenants simply walking away from their home.

2.2.2 According to recent data² a total of 241 homes are vacant across the city, 1.2% of the entire stock. These figures are skewed by the number of void homes in the city centre – more than half of the entire stock vacancies are in this area. Taking out the city centre tower blocks figures the void rate across the rest of the stock is 0.7%.

2.2.3 The high proportion of the voids in the city centre is because of the tower blocks refurbishment programme. A number of flats have been kept unlet so that tenants can be moved into them while their own homes are renovated and upgraded.

2.2.4 Technically these homes are voids. In practice they are mostly occupied. They do, however, have a dramatic effect on the overall statistics for delays in repairing voids. The four longest-“vacant” properties have been “empty” for around 2,700 days. Thirty-six of the longest-running 37 voids are held as “decant” homes.

2.2.5 The Housing Department has set up a voids task group which collects data on vacant homes and is tracking the 200 longest-empty homes in the stock. The most recent report suggests the bottom of this table was taken up by five homes which had been empty for 29 days. Forty-four homes were empty for less than 50 days. In July 2017 the lowest homes in this league had been empty for 20 days. A total of 53 homes had been vacant for less than 50 days.

2.2.6 In financial terms the calendar month point is important. The loss of rent to the Housing Revenue Account is obvious. However, when a council home is empty for a calendar month or more the authority is obliged to start paying the council tax police and fire authority charges on that home. That charge is from the HRA to the council's general revenue fund.

2.2.7 An indicator of the costs involved came from a report to Housing Scrutiny in September 2015 (see link in footnote 3 below). Rent losses are running at around £900k a year and council tax costs at around £150k. In total, void losses in rent and council tax for 2014-2015 were just over £1m.

2.2.8 A profile of the empty properties held by the council shows that of 241 voids 135 are one-bedroom flats, two thirds of them in the central city area. Another

² February 2017

21 are two-bedroom flats. Forty-eight houses, 33 of them three-bedroom, are vacant across the city, just three of them in the city centre.

- 2.2.9 The Housing Scrutiny Commission [received a report](#) on the voids improvement programme in December 2014. The Commission was told then that at the end of the previous year it had been taking 54 days to turn around an empty property; this figure had been reduced to 38 days. The new target would be 25 days. While these times are lower than those being currently achieved, the number of voids has decreased significantly since a peak of 457 in April 2014 and 345 in October 2014.
- 2.2.10 Targets have not been met and a new norm of around 54 days is being looked at as a benchmark for reducing void times. The Task Group looked in detail at the issues underlying why it has been taking so long to bring voids back into use.
- 2.2.11 [A further report to the Housing Scrutiny Commission](#) in September 2015 referenced “steady progress” since the report of December 2014. It set out the costs to the council of voids in four years from 2012-13 to 2014-2015 - £0.6m, £1.0m and £09.m respectively. This figure is likely to be more than £1.1m in 2016-2017.

Voids – the technical issues

- 2.2.12 The department’s Voids Improvement Programme, looking in detail at a small number of voids, analysed the issues involved in bringing them back into physically sound condition and then the processes for getting them re-let.
- 2.2.13 These are broadly in three categories:
- Post-vacancy technical survey
 - Survey results notification to repairs teams
 - Repairs/improvements
- 2.2.14 In some cases homes have been left by previous tenants in considerable disarray. In 2013/14, for example, 396 tenants were charged a total of £402k for some of the work that needed doing in the property after they left.
- 2.2.15 These type of debts are hard to collect, but the allocation policy states that any applicant on the housing register who has a housing related debt will normally only be considered for re-housing under exceptional circumstances.
- 2.2.16 Scrutiny task group members strongly felt debts for damage and vandalism should be strongly pursued by the department, and that neighbourhood housing officers (NHOs) should routinely inspect homes to ensure structural and other standards are maintained by tenants in the council’s homes – including gardens, where it applies.
- 2.2.17 Once a home has been declared void, a technical inspection assesses its physical state. This extends beyond the sometimes cosmetic issues which might come under the issues in the previous paragraph. Around 70% of the stock has asbestos and an early assessment involves whether it is present and if so how it is dealt with.

- 2.2.18 Asbestos may be completely safe for tenants while it remains undisturbed, but if a home requires major renovation – new kitchen or bathroom, for example – the asbestos may pose a serious risk for those doing the site work. In such cases the Health and Safety Executive needs to be notified and a specialist asbestos removal contractor recruited to remove it.
- 2.2.19 Beyond the specific technical issues presented by asbestos different teams have been using different ideas about what needs to be done to bring a void up to standard. No clear definition of this standard has existed and the task group heard that there were instances of “mission creep” by estate management officers who asked for more improvements than might have been necessary (see appendix B3).
- 2.2.20 An over-arching lettings standard has been developed, taking into account a wide range of issues relating to the state of the property – inside and out (see Appendix B3 par 3.3.1). In all around 150 elements ranging from recharges to departing tenants to groundwork are brought into the scope of the lettings standard.
- 2.2.21 However these can be summarised under three broad headings: that all properties, including all associated components to the property and its surrounding area are re-let on the basis of being:-
- Safe
 - Clean
 - In good working order
- 2.2.22 This guidance is directed toward all employees and stakeholders who are required to carry out visits, inspections, removals and repairs to void properties and sets out the standard to which empty homes should be inspected, repaired and offered to new tenants.
- 2.2.23 The aim of the standard is to ensure the Council provides good quality homes for new tenants which are suitable to their needs. It also assists in understanding the cost of works required and the time the repairs might take.
- 2.2.24 The standard suggests not all work must be finished before a new tenant moves in if doing the work would delay the letting and is of a minor nature. The lettings standard suggests new tenants will be advised of and must agree to this arrangement for the work during viewing and/or during sign-up. Otherwise the work must be carried out while the property is still empty.
- 2.2.25 The standard will also provide for an allowance to give to incoming tenants to decorate their new home. The existing allowance arrangement costs £160,000 a year and has to be re-procured in the next year.
- 2.2.26 The department is cautiously rolling out the concept of a lettings standard. But members of the Task Group strongly supported the standard and were keen that it should be promoted more widely.
- 2.2.27 They also felt there should be more monitoring of the condition of homes, inside and out, by estate management staff and where homes are in disrepair tenants be required to do that work themselves.

