



# Doncaster Council

## Report

---

**Date: 25 June 2020**

**To the Chair and Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee**

**St Leger Homes of Doncaster Ltd (SLHD) Performance & Delivery Update:  
2019/20 Quarter Four (Q4) and year end outturn**

<b>Relevant Cabinet Member(s)</b>	<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Key Decision</b>
Councillor Glyn Jones, Cabinet Member for Housing and Equalities, Deputy Mayor	All	None

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. As part of the Management Agreement and governance arrangements for SLHD, an Annual Development Plan (ADP) is produced in agreement with Doncaster Council (DC) officers, the Housing Portfolio holder and the Mayor. The ADP identifies the key deliverables, outcomes, milestones and performance measures. Part of the agreed governance framework is a quarterly report of key performance indicators to the Executive Board.
2. This report provides an opportunity to feedback on performance successes and challenges against the 2019/20 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

### **EXEMPT REPORT**

3. This report is not exempt.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

4. That Committee note the progress of SLHD performance outcomes and the contribution SLHD makes to supporting DC strategic priorities.

## WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE CITIZENS OF DONCASTER?

5. As this report includes the current progress on the St. Leger Homes performance indicators, the implications of the contents may ultimately affect the delivery of services to the people of Doncaster

## BACKGROUND

6. As part of the Management Agreement and governance arrangements for SLHD, an Annual Development Plan (ADP) is produced in agreement with Doncaster Council (DC) officers, the Housing Portfolio holder and the Mayor. The ADP identifies the key deliverables, outcomes, milestones and performance measures. Part of the agreed governance framework is a quarterly report of key performance indicators to the Executive Board.
7. This report provides an opportunity to feedback on performance successes and challenges against the 2019/20 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

## 8. 2019/20 QUARTER 4 AND YEAR END OUTTURN PERFORMANCE

- 8.1. **Appendix A** contains the SLHD 2019/20 Performance Management summary for Quarters 1, 2, 3 and 4. Commentary covering the performance against all indicators is provided below.

- 8.2. Targets and measures were reviewed with DC officers and elected members prior to the start of the financial year. Nineteen KPIs were agreed for 2019/20, although five of these are measured annually.

- 8.3. During Q2 2019/20, KPI 14 was split in two – KPI 14a and KPI 14b - to separately report performance on training and employment support, so there are now 20 KPIs for 2019/20 (see 4.18 below).

- 8.4. Elements to note as at the end of Quarter 4 are:

	Q4 19/20	Q3 19/20	Q2 19/20	Q1 19/20	Q4 18/19	Q3 18/19	Q2 18/19	Q1 18/19
Green (on target)	10	6	7	7	10	8	7	7
Amber (in tolerance)	4	5	4	1	1	3	2	3
Red (below target)	4	3	3	5	2	2	3	2
No target <sup>1</sup>	2	1	1	1	1	1	2 <sup>3</sup>	2
Annual KPIs	-	5	5	5	-	-	-	-
Total	20	20	20 <sup>2</sup>	19	14	14	14	14

- 1 Two KPIs do not have a target at year end –
  - a. KP4 : number of households placed in B&B accommodation
  - b. KPI19 : our performance against comparable organisations
- 2 During Q2 2019/20, KPI 14 was split in two - KPI14a KPI4b - to separately report performance on training and employment support, so there are now 20 KPIs for 2019/20
- 3 In Q3 2018/19, a target was developed for the ASB cases resolved KPI.

- 8.5. The tolerances which determine the red, amber and green status are now consistent with DC and Doncaster Children's Trust measures. Please note performance data is cumulative year to date (YTD) rather than performance in the quarter, as this can be misleading when comparing to target.

8.6. There have been two serious disruptions to core services in the year – floods in November 2019 and the Covid19 lockdown in March 2020. Both have impacted on operational performance:

8.6.1. Floods : During November 2019, the borough experienced extensive flooding in some areas, primarily for SLHD in Bentley and Fishlake, and this affected service delivery and some KPIs, although this was minimal. Additional related costs have been incurred in staff time (overtime) plus other costs (materials, fuel, utilities, B&B, household goods, etc.). Where eligible, these costs have formed part of recovery claims in a wider Government scheme ('Bellwin') or insurance arrangements.

8.6.2. Covid19 : Although there was a rapid escalation in response to the virus, it mainly happened in March 2020 and therefore had only limited impact on financial and operational performance. SLHD's response however has been significant and will have its main impact in 2020/21 on a number of KPIs, including rent arrears, voids, homelessness, repairs, property improvements and tenant satisfaction, as well as a number of budgets.