Site Visits: The Ultimate Void project

- 2.2.28 An important part of the Task Group's work was to make site visits to a number of voids in various states of repair and these were arranged by the housing voids management team, which members appreciated and were grateful for. Detailed notes of the visits can be found in Appendix B4.
- 2.2.29 Property A was re-let within 28 days despite the presence of asbestos, the need for kitchen refurbishment a series of problems – namely a lack of access to keys which delayed the access for the asbestos survey work, a five day delay in starting the kitchen refurbishment and a need to go back to remove some asbestos not spotted in the original survey.³ An offer was accepted on day 10 of the void and the tenant was able to move in once the work was done.
- 2.2.30 Work on Property B featured a number of infuriating problems. It took 35 days to turn round and in that time:
- Kitchen materials were ordered eight days after the property was surveyed and took a further six days to deliver
 - The wrong materials were delivered and it took two days more for the correct materials to be delivered and the kitchen refurbishment to begin.
- 2.2.31 Tenancies start from a Monday; if the work had been finished two days earlier the void time would have been reduced by a week. This particularly exercised members. They felt this policy could cause repair work to be concentrated unnecessarily, also putting pressure on estate management staff to complete formalities for new tenants at the same time of the week.
- 2.2.32 Property C featured a £700 recharge for work required from the previous tenant, and a delay in completing asbestos removal work due to a lack of trained staff.⁴
- 2.2.33 The property was refused twice before an offer was accepted. Both refusals cited the reason that they “did not like the area.” The first refusal was eight days after an offer; the second took 13 days to refuse. The third offer was accepted and the new tenant moved in on the same day.
- 2.2.34 Members were concerned that offers were being rejected on the basis of the location – particularly as this would have been part of the information available when the offer was being made.
- 2.2.35 They were also concerned that it took so long for the department to be told the offer was being rejected. Where lifts are not available this should be made clear. Where possible there should also be escorted visits so that

³ It was suggested a key safe would avoid problems with key access. However the department trialled the use of a key safe and found it made little difference. Staff and contractors STILL forgot to put the key back when they had finished....

⁴ This is less of a problem now the council has extended its list of approved asbestos contractors from two to six.

there is much less chance of “misunderstandings” about a property being offered and its location.⁵

- 2.2.36 Property D was ready after 24 days but took 35 days to let and featured three refusals. One of these appeared to have been a bid made in an error which the applicant was unable to reverse. The other refusals cited a lack of problems with site access. The first offer was rejected after five days. It took 20 days for the next offer to be rejected.
- 2.2.37 *Members would like to put on record that where they met with staff and technicians working on the void properties they were impressed by their enthusiasm and commitment. Women were in the teams and a number of staff were involved in the apprenticeship schemes being run by the City Council.*
- 2.2.38 Members expressed concern at this point that any restructuring of the stores system across the city should not compromise the effective delivery of both a voids repairs system and the wider issue of housing repairs and maintenance.
- 2.2.39 In particular they were concerned that if contracting and supply arrangements were outsourced contractors’ and departmental IT systems were compatible. If necessary this should be written into any procurement specifications.
- 2.2.40 Members of the Task Group visited the Tower refurbishment project in November 2016. Specifically they conducted a tour of Gordon House, which was completely decanted to allow contractors complete access to the building.
- 2.2.41 Members saw homes in three different states of stripping out and being built up again. They were informed that the refurbishment would not provide any upgrade in thermal efficiency of the block, which was part of a four-block development on the St Peters Estate in the early 1970s.
- 2.2.42 They were also told the project management arrangements for the tower had been radically changed after the department’s experience of the refurbishment of the first tower – Framland House.
- 2.2.43 The project involved refurbishing the top eight floors first, moving the tenants back in and then refurbishing the lower floors in the hope that it would make for a speedier refurbishment. This did not happen because the complexities of moving so many tenants in and out of the block had been underestimated and any hoped-for economies of scale were lost.
- 2.2.44 At Gordon House new front doors and communal fire doors had been completed before the main refurbishment and one lift replaced to try and

⁵ Officers are sceptical about the reason given as not liking the area. They suspect applicants of gaming the system and putting in a bid while looking for another property they would prefer to make a bid on.

ensure the block was refurbished as quickly as possible. The site was formally handed over to the main contractor on the 1st August.

- 2.2.45 Members on the visit were pleased with the technical quality of the work under way and the co-operation between council teams and the main contractor. They noted that tenants were pleased with the quality of refurbishment of the other towers where work had been completed⁶.

3. CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 Some issues relating to delays in filling void homes are specific to this issue; but many relate to wider issues of practice and performance across the whole housing stock. These wider issues have an impact on the council's housing repairs service and included:
- Accurate recording of technical data and material requirements
 - Programming of work
 - Availability of appropriately skilled and trained staff
 - Letting procedures
- 3.2 Important health and safety issues involve the presence and removal of asbestos. With 70% of homes potentially containing asbestos this can create significant delays in the turn-round of empty homes. However asbestos can in most cases be safely retained within the council's housing stock.
- 3.3 For some homes which have been renovated delays have sometimes occurred because of how long it has taken to get an offer of housing accepted.
- 3.4 The list of long-term voids is deceptive. Many very-long term "voids" are being used to decant tenants affected by the blocks replacement programme.
- 3.5 Members were dismayed at a system which means tenancies can only start on a Monday. A more flexible system which allows tenants to go into a home once it is ready for occupation should be developed and implemented. Members felt the Monday deadline made it more difficult to programme routine and required work smoothly.

Cllr Paul Newcombe
 Chair of the Leicester City Council Housing Scrutiny Commission
 3rd March 2017

⁶ The future of Goscote House, a different design, will be subject to a future report to Scrutiny. Options including refurbishment and complete demolition are being assessed by consultants.

4. FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

1. Financial implications

To come

2. Legal implications

To come

3. Equality Impact Assessment

To come

4. Summary of Appendices

Appendix A – Membership and evidence: Page
Appendix B – Task Group meeting information notes: Page
Appendix C – Scoping document: Page

5. Officer to Contact

Jerry Connolly
Scrutiny Policy Officer
Tel: 0116 454 6343
Jerry.connolly@leicester.gov.uk

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Membership of the Task Group

Cllr Paul Newcombe (chair)
Cllr Dawn Alfonso (Vice chair)
Cllr Teresa Aldred
Cllr Hanif Aqbany
Cllr Annette Byrne
Cllr Diane Cank

Officers providing evidence and support:

Simon Nicholls
Vijay Desor
Jo-Anne Hollings

APPENDIX B: TASK GROUP MEETING NOTES

APPENDIX B1: Notes of meeting on 30th March 2016

Present: Cllr Paul Newcombe; Cllr Dawn Alfonso
Vijay Desor; Simon Nicholls

1. The purpose of the meeting was to activate the task group review into delays in bringing void properties back into use. The void improvement project had been led by Dijay Visor, but after a departmental re-organisation of responsibilities Simon Nicholls was taking over responsibility for this project.

It was suggested that areas of interest would include examining the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which were used by the department to assess how well they were performing in this aspect of the department's service.
3. There had been two previous reports to the Commission about the issue following members' continuing concern about the problem of delays in bringing empty properties back into use. The delays cost the council in terms of lost rent and council tax income; importantly it meant that people needing to be housed were not able to access homes.
4. Issues relating to 2014-2015 included problems with the failure of a private contractor. Resources, including those allocated to repairing voids, had to be diverted to cover the work of the contractor, and this was a major cause of further delays in bringing void properties back into use.
5. Officers said that one reason for delays to voids to bring them back into use was the build of the property – some 70% of homes had asbestos and this would need detailed surveying and if necessary, depending on the structural state of the asbestos, it would have to be removed using specialist sub-contractors.
6. Areas of work to be reviewed would include the co-ordination between various teams dealing with:
 - Notification that a home had become void (by whom and to whom)
 - Surveying of the building
 - Post-survey notification to the repairs teams
 - Repairs and/or capital investment
 - Notification that the home was available for letting (by whom and to whom)
 - Letting of the void
7. It was noted that all this was happening at a time when the department was undergoing a major organisational review which would put further stresses on operatives and admin and professional services within the department.
Jerry Connolly: 22nd April 2016

APPENDIX B2: Notes of meeting on 27th April 2016

Present

Cllr Newcombe; Cllr Alfonso; Cllr Byrne; Cllr Aldred; Cllr Aqbany
 Simon Nicholls: Head of Service
 Jerry Connolly: Scrutiny Policy Officer

1. Apologies

Cllr Cank

2. Introduction to background issues: Simon Nichols

- 3.1. Simon explained that he had inherited the voids improvement project (VIP) in the last few weeks. He was keen to put some oomph into the VIP and said one aspect he wanted to concentrate on was the issue of council tax liability.
- 3.2. “We need to ensure, in challenging times and in the context of the 1% reductions in rent over the next few years that we maximise income. Rental income is also a massive part of what we do so this issue feeds into that”.
- 3.3. The work of the review was divided into two clearly defined sets of issues:
- a. **Administrative**
 - Pre-notification..how the department knows when buildings become void..
 - Post-notification how the department is told when work has been completed
 - Letting of the voids
 - b. **Technical**
 - Post-vacancy technical survey
 - Survey results notification to repairs teams
 - Repairs/improvements
- 3.4. Keys – their location, use, access and passage on to other parts of the chain of actions – was an issue. Passing on keys in time from one team to another is a big issue. We have to get to the bottom of this issue even if we have universal key while the property is void.
- 2.5. Surveys present a range of issues. One involves changes of legislation about asbestos; many homes (about 70% of the stock) have asbestos. This is normally safe for tenants – the issues relate to exposure of workers to it. We need to notify The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) 14 days before we remove some asbestos and have to use a specialist contractor.
- 2.6. Now we also have to provide an energy performance certificate (EPC). We have had to do this since 2012 and we have not done the whole stock – around 50% have been done and we have an in-house team doing this.