8.7. Overall, in terms of the 'direction of travel', performance is broadly the same as the position for Q3 and Q2.

**8.8. KPI 1: Percentage of Current Rent Arrears against Annual Debit :**

**Target** **3.22%**  
**Q4 outturn** **2.79%** **BETTER THAN TARGET – GREEN**

The year-end target for 2019/20 (3.22%) is higher than the 2.95% target for 2018/19, reflecting the impact of Universal Credit (UC) not being paid for the 53<sup>rd</sup> rent week in 2019/20 for those claiming UC. The impact was estimated at £310k and the target therefore comprises:

	<b>19/20</b>	18/19
Base current arrears target	<b>2.80%</b>	2.95%
53rd week impact	<b>0.42%</b>	-
Total current arrears target	<b>3.22%</b>	2.95%

The table below shows current performance against profiled target and comparatives from 2018/19.

Quarter	Current rent arrears %	Profiled rent arrears target %
Q1 18/19 ytd	2.72%	2.74%
Q2 18/19 ytd	3.02%	2.84%
Q3 18/19 ytd	3.13%	2.95%
Q4 18/19 ytd	2.61%	2.95%
Q1 19/20 ytd	2.77%	2.77%
Q2 19/20 ytd	2.95%	3.10%
Q3 19/20 ytd	3.29%	3.28%
<b>Q4 19/20 ytd</b>	<b>2.79%</b>	<b>3.22%</b>

Performance at the end of March out turned at 2.79% against the year end target of 3.22%.

Performance remained consistently strong throughout the year and is particularly impressive when taking into account the 53-week UC issue and that there are over 1,800 more tenants claiming UC compared to the same period last year.

The Tenancy Sustainability Team achieved financial gains of £477k for tenants during 2019/20 which will have been a significant factor in reducing arrears on accounts.

Changes to the way in which Alternative Payment Arrangements (APA) and Third Party Deductions (TPD) are paid to Landlords have also contributed towards this strong position. In addition, the Tenancy Sustainability and Income Management teams continue to focus on early intervention and managing and mitigating the impact of UC.

Approximately 7,500 tenants are expected to be affected by Universal Credit (UC) over a four year rollout period and there are now 5,041 UC claimants. Of these, 3,345 (66%) are in current rent arrears. At this point last year there were 3,094 UC claimants, of which 2,152 (70%) of customers were in rent arrears. This is improving slowly as it has been as high as 75% in arrears in 2018/19.

The average number of new claimants is about 35 per week over the period to date, but new claimants have been at around the 70 per week level in March 2020.

The total rent arrears for those who are claiming UC is £1.36m, however, it should be noted that prior to claiming UC the total arrears for the same 5,041 claimants was £1.08m, meaning the impact of UC on arrears levels is an increase of £280k.

The number of UC cases has increased by 1,947 over the past year, but, the proportion of customers who are in rent arrears and in receipt of UC has broadly stayed the same (~70%)

At the time of writing this report 31% of all UC cases have Alternative Payment Arrangements (APA) for direct payment to St Leger Homes, up slightly from 30% at the end of Q3.

We continue to work collaboratively with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Doncaster Council (DC) to ensure all customers are supported to make and maintain their Universal Credit claim.

Referrals to our Tenancy Sustainability Service for intensive support continue to grow from commencement in 2018, and we have supported 2,326 customers and secured in total over £1.27m of financial gains for supported clients. Financial gains have been as a result of support with benefit claims or appeals, applying for grants, and accessing financial support to reduce debt etc.

## 8.9. KPI 2: Void Rent Loss (VRL) – Percentage of rent loss through vacant dwellings:

<b>Target</b>	<b>0.50%</b>	
<b>Q4 outturn</b>	<b>0.59%</b>	<b>ABOVE TARGET – RED</b>

For 2019/20, a reduced target of 0.50% was set (2018/19 : 0.60%), and performance for Q1, Q2 and Q3 was above target, but improving as the year has progressed. Cumulative performance for the year was **0.59%**, equivalent to £425k of rent loss. This is a deterioration compared to performance in 2018/19 (£361k), but an improvement from Q1 and Q2 2019/20, as summarised below:

Quarter	% Void rent loss	% void rent loss target
Q1 18/19 ytd	0.53%	0.60%
Q2 18/19 ytd	0.50%	0.60%
Q3 18/19 ytd	0.48%	0.60%
Q4 18/19 ytd	0.49%	0.60%
Q1 19/20 ytd	0.72%	0.50%
Q2 19/20 ytd	0.64%	0.50%
Q3 19/20 ytd	0.59%	0.50%
<b>Q4 19/20 ytd *</b>	<b>0.59%</b>	<b>0.50%</b>

\* Following the flooding event from 7 November, allocations of empty properties were suspended from 11 to 28 November until the extent of the flood damage and demand for temporary accommodation was understood. The adverse impact on the void rent loss has been estimated and had the flood incident not occurred, the VRL KPI would have improved slightly to 0.57%.

After a positive, improving trend in Q3, performance in Q4 was generally consistent but above target at about 0.59%. The final quarter of 2019/20 was challenging, with the Christmas shut down period, ongoing flood reinstatement works and finally Covid19.

For the latter, new processes have been implemented to ensure work continues in void properties that may be required for those fleeing domestic violence, rough sleepers and the homeless. However, the advertisement cycle has been suspended and no general re-lets are taking place, the number of voids held will continue to increase which again will have a negative impact on performance in early 2020/21.