- 2.7. With voids we have no standard for energy performance, but this is also a wider issue in the council's housing stock. A number of programmes have been aimed to improve energy performance, thereby improving financial viability of low-income households.
- 2.8. Where there is friable asbestos in a void we have to use a licensed contractor to remove it. Problems in getting a specialist contractor is not a current issue because we have just put six asbestos removal contractors onto a specialist list – an improvement on previous position where the approved list gradually reduced to two.
- 2.9. Procurement is quite a difficult process. We are trying to employ local companies and workers, but Leicester was not full of asbestos removal contractors. We also need analysts to test the air to make sure it is free of asbestos fibres after the removal contractors have finished their work.
- 2.10. Cllr Aqbany: we've had quite a good service and it might get even better. But there was an issue about the variable quality of void surveys. (This was also referenced by technical staff during the site visits).
- 3.11. Simon agreed there were inconsistencies in quality of surveys across the city. He said the team was recruiting a technical team leader to help improve consistency. There are 5/6 voids technicians across the city. They currently report to housing management team leader. But there will be a change so reports will go to a technical team leader. That is being brought forward and you should start to see more consistency, he said.

A Letting Standard

- 3.12. We will look to define what this will be (rather than a minimum letting standard).

Refusal of lettings offers

- 3.13. Cllr Alfonso raised the issue of the refusal of lettings, which was a significant factor in extending why some homes remained empty although ready for letting. Simon said he had a report on the issue of refusals, but needed to do more work because of data inconsistencies relating to a switch to the new Northgate IT system.
- 3.14. There was a really issue about the way the choice/offer system operated and this might need to be addressed by the Task Group as part of its recommendations.
- 3.15. Cllr Newcombe said that at an earlier point members did stipulate that better information on the location of homes being offered was needed. He commented that it did not sound as if matters have been moved on.

- 3.16. Cllr Byrne commented that housing staff were telling people to bid for houses.
- 3.17. Cllr Aqbany Aqbany said that when he had been a Cabinet lead other members would often pass on complaints about poor quality of homes being offered to tenants. Do you think this has improved. Cllr Aldred pointed out that people in their 80s do not have computer literacy, creating a barrier to HomeChoice.
- 3.18. In relation to **post-survey notification**, Simon said the process of transforming a completed survey into a project specification needed to be smoother. This process also involved new software – Corona.
- 3.19. He also said a grown-up conversation was needed about what work might be done and might have to be done, and when. Some work had to be done before tenant moves in. Electrical safety work for example.
- 3.20. But some might also be done after a new tenant had moved in. There needed to be trust from the tenant that that promised work would be done. Maybe that is something that needs to be part of the conversation.
- 3.21. There might be incentives to make sure the promised work was done. Cllr Aqbany said people are told things are going to be done on trust. Perhaps there should be a statement of what needs to be done and when.

Ultimate Void Journey (UVJ)

- 3.22. Simon described a testbed project starting on 9th May on four voids in Beaumont Leys ward. Under the UVJ we will be monitoring the four properties to physically go through the journey of the void. We will look at the whole process; looking in real life what the real barriers are. All the real world real life problems will be tracked.

3. Site visits

- 4.1 Members and officers found out a lot talking to staff on the site visits to a number of voids. It was noted the homes did not include examples of the few homes which have been left very badly damaged by departing tenants.
- 4.2 Operatives talked about work not being picked up on the specification and talked about the different standards of survey report prepared for them in different parts of the city.
- 4.3 Members thanked Simon for arranging the site visits and meeting site staff to talk about their work.

5. Future actions

- 5.1 HomeChoice – how it works: Suzanne Collins to provide presentation
Ultimate void journey: report back when available

Grouped issues

- Notification that a home is void
- Notification that the home is available
- Letting the void; and
- Surveying voids
- Translation of survey into work specification
- Repairs and/or capital investment

5.2 It was agreed at least three meetings would be required, programming in work as available. Jerry would consult members and officer, particularly Simon, and arrange further meetings.

The meeting ended at 19.10.

Jerry Connolly 28th April 2016

APPENDIX B3: Notes of meeting on 7th July 2016

1 Present

Cllr Newcombe; Cllr Alfonso;

Simon Nicholls: Head of Service

Jo-Anne Hollings: Business Change Manager

Jerry Connolly: Scrutiny Policy Officer

2. Apologies

Cllr Byrne

3. The lettings standard

3.1 The current position

3.1.1 Simon Nicholls and Jo-Anne Hollings introduced a document summarising work being done by the department's own voids task group to establish an agreed standard of a home when it is being taken over by a new tenant.

3.1.2 There was no clearly established quality benchmarks for new tenants and, critically, for technical and housing staff. For various reasons technical staff have been working to different standards in different parts of the city, partly because technical assessments of work required to be done could vary depending on who was doing the survey.

3.1.3 The picture has been further confused when estate management officers (EMOs) have asked for further work to be done, requiring return visits by technical staff to do further, often minor, work, disrupting and delaying their work schedules.

3.1.4 Calls for further work have also been prompted by demands by the new tenant who may, reasonably or otherwise, expect that certain work should have been done. Pressure might be being put on EMOs, who simply transferred the request to the housing department's technical team.



- 3.1.5 Simon said in evidence: “In the past we had a minimum standard which evolved and which was never adequately communicated... different standards were adopted in different parts of the city.”
- 3.1.6 Because of a lack of clarity about what work, and to what standard, should be done to put a void into good order, standards and methods have developed in a piecemeal and ad hoc basis over time.
- 3.2 A new definition
- 3.2.1 The departmental voids team has adopted the term “lettings standard” to describe in general terms a package of measures which would make up what tenants, repairs and maintenance and technical surveying staff might expect to be done on a void property.
- 3.2.2 The critical difference is that it moves away from the current terminology which describes the work, some of it quite complex and expensive, for letting empty homes as a “minimum” standard.
- 3.2.3 There have been two important objectives in the development of a new letting standard
- Define what should be done under the new lettings standard
 - Ensure the new standard is adopted uniformly across both the department and by tenants
- 3.2.4 There was an online staff consultation on a proposed standard, while new tenants were also asked their views on the proposed standard. Proposals were also taken to the tenants’ and leaseholders’ forum On 26th May 2016 (and were welcomed at that time).
- 3.3 The lettings standard**
- 3.3.1 This was set out in detail in Appendix A of the briefing report to members. The headings for the standard were:
- General principles
 - Recharges (to outgoing tenants)
 - Decoration
 - Electrics
 - Gas plumbing
 - Carpentry
 - Plumbing
 - Labouring
 - Plastering
 - Floor tiling
 - Groundwork
 - Bricklaying; and
 - External work
- 3.3.2 In all more than 150 items, small and large, are included within the above headings. Jo-Anne Collings said that different versions would be available

for different audiences, with a shorter and perhaps simplified version available to new tenants.

- 3.3.3 A launch of the new standard was expected within the next week or so and there would be a detailed three-month consultation before it was formally adopted. It would also be subject to on-going 12 month reviews.

3.4 Further development work

- 3.4.1 One issue has been the variations in surveys across the city and it was clear, not least from site visits by members, that the workers who did the jobs within the void buildings found there were differences across the city which partly related to who had done the survey work.

- 3.4.2 The department has recognised this and has created a post of senior voids technician who will have the job of standardising survey quality across the city and individual stock surveyors. The new post is expected to be filled from September.

3.5 Task group member issues

- 3.5.1 Cllr Newcombe welcomed the move to create a new standard and said it should also be embedded in the tenants' handbook. He also asked if technical staff were moved from area to area to spread good practice where appropriate. Simon said that this was not a policy, but sometimes happened anyway because of pressures on the workforce to get a job completed in a timely way which required them to work in different areas. "We would look to do that but there is a small number of technicians and we get 100 voids a month."

- 3.5.2 Cllr Newcombe asked whether the department had or would consider buddying up technicians to spread good practice. Cllr Alfonso suggested the lettings standard should also include a tenants' responsibilities standard. She said voids work often involved repairs which should have been done through the tenancy.

- 3.5.3 Networking with other authorities. Officers said that they were looking to make comparisons with the Sheffield voids performance, and a benchmarking exercise was being done with other authorities. But members were advised that it was sometimes difficult to make direct comparisons because authority issues were often very different. In Leicester there was now constant pressure on all housing across the city. Some neighbouring authorities still had hard-to-let properties.

- 3.5.4 Members asked what would be required to implement the new standard. Officers said that there should not be any financial impact, but agreed to assess the cost, and therefore the savings by their elimination, of repairs and maintenance staff having to come back to jobs they thought had been completed. This assessment would be provided to the task group.

- 3.5.5 Jo-Anne said she would be monitoring implementation of the standard, including monitoring complaints and the report will be updated on a regular basis. The three month assessment would involve 300 properties, which

should be enough to test the document and provide valuable monitoring and feedback.

- 3.5.6 The department will review the decorating allowance under which around £160k a year is given to new tenants to decorate their homes. Payment was through a B&Q card and the whole scheme would be re-procured and a strategy needed to be in place in April 2017. A number of options would be considered.

4. **Other actions**

- 4.1 An electronic version of the letting strategy would be sent to Jerry and form part of the evidence to this meeting.
- 4.2 Housing Commission members were to be reminded that the task group next met on 14th July at 12pm to consider a report on The Ultimate Void. The meeting closed at 13.35.

Jerry Connolly 8th July 2016

APPENDIX B4: Notes of meeting on 14th July 2016

1. Present

Cllr Newcombe: Cllr Alfonso
Simon Nicholls; Jo-Anne Hollings
Jerry Connolly

2. Apologies

Cllr Byrne

3. Notes from 7th July 2016

- 3.1 The meeting notes from 7th July 2016 were approved.
- 3.2 Issues arising: laminate floors in flats and troublesome trees. These were raised by Cllr Connelly and the topics are covered by the term “exceptional circumstances.” If flooring is in good condition then whether to replace it will be a call for the survey technician.
- 3.3 The tree issue can be controversial with tenant and resident interest groups. One view is that the trees shouldn’t be there in the first place. The reality is that some tenants allow trees to grow piecemeal.
- 3.4 Estate management officers deal with day-to-day issues of tree management. However with staff review this function will become part of EMO function (shrubs, grass grounds maintenance etc).
- 3.5 In the worst cases it could take five days to clear overgrown gardens – an issue which should be dealt with under tenancy management rather than through the voids programme.