The number of voids held at the end of March at 122 is just above the number held the previous month (February) of 121. However, by early May 2020, the number of voids held had increased to 170.

Forward planning is taking place regarding our return to as near full operations as possible. So that we can begin in a good position, all void properties will have been surveyed to ensure they are ready to be advertised as soon as possible.

**8.10. KPI 3: Average number of days to re-let standard properties :**

**Target** **20.00 calendar days**  
**Q4 outturn** **22.68 calendar days** **ABOVE TARGET – RED**

This was a new KPI for 2018/19 to complement other void measures.

For 2019/20, a reduced target of 20 calendar days was set (2018/19: 23 days) and on average, it took **22.68** days to re-let a property during the year.

This is a deterioration compared to performance in 2018/19, but is considerably better than the time taken in 2017/18 (40 days) and has been improving as the year has progressed, as summarised below:

Quarter	Void re-let time (days)	Void re-let time (days) target
Q1 18/19 ytd	25.50	23.00
Q2 18/19 ytd	21.89	23.00
Q3 18/19 ytd	20.80	23.00
Q4 18/19 ytd	20.92	23.00
Q1 19/20 ytd	26.18	20.00
Q2 19/20 ytd	23.83	20.00
Q3 19/20 ytd	22.30	20.00
<b>Q4 19/20 ytd *</b>	<b>22.68</b>	<b>20.00</b>

\* Following the flooding event from 7 November, allocations of empty properties were suspended from 11 to 28 November until the extent of the flood damage and demand for temporary accommodation was understood.

Had the flood incident not occurred, this KPI would have improved slightly to 21.63 days and would have been within tolerance levels of the target.

February and March saw an improving trend after a dip in January, but performance was then badly affected by the lock down.

A total of 98 re-lets were completed during March, of which, 77 were standard re-lets. However, several viewings and sign-ups were arranged to take place during the last week in March which had to be cancelled due to the lock down.

Stringent monitoring remains in place across all teams involved in the key to key process to ensure work is completed in voids and all teams are working collectively to ensure when we are able to return to work we are in a position to begin making an improvement to performance as quickly as possible

### 8.11. KPI 4: Number of households placed in bed and breakfast (B&B) accommodation (NO TARGET)

The table below summarises activity over the past two years:

	Households placed in B&B accommodation	Total number of nights in B&B accommodation	No. of children placed in B&B accommodation
Q1 18/19	60	n/k	21
Q2 18/19	81	1,166	50
Q3 18/19	58	569	43
Q4 18/19	75	502	45
Q1 19/20	28	67	15
Q2 19/20	18	41	10
Q3 19/20	4	11	5
<b>Q4 19/20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Covid19 March</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Q4 19/20 Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>5</b>

Up to the end of Q3, the table shows a continued, big reduction in placements in 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. This continued in Q4 until the Covid19 related government directions about the homeless. The table has therefore been amended to reflect the impact by separating out data, and shows 24 of the 26 placements in March were a result of the contingency plans put in place for Covid19.

This should not distract from the much improved performance when compared with Q4 performance last year, in brackets. 34 (75) household were placed for a total of 103 (430) nights. Indeed over the last year where we placed only 84 (274) households in B&B for a total of 222 (1,855) nights.

Increasing preventions and interventions together with the additional resources from MHCLG Grants to assist with accessing the private rented sector provides an alternative to a placement in temporary accommodation as well as an opportunity to move on more quickly from it.

### 8.12. KPI 5: Number of full duty homelessness acceptances :

Target	130	
Q4 outturn	228	<b>ABOVE TARGET – RED</b>

This was a new key performance indicator introduced in 2018/19 to reflect the implementation of the Homeless Reduction Act (HRA), which came into force in April 2018.

For 2019/20, there were **228** acceptances, higher than the target for the year of 130. The table below summarises the trends since this measure was introduced:



**8.14. KPI 7: Complaints – Percentage of complaints upheld against customer interactions :**

**Target** **0.075%**  
**Q4 outturn** **0.061%** **EXCEEDED TARGET – GREEN**

Complaints are reported one month in arrears to allow time for the complaint to be investigated and closed in line with our service standards. All complaints are investigated and either 'upheld' or not. Complaints are upheld where policies and procedures have not been followed. The target for the year is to be below 0.075%.