4.

The ultimate void

4.1

Simon Nicholls and Jo-Anne Hollings introduced the evidence base relating to how voids were dealt with by the voids management team. They consisted of four case studies – the voids which first became available under the terms of the exercise.

4.2

Wanted to get a full understanding of the issues relating to the physical and organisational barriers to turning a void round. In the case studies presented, the time taken to re-let the voids were 35 days for three homes and 28 days for the fourth.

4.3

This is against an average void time of 64 days across the city, and while the numbers were good the exercise did highlight areas of concern, officers told the task group. For information the sample included two three-bedroom houses and two two-bedroom flats on the first and second floors of housing blocks. A spreadsheet of information about each of the four houses was tabled at the meeting. The spreadsheet forms appendix B of this note. Members were made aware of the property IDs but they will be anonymised for the purposes of the public scrutiny report.

4.4. Property A

4.4.1

A three bedroom house which took 28 days to re-let. This comparatively short period was achieved despite the house needing a re-wire, new kitchen and stripped of asbestos. It also required locks to be changed. The kitchen refurbishment took 16 days and was done by a private contractor. Rewiring took 21 days from key handover to work completion. An offer was accepted on day 10 of the void and the new tenant moved in on day 28.

4.4.2 Issues noted were:

- Lock was changed but the lock was not passed on so an asbestos survey could be undertaken
- The asbestos survey was delayed by the need to remove a carpet which had been considered acceptable by an estate management officer but which on closer inspection needed to be removed
- Five days were lost between passing keys to the kitchen design team and work starting. The reasons for this delay were not clear at this point.
- An element of asbestos was missed in the survey and further work had to be done. Had the survey been completed first time this could have saved a day
- Aluminium doors and windows put in by the tenant had to be replaced

4.4.3

Officer/member observations: The department is looking at how to integrate asbestos survey data in one home to similar homes (for example in a block of flats, or neighbouring houses built at the same time to the same designs)

4.4.4 This cloning process, being done with the use of the Northgate IT system, could save time and money because there is asbestos survey data available on 10k out of 21k homes owned by the council. The council is looking at records of surveying done over the last three years.

4.4.5 Cllr Newcombe raised the possibility of homes have a key safe to reduce the problems relating to handover times from one set of workers or contractors to another. Jo-Anne commented that an issue with this was that staff might forget to return a key when vacating the building.⁷

4.5 Property B:

4.5.1 A three bedroomed house which took 35 days to let. It was surveyed for asbestos but none was found which needed treatment or removal. The kitchen needed to be refurbished, rear garden cleared out and a DPI⁸ switch needed to be installed. The property was accepted by a prospective tenant two weeks before the house was vacated and occupied 35 days later.

4.5.2 Issues noted included:

- The DPI switch had to be ordered from Western Power and took 11 days to deliver.
- Kitchen materials were ordered eight days after the property was surveyed and took a further six days to deliver
- Not only was the kitchen material delivery delayed but wrong materials were delivered
- It took two days for the correct materials to be delivered and the kitchen refurbishment to begin
- The work took 14 days to complete
- Tenancies start from a Monday; if the work had been finished two days earlier the void time would have been reduced by a week.

4.5.3 Members considered that the policy of only starting a tenancy on a Monday needed to be reviewed. Officers were asked to provide an explanation for the current policy and considered that a draft recommendation might be that tenancies should be capable of being started on any weekday.

4.5.4 They felt that in any case this policy could cause work to be concentrated unnecessarily, putting pressure on estate management staff to complete formalities for new tenants at the same time of the week.

4.6 Property C:

4.6.1 A first floor two bedroom flat which took 35 days to re-let. It was surveyed for asbestos and material removed. A new uPVC door was fitted and it was

⁷ There is a possible issue that several trades or contractors might need access during the same period, requiring more than key for the property

re-wired. There was a recharge to the ex-tenant of almost £700 for repairs to the flat arising from the way it had been damaged during the tenancy.

4.6.2 Issues arising during the void period were:

- Asbestos survey technician was given front door key only – needed keys to access other areas
- Asbestos removal was delayed because of a lack of trained staff able to wear the required face mask used in the work. The work was completed 28 days after the survey
- The property was refused twice before an offer was accepted. Both refusals cited the reason that they “did not like the area.” The first refusal was eight days after an offer; the second took 13 days to refuse. The third offer was accepted and the new tenant moved in the same day.

4.6.4 Members were concerned that offers were being rejected on the basis of the location – particularly as this would have been part of the information available when the offer was being made.

4.6.5 They were also concerned that it took so long for the department to be told that the offer was being rejected. A possible recommendation from the task group is that there should be tighter time limits on when an offer can be declined. They felt that some potential tenants might not be able to easily access flats without lifts, and that where lifts are not available this should be made clear. Where possible there should also be escorted visits so that there is much less chance of “misunderstandings” about a property being offered and its location.

4.7 Property D

4.7.1 The 2nd floor two bedroom flat took 35 days to re-let. It was refused three times – once due to what might be called user error when a customer pressed an acceptance button by accident. The system appears not to allow such errors to be corrected at the time. This would be a matter of discussion with HomeChoice witnesses.