Period	Interactions	Complaints	Upheld	% Upheld	% Target
Feb, Mar, Apr 18 Q1	83,189	197	31	0.037%	0.080%
Jun, Jul, Aug 18 Q2	80,705	223	54	0.067%	0.080%
Sep, Oct, Nov 18 Q3	95,039	240	79	0.083%	0.080%
Dec18, Jan, Feb 19 Q4	88,713	218	69	0.078%	0.080%
<b>Totals 2018/19 YTD</b>	<b>347,646</b>	<b>878</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>0.070%</b>	<b>0.080%</b>
Mar, Apr, May 19 Q1	125,712	209	53	0.055%	0.075%
Jun, Jul, Aug 19 Q2	99,052	195	59	0.059%	0.075%
Sep, Oct, Nov 19 Q3	105,094	209	64	0.061%	0.075%
Dec19, Jan, Feb 20 Q4	94,271	208	64	0.068%	0.075%
<b>Totals 2019/20 YTD</b>	<b>424,129</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>0.061%</b>	<b>0.075%</b>

Complaints in Q4 were down slightly and those upheld were at levels consistent with the rest of the year. The general trend is of improving performance but work is on-going to understand the reasons for the number of complaints and prevent similar complaints in the future. Whilst complaints are received in a variety of service areas, the main areas are repairs and maintenance, and tenancy and estate management. This is expected given that these areas of the business have the highest levels of visibility to tenants and the highest volume of interactions.

**8.15. KPI 8: Number of tenancies sustained post support :**

**Target** **85.00%**  
**Q4 outturn** **93.80%** **EXCEEDED TARGET – GREEN**

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 to measure the success of the support provided to tenants by our tenancy sustainment service.

Period	Cases closed 6 months previously	No. of tenancies sustained after 6 months	% of tenancies active 6 months after support ended	% Target
Q1 19/20	214	199	92.99%	85.00%
Q2 19/20	211	200	94.79%	85.00%
Q3 19/20	262	247	94.27%	85.00%
Q4 19/20	313	292	93.29%	85.00%
<b>2019/20 YTD</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>938</b>	<b>93.80%</b>	<b>85.00%</b>

At the end of 2019/20, 1,000 tenancies have been closed for 6 months following their period of support. Of these, **938** are still being sustained, representing a year to date success rate to **93.80%** against a target of 85.00%.

**8.16. KPI 9: Number of repairs complete on first visit :**

**Target** **92.00%**  
**Q4 outturn** **90.24%** **WITHIN TOLERANCE – AMBER**

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 to measure the number of responsive repairs completed without the need for the operative to return a second time because the repair was inaccurately diagnosed and / or did not fix the problem.

**NB:** In the period since Q1, figures for 2019/20 have been restated to exclude certain repairs where it would not be possible to complete at first visit, and is more consistent with the Housemark definition, eg. some glazing repairs where measuring up is required for replacement parts.

Performance for the year was **90.24%**, therefore below target but within tolerances.

Period	No. of repairs completed	No. of repairs completed first visit	% repairs completed first visit	Target %
Q1 19/20	10,444	9,421	90.20%	92.00%
Q2 19/20	10,892	9,790	89.88%	92.00%
Q3 19/20	12,660	11,348	89.64%	92.00%
Q4 19/20	11,138	10,169	91.30%	92.00%
<b>2019/20 YTD</b>	<b>56,899</b>	<b>45,134</b>	<b>90.24%</b>	<b>92.00%</b>

The table shows that volumes increased in Q3 but fell away in Q4, largely as a result of reduced repairs right at the end of March with the lockdown in place. Performance is generally consistent around 89% to 90% levels. Further analysis is on-going to understand the reasons and ensure this improves.

**8.17. KPI 10: Gas servicing, percentage of properties attended against planned:**

**Target** **100.00%**  
**Q4 outturn** **100.00%** **MET TARGET – GREEN**

The 2019/20 programme concluded in December and had **100% performance**.

The 2019/20 programme target for year was to attend 19,017 properties and we visited all these properties on the set appointment date, therefore gas servicing appointments made and kept remains at 100%.

There was an increase in the number of properties where access could not be gained at the first visit. These are managed through our legal access process.

The way the programme is managed in future years has changed to increase the time we have to gain access to complete the gas service prior to the expiry date.

We commenced the 2020/21 MOT type gas servicing programme in February 20, taking advantage of this change in legislation (MOT) to undertake gas servicing 2 months prior to the expiry date of the landlord gas safety record.

Following the government's lockdown announcement relating to Covid19 and guidance on social distancing, gas servicing was suspended for over a one week whilst landlords obtained HSE and Regulator for Social Housing clarification on whether to continue with gas servicing. Once notice to continue was clarified, we recommenced gas serving and followed Public Health England guidance.

As a result of Covid19 there have been a significant increase in 'No Access' and refusals due to tenants self-isolating, shielding or too frightened to allow engineer access. It is therefore expected that a number of gas services will inevitably go overdue. We will continue to follow our Gas Servicing policy and take legal enforcement action where required.

#### 8.18. KPI 11: Days Lost to Sickness per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) :

**Target** **7.90**  
**Q4 outturn** **8.22** **WITHIN TOLERANCE LEVELS – AMBER**

The number of days lost to sickness absence peaked in July at 0.84 days per FTE for the month, and has generally been consistently around the 0.70 days per FTE for the months since, making year to date performance within target tolerances. As at end of the year, **8.22** days per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) had been lost. This is an improvement on the 8.90 outturn for 2018/19.

Quarter	Cumulative days lost to sickness	Cumulative days lost per FTE	Profiled target
Q1 18/19	1,361	1.87	1.92
Q2 18/19	2,983	4.04	3.75
Q3 18/19	4,852	6.68	5.79
Q4 18/19	6,451	8.90	7.89
Q1 19/20	1,471	2.01	1.92
Q2 19/20	2,965	4.05	3.75
Q3 19/20	4,501	6.18	5.80
<b>Q4 19/20</b>	<b>5,969</b>	<b>8.22</b>	<b>7.90</b>

The outturn of 8.22 days per FTE is made up of 3.48 days per FTE of long term sickness and 4.74 days per FTE of short term sickness absence. Cases are being managed through the Managing Attendance Policy. However Stage 4 Attendance Hearings are currently on hold due to the emergency situation with Covid19

The top five most common reasons for sickness absence for the year are:

1. Other Musculo/Skeletal
2. Stress/Depression/Anxiety
3. Infection/Virus
4. Stomach/Liver/Kidney/Digestion
5. Back/Shoulder

#### 8.19. KPI 12: Percentage of Local Expenditure :

<b>Target</b>	<b>66.00%</b>	
<b>Q4 outturn</b>	<b>59.06%</b>	<b>WITHIN TOLERANCE LEVELS-AMBER</b>

Cumulative local spend for the year was £5.849m (59.06%) of the overall £9.902m contracted spend, with a target of 66%. In monetary terms this under performance is £691k.

Local spend in March 2020 was lower than the previous month out turning at 49%, against the 66% target. The dip in March was down to a number of large payments made to organisations that are outside of the borough.

Whilst every endeavour is made to support and appoint local contractors and suppliers when new contracts are awarded, this is not always possible if local suppliers do not exist, or are unable to demonstrate value for money through legally required, transparent procurement processes. SLHD continues to actively participate in supplier events to encourage local business engagement in new procurement exercises as they occur.

Although it is acknowledged that cumulatively we are currently slightly below target, it should be recognised that this is a challenging target to achieve for the reasons outlined above.

The Company has to comply with legislation, where contract opportunities cannot be ring-fenced to organisations in the Borough of Doncaster. The Procurement Strategy and Contract Standing Orders have been developed to try and optimise local spend and social value

#### 8.20. KPI 13: Anti-social behaviour (ASB) cases resolved as a percentage of all cases completed :

<b>Target</b>	<b>90.00%</b>	
<b>Q4 outturn</b>	<b>95.55%</b>	<b>EXCEEDED TARGET - GREEN</b>

This was a new key performance indicator in 2018/19. The table below summarises the year to date performances throughout 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Quarter	YTD % ASB cases resolved	% target
Q1 18/19	86.75%	90.00%
Q2 18/19	91.37%	90.00%
Q3 18/19	92.22%	90.00%
Q4 18/19	92.99%	90.00%
Q1 19/20	96.49%	90.00%
Q2 19/20	95.51%	90.00%
Q3 19/20	96.43%	90.00%
<b>Q4 19/20</b>	<b>95.55%</b>	<b>90.00%</b>

Case volumes are slightly higher this year. Q4 case levels were consistent with the rest of the year and have ranged between 120 and 160 per month, although they fell to 87 in December 2019. Data continues to be monitored closely.

Performance has been generally consistent over the year to date and reflects strong performance in dealing with ASB cases.

Despite a small dip in performance in March, performance overall has remained strong throughout the year, with a year-end outturn of **95.55%**, as 1,680 out of 1,709 cases were resolved.

#### 8.21. KPI 14 – Number of tenants and residents helped in to training and/or employment

During Q2 2019/20, this KPI was split into two to separate training and employment elements and we now measure :

- **KPI14 a - Number of tenants and residents in to training and education;**
- **KPI14 b - Number of tenants and residents in to employment.**

This was to ensure clarity of reporting and prevent double counting and also time considerations. This will also enable more accurate benchmarking.

#### **KPI 14 a : Number of tenants and residents helped in to training and education:**

<b>Target</b>	<b>56</b>	
<b>Q4 outturn</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>WITHIN TOLERANCE LEVELS – AMBER</b>

For 2019/20 **53** residents have been supported into training or education, against a target of 56, and an outturn last year of 55.

Unfortunately due to a reduction in the number of applicants for the WoW Cleaning Course during Q2/Q3 the target has not been met. This reduction in applicants was not experienced in Q4.

## KPI 14 b : Number of tenants and residents helped in to employment:

Target	18	
Q4 outturn	31	<b>EXCEEDED TARGET – GREEN</b>

For 2019/20 31 residents were supported into employment, against a target of 18, and an outturn last year of 16. This excellent performance was achieved despite the reduction in numbers attending the college training courses. This success can be attributed to the POW WoW's and Opening Doors Skills support being provided to those on the WoW Database by the WoW Co-ordinator.