4.7.2 The property was re-wired, a door needed to be fitted and tiling put back following the re-wiring. It was ready to let after 24 days. It took a further 11 days for the void to be occupied.

4.7.3 Apart from the finger error bid referred to in 4.7.1 two other offers were refused, both citing problems with stair access. The first was declined after five days; the second took 20 days to be turned down. The property was then offered to Housing First and was occupied within a week.

5 Further issues

5.1 There was some discussion about the balance of responsibilities between the tenant, housing management and void work. In some cases it was

possible that work which should have been considered routine maintenance was being picked up (or consigned to) the voids team.

- 5.2 This may be clarified by the new repairs standard. However, there might also be scope to explore an incentive scheme which would reward tenants who kept their homes in good order. A housing association had developed such a scheme and officers said they would investigate it.
- 5.3 Members were also keen to know the costs associated with voids – both repair costs, loss of rent income and the impact of council tax exemption ending after four weeks. Officers agreed to provide information the costs associated with the ultimate void project.
- 5.4 Members were also keen to see examples of very long-term voids, some of which were empty for 90 days or more. There was also discussion about the need to identify different types of void. Those being decanted for major tower block works should be separated out from voids arising through the normal turnover of tenancies.
- 5.5 Officer said that the ultimate void project had not provided all the information that would be needed. A further study would be done involving a much more serious case.
- 5.6 Members were interested to have information on how well the housing options system was working at the Granby Street customer centre. Officers said they would look to provide information on how the system was working (Caroline Carpendale might be the relevant officer).
6. The meeting closed at 13.35

Jerry Connolly

15th July 2015

APPENDIX B5: Notes of meeting on 21st July 2016

Voids task group meeting notes

1. **Present**
Cllr Newcombe; Cllr Alfonso
Simon Nicholls; Suzanne Collins; Ketan Shah
Jerry Connolly
2. **Apologies**
Cllr Byrne; Cllr Aqbany; Cllr Cank
3. **Notes from 14th July 2016**

These were agreed as a correct record

4.

HomeChoice

4.1

Suzanne introduced her colleague Ketan and said the presentation would be in two parts:

- the HomeChoice web site and the transition from the previous Open Housing lettings application system in January 2016
- A live demonstration of the application system

4.2

The introduction of the Northgate system involved a major reshaping of the HomeChoice web site. One advantage was the splitting out of information for existing tenants and for new applicants.

4.3

This was subject to consultation with the Tenants' Forum, which approved the amendments and made the site easier to use for applicants and those who had to administer the system.

4.4

Objectives were to:

- Provide a clearer customer journey.
- Prevent duplication.
- Provide Future proofing, with a clearer basis on which to update information.
- Promote channel shift.

4.5

Northgate went live for this system in January 2016. It cause some difficulties in that the site architecture appeared to have been developed in the 1990s and was not compatible with more modern systems.

4.6

Changes, and their underlying reasons, were set out as follows.

Previous system

- Disjointed journey with duplication of information on LHC web site and corporate website.
- Information relating to LHC and applying for housing mixed up with existing tenants information.
- Often have to do more than 2 searches to find what you want using LHC URL and LCC URL

New process

- Customer Journey starts with registration and can be followed through logically to the end stage.
- Information about LHC and applying for housing is on its own corporate landing page.
- Link to the cbl site via the corporate apply for housing page for search and bid only.

- Old LHC URL links were redirected to the corporate apply for housing landing page where all information and links are.

4.7 For vulnerable individuals around 60 letters are now being sent out each week highlighting vacant homes; clients would be helped by family members or other advocate support, or come into the office in person.

4.8 Clients still have three bids but the Northgate system does not allow them to prioritise their searches. The system reassesses the total priority list each evening; it allows for the creation of a basket of bids and allows applicants to amend their basket of bids if they have made a bid in error, (an issue raised at a previous task group) or if, for example, a more attractive option becomes available.

4.9 Only relevant properties are made available to clients bidding on the system. The council continues to fund the HomeSwapper social housing exchange system and this service remains free to tenants.

Rejected offers

4.10 Members asked why so many tenants had turned down offers on the basis of the area having previously accepted the offer. They were told that this reason was the most common factor in tenancy offers being neglected.

4.11 It was noted that properties being offered had information, including Google Maps and Streetview, about exactly where they were and the neighbourhood they were in. However location was often a convenient cover for the fact that a home which was more attractive or interesting had been advertised after a bid had been accepted.

Satisfaction surveys

4.12 Councillors asked if there was an end-of-process customer satisfaction survey option on the new site. They were informed no survey was available but that it could be added to the system. As the new process had been online since January it might be appropriate to have such a survey.

4.13 The new system had prompted far fewer telephone queries than when the previous system was put into place, members were told.

4.14 In an ancillary point, Cllr Newcombe asked if there was customer satisfaction data available for clients at the Granby Street Customer Centre.

9 Future schedule

9.1 No further meeting of the task group had yet been scheduled. It was possible that one could be held on Thursday 4th August, depending on whether information was available on:

- Granby Street customer centre satisfaction data

- Longer term voids
- Separation of data on void times to take into account the tower block repairs programme (with its associated long term voids)
- A detailed technical note about the reasons for Monday being the only date at which tenancies began.

Jerry Connolly 21st July 2016

APPENDIX C: Scope of the review

To be completed by the Member proposing the review		
1.	Title of the proposed scrutiny review	Progress and performance relating to void times in city council housing stock
2.	Proposed by	Cllr Paul Newcombe
3.	Rationale	<p>State what prompted the review e.g. media interest /public feedback / new legislation / performance information.</p> <p>Voids and void times are a matter of on-going interest for ward members, members of the scrutiny commission and tenants.</p> <p>There were known difficulties due to the failure of a contractor which required the diversion of departmental resources and caused voids times to increase.</p> <p>A short review would assess the current position, how this relates to previous performance and prospects of further improvements.</p>
4.	Purpose and aims of the review What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?)	To determine performance levels based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area housing offices • Contractor client (relevant depots) • Relevant KPIs for the service and compared with other authorities • Housing type and locations across the city, including inner and outer estates
5.	Links with corporate aims / priorities How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities?	The built and natural environment Neighbourhoods and communities Providing care and support
6.	Scope Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.	A task group would look at a small number of cases from a range of housing offices across the city For example the task group would look at two examples within each area of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quickest turn-round of voids • homes empty the longest • repairs completed around the average for the service

Develop a draft Project Plan to incorporate sections seven to twelve of this form

7.	Methodology Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review. How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?	The inquiry will be conducted by a task group and involve at least two meetings. Evidence will be assembled into conclusions and recommendations made to the Housing Scrutiny Commission. Tenant representatives will be invited to take part in the Review
	Witnesses Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this	Evidence would be taken from officers, local members where appropriate, tenant representatives and other interested individuals or groups. Evidence will be in the form of written reports and oral evidence to the Task Group Site visits would also be organised to look at a range of voids
8.	Timescales How long is the review expected to take to complete?	Four months
	Proposed start date	December 2015
	Proposed completion date	March 2016
9.	Resources / staffing requirements Scrutiny reviews are facilitated by Scrutiny Policy Officers and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.	Approximately two weeks of Scrutiny Policy Officer time
	Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details.	Site visits within the city may be organised as part of the task group review

10.	Review recommendations and findings To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. Executive / External Partner?	Recommendations will be made to the executive
11.	Likely publicity arising from the review - Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.	This is unlikely to be a high-profile issue attracting significant media attention. However the media office will be notified routinely when reports are made to the Scrutiny Commission
12.	Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations How will these be published / advertised?	Recommendations and conclusions will be communicated to tenant representative groups and forums; A media report may be produced on the main findings and recommendations
13.	How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement?	By concentrating on an area of performance which has been of interest to members and making constructive recommendations it is hoped to achieve an improvement in the service. It is recognised that external factors (such as the 1% year on year rent reductions demanded by the government) may have a negative impact on the performance of this (and other) housing services.
To be completed by the Divisional Lead Director		
14.	Divisional Comments Scrutiny's role is to influence others to take action and it is important that Scrutiny Commissions seek and understand the views of the Divisional Director.	To come
15.	Are there any potential risks to undertaking this scrutiny review? E.g. are there any similar reviews being undertaken, on-	

	going work or changes in policy which would supersede the need for this review?	
16.	Are you able to assist with the proposed review? If not please explain why. In terms of agreement / supporting documentation / resource availability?	
	Name	
	Role	
	Date	

To be completed by the Scrutiny Support Manager

17.	Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Scrutiny Team?	It is expected that this review can be supported fully by the SPO and that it is anticipated to be a fairly quick review. It is also the first review for this commission and is not likely to have any negative impact on any other work of the commission.
	Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details.	Yes, the SPO should be able to adequately support this review.
	Name	Kalvaran Sandhu
	Date	3 rd December 2015

Housing Forward Planner 2016/17 (10/03/2017)

HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

MEETING DATE	MEETING ITEMS	LEAD OFFICER	ACTION AGREED
10th October 2016, 6.15pm Agenda meeting 14 September 2016	Introduction of new departmental staffing Northgate IT update Rent arrears quarterly update STAR (including refugee resettlement programme) – update Work programme	Chris Burgin Mike Watson	
15th November 2016, 6.15pm Agenda meeting 26 th October 2016	Homelessness strategy Technical service and stores update STAR Gambling Survey 2016 Tenant forum – meeting notes Work programme		
19th December 2016, 6.15 pm Special Meeting	Special meeting to consider HRA proposals and rent setting Work programme		
30th January 2017, 6.15pm Agenda meeting 4 th January 2017	Area managers' presentation – 12 month changes and challenges Customer Services Data Housing Register update Ex-forces Homelessness Work programme		

Housing Forward Planner 2016/17 (10/03/2017)

<p>20th March 2017, 6.15pm Agenda meeting 22nd February 2017</p>	<p>Area managers' presentation – South Area Housing Management Quarterly Rent Arrears Update Overcrowding and Under-occupation project Voids Report – Jerry Connolly Work programme</p>		
<p>To be allocated 2016/17</p>	<p>Tower block management Goscote House remodelling Pay to stay High value vacant homes levy UC/HB cap/ bedroom tax/ rent arrears Update on implementation of the Northgate system Plan of Key Decisions Redevelopment of decommissioned hostels and houses in multiple occupation Council House Building – moved from 15 November</p>	<p>Awaiting government information Minute 36 refers</p>	