## 9. Annual KPIs

9.1. For 2019/20, there are a number of annual KPIs that can now be reported on.

### 9.2. KPI 15: Tenant satisfaction levels :

Target	89.00%	
Performance	87.00%	<b>WITHIN TOLERANCE LEVELS – AMBER</b>

These satisfaction levels are monitored through the bi-annual STAR Survey which is a perception survey and the survey was carried out in February/March 2020.

There has been a slight reduction in the overall satisfaction feedback for 2020 which now stands at **87.00%** (-1.8% from 2018). Further analysis is being undertaken to look at the comments and reasons why but initial work on the data shows that customers have moved into the 'neither' category, rather than the dissatisfied category.

A local, transactional, operational indicator has been developed to monitor satisfaction levels of key transactional services in year to enable proactive management and these show an overall satisfaction rating of 91.4%

### 9.3. KPI 16: Percentage of homes meeting Decent Homes standard ANNUAL KPI:

Target	100.00%	
Performance	100.00%	<b>MET TARGET – GREEN</b>

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 and is reported annually.

All properties were included in the decent homes programme and either received works, or declined works. Where properties have previously declined works then under the decency definition these can still be classed as decent, hence the reporting still of 100% decency

### 9.4. KPI 17: Tenant satisfaction with property condition ANNUAL KPI :

Target	89.00%	
Performance	89.40%	<b>EXCEEDED TARGET – GREEN</b>

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 and is reported annually.

These satisfaction levels are monitored through the bi-annual STAR Survey and the survey was carried out in February/March 2020.

There has been a marginal increase in the quality of home satisfaction feedback for 2020 which now stands at **89.4%** (+0.2% from 2018). Further analysis is also underway to look at the drivers for this

#### **9.5. KPI 18: Energy efficiency ANNUAL KPI :**

<b>Target</b>	<b>92.00%</b>	
<b>Performance</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>EXCEEDED TARGET – GREEN</b>

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 and is reported annually.

The current KPI is taken from the Environmental Strategy 2017-20. The target is that 92% of all homes are EPC level D or better.

As part of our strategy, we have undertaken a lot of work on analysing the data we had. We were previously relying on old data. This data has now been refreshed and updated with all completed reinvestment works.

Moving forward for 20/21 a new target has been agreed to meet EPC –C by 2030.

We will begin to re-align our investment strategy to contribute to the new target.

#### **9.6. KPI 19: Our overall operational and financial performance against comparable organisations ANNUAL KPI (NO TARGET) :**

This is a new KPI for 2019/20 and is reported annually.

The main method of benchmarking is through our membership of Housemark (see Section 8 below), but we also carry out more tailored benchmarking with specific organisations, wherever possible and appropriate.

The latter tailored benchmarking has included Universal Credit, health and safety, income management, high rise residential buildings, void management and homelessness and has shown St Leger to be a proactive, forward thinking company adopting best practice.

9.7. National benchmarking through Housemark involves submitting quarterly performance data and annual financial data. Benchmarking results for the 2019/20 financial data will not be available until September 2020 but based on the performance data for the four quarters in 2019/20 and the financial information to be submitted, it should again show that St Leger remains a low cost, mid to high performing organisation when compared to our peers and also nationally.

### **OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

10. Not applicable

## REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION

11. Not applicable

## IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY OUTCOMES

12.

	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Implications</b>
	<p><b>Doncaster Working:</b> Our vision is for more people to be able to pursue their ambitions through work that gives them and Doncaster a brighter and prosperous future;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better access to good fulfilling work</li> <li>• Doncaster businesses are supported to flourish</li> <li>• Inward Investment</li> </ul>	<p>Work of St. Leger Homes of Doncaster impacts on Council key priorities, with implications on the quality of life for Doncaster Council's tenants and other residents and the communities they live in.</p>
	<p><b>Doncaster Living:</b> Our vision is for Doncaster's people to live in a borough that is vibrant and full of opportunity, where people enjoy spending time;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The town centres are the beating heart of Doncaster</li> <li>• More people can live in a good quality, affordable home</li> <li>• Healthy and Vibrant Communities through Physical Activity and Sport</li> <li>• Everyone takes responsibility for keeping Doncaster Clean</li> <li>• Building on our cultural, artistic and sporting heritage</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Doncaster Learning:</b> Our vision is for learning that prepares all children, young people and adults for a life that is fulfilling;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every child has life-changing learning experiences within and beyond school</li> <li>• Many more great teachers work in Doncaster Schools that are good or better</li> <li>• Learning in Doncaster prepares young people for the world of work</li> </ul>	

	<p><b>Doncaster Caring:</b> Our vision is for a borough that cares together for its most vulnerable residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children have the best start in life</li> <li>• Vulnerable families and individuals have support from someone they trust</li> <li>• Older people can live well and independently in their own homes</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Connected Council:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A modern, efficient and flexible workforce</li> <li>• Modern, accessible customer interactions</li> <li>• Operating within our resources and delivering value for money</li> <li>• A co-ordinated, whole person, whole life focus on the needs and aspirations of residents</li> <li>• Building community resilience and self-reliance by connecting community assets and strengths</li> <li>• Working with our partners and residents to provide effective leadership and governance</li> </ul>	

## **RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

13. Specific risks and assumptions are included in section 12 of this report

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Scott Fawcus, Asst. Director Legal & Democratic Services, 03.06.20**

14. There are no legal implications for this report.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Nigel Feirn, SLHD Head of Finance and Business Assurance, 28.05.20**

15. In 2019/20 St. Leger Homes received management fees of £31.2m from DC. This is made up of £30.9m from the Housing Revenue Account and £1.2m from the General Fund to pay for the general fund services managed by SLHD.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

**Angela Cotton, HR & OD Business Manager, 04.06.20**

16. There are no specific Human Resource Implications for this report.

## **TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS**

**Alison Morte, Head of ICT 01.06.20**

17. There are no specific technology implications for this report.

## HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

Karen Horrocks, Public Health Improvement Coordinator, 02.06.20

18. The home environment is an important contributor to health and wellbeing and a healthy community supports residents to thrive, be independent and contribute. Access to decent and appropriate housing is critically important in terms of health and wellbeing and our social housing has the potential to provide safe, secure and healthy homes for some of our most vulnerable residents, who may also experience health inequalities.

Housing quality is important, and this year people have spent more time in their own homes than they normally would expect to. In light of the significant economic and social impacts that the country will experience due to COVID-19 it is even more important that our social housing not only forms part of our financial recovery, but also delivers high quality and affordable housing that forms part of healthy, sustainable communities.

It is encouraging to see that work to support tenants to maintain their tenancy, avoid rent arrears and gain employment and access training and development continues to take place (**KPIs 1, 8 & 14**). This type of support can help mitigate the impact of welfare reform and can lead to improvements in the financial situations of the tenants involved and to the health and wellbeing of their families. Homes should protect and promote good mental health: they should provide security of tenure, and a sense of safety and comfort. Having a secure tenancy can positively impact on health and wellbeing, thus it is good to see this preventative approach continue.

### **KPI 4: Number of households placed in bed and breakfast (B&B) accommodation.**

Once COVID-19 related placements are accounted for the Q4 figures show a continued, decrease in the numbers of households placed in B&B, especially in the numbers of families. Providing a safe, secure home can have a positive effect on a child's physical and mental health and can lay the foundations for a healthy future. Therefore, any measures to reduce the number of people, especially families, living in bed and breakfast accommodation should improve health and wellbeing.

It is encouraging to see that work has taken place to utilise general needs stock, increase preventions and interventions and provide alternatives to temporary accommodation and that this is reducing the number of placements in B&B. We recommend that work to place people elsewhere is continued, and that particular care is taken to support those who have been affected by COVID-19. Preventative work and supportive systems will be essential to help people move on and prevent placements in B&B accommodation in the future. We also recommend that wherever the private rented sector is accessed as an alternative, that property quality, suitability and security of tenure is also prioritised.

It is positive to see that number homelessness preventions (**KPI 6**) has again exceeded its target and is working proactively through a number of initiatives with customers in relation to their housing options. Preventative work to tackle

homelessness can have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of the most vulnerable people in our communities. The health of people experiencing homelessness is significantly worse than that of the general population, and the cost of homelessness to the NHS and social care is considerable. Homelessness is more likely to affect those in society who are most at risk of experiencing other inequalities, including BME young people, LGBT young people, gypsies and travellers, and people with long-term illnesses or a disability (LGA, 2017). A preventative, upstream approach can not only have a positive effect on the health and wellbeing of people at risk of, or experiencing homelessness, but can also be more cost effective in the long term. Wherever the private rented sector is accessed as a housing solution, property quality, suitability and security of tenure should be prioritised.

In reference to **KPIs 7: Complaints (Green) and 9: Repairs completed on first visit (Amber) (and annual performance indicators 16-18)**: The condition of a home can have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the people that live there. A healthy home is in good repair, warm, comfortable, and free from hazards. Poor quality housing is associated with a range of physical and mental health problems and the King's Fund suggest that £1 spent on improving homes saves the NHS £70 over 10 years. It is essential that social housing is well-maintained and kept in good repair in order to promote the health of the families living there.

KPI 10: The report states that during COVID 19 there has been an increase in access refusals by tenants who may be shielding, self-isolating or too frightened to allow access. During this period there is a balance between ensuring people's homes are safe from the risks associated with faulty gas boilers and appliances and ensuring that they are protected from COVID 19. It is important that Public Health guidance, safe working practices and the gas servicing policy are utilised in a way that shows understanding and respect for tenants in these difficult times and provides them with a sense of safety and security.

**KPI 11** relates to days lost to sickness and is currently performing within tolerances. Over the last 10 years, there has been a growing body of evidence supporting the business case for improving health and wellbeing in the workplace. Poor employee health can cost huge amounts of money through sickness absence, relief cover costs, loss of productivity, time to attend hospital appointments, and loss of reputation and image.

Employers are key players in being able to create a healthy work environment and deliver public health messages as they have a captive audience – their staff. By promoting a healthy workplace and engaging with a workplace health award, businesses can work towards building good practice and promoting a culture that promotes health and wellbeing

## **EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

19. Equality implications are considered in line with the Equality Act 2011 for the delivery of all St. Leger Homes services.

## **CONSULTATION**

20. Consultation has taken place with key managers within St. Leger Homes, the Lead Member for Housing and Senior Officers within the Council.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

21. None

## **GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

ADP	Annual Development Plan
APA	Alternative Payment Arrangement (for Universal Credit benefit)
ASB	Anti- Social Behaviour
DC	Doncaster Council
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
HRA	Homelessness Reduction Act
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
SLHD	St Leger Homes of Doncaster
STAR	Survey of Tenants and Residents
UC	Universal Credit
VRL	Void rent loss
WOW	World of Work
YTD	Year to date

## **REPORT AUTHOR & CONTRIBUTORS**

Nigel Feirn,  
Head of Finance and Business Assurance, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster Limited  
01302 737485  
[Nigel.Feirn@stlegerhomes.co.uk](mailto:Nigel.Feirn@stlegerhomes.co.uk)

Paul Tanney  
Chief Executive Officer, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster Limited  
01302 862700  
[Paul.Tanney@stlegerhomes.co.uk](mailto:Paul.Tanney@stlegerhomes.co.uk)

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

22. None

### **23. Report Author**

Nigel Feirn,  
Head of Finance and Business Assurance, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster Limited  
01302 737485  
[Nigel.Feirn@stlegerhomes.co.uk](mailto:Nigel.Feirn@stlegerhomes.co.uk)

Paul Tanney  
Chief Executive Officer, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster Limited  
01302 862700  
[Paul.Tanney@stlegerhomes.co.uk](mailto:Paul.Tanney@stlegerhomes.co.uk)

## Appendix A - St. Leger Homes Key Performance Indicator Summary Q4 2019/20

KPI	Indicator	18/19 Outturn	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Target	DoT	R/A/G
1	Percentage of current rent arrears against annual debit	2.61%	2.77%	2.95%	3.29%	<b>2.79%</b>	3.22%	↑	🟢
2	Void rent loss (lettable voids)	0.49%	0.71%	0.64%	0.59%	<b>0.59%</b>	0.50%	← →	🔴
3	Average Days to Re-let Standard Properties	20.92	26.65	23.83	22.30	<b>22.68</b>	20.00	↓	🔴
4	Number of Households Placed in B&B Accommodation ytd	274	28	46	50	<b>84</b>	No Target ↑		
5	Number of Full Duty Homelessness Acceptances ytd	130	40	106	142	<b>228</b>	130	↓	🔴
6	Number of homeless preventions	<i>New KPI</i>	160	451	725	<b>965</b>	605	↑	🟢
7	Complaints upheld as a % of customer interactions	0.070%	0.050%	0.060%	0.060%	<b>0.061%</b>	0.075%	↓	🟢
8	Number of tenancies sustained post support	<i>New KPI</i>	86.26%	92.79%	91.11%	<b>93.80%</b>	85.00%	↑	🟢
9	Number of repairs first visit complete	<i>New KPI</i>	80.82%	87.71%	89.89%	<b>90.24%</b>	92.00%	↑	🟡
10	Gas servicing – % of properties attended against target	100%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	100.00%	← →	🟢
11	Days lost through sickness per FTE	8.90	2.08	4.00	6.18	<b>8.22</b>	7.90	↓	🟡
12	Percentage of Local Expenditure	57.94%	58.69%	59.46%	60.16%	<b>59.06%</b>	66.00%	↓	🔴
13	ASB Cases Resolved as a % of All Cases Closed	92.99%	96.47%	95.50%	96.43%	<b>95.55%</b>	90.00%	↓	🟢
14a	Number of residents undertaking training or education	<i>New KPI</i>	3	24	30	<b>53</b>	56	↑	🟡
14b	Number of residents supported into employment	<i>New KPI</i>	6	14	23	<b>31</b>	18	↑	🟢
15	Tenant satisfaction levels	<i>New KPI</i>	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	<b>87.00%</b>	89.00%		🟡
16	Percentage of homes maintaining decent standard	<i>New KPI</i>	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	<b>100.00%</b>	100.00%		🟢
17	Tenant satisfaction with property condition	<i>New KPI</i>	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	<b>89.40%</b>	89.00%		🟢
18	Energy efficiency	<i>New KPI</i>	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	<b>99.96%</b>	92.00%		🟢
19	Our performance against comparable organisations	<i>New KPI</i>	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	Annual KPI	No Target		

Notes :

- Direction of travel (DoT) is against performance in the previous quarter. ↑ = Improving, ← → = No Change, ↓ = Declining.
- Year to date (YTD) is performance since April 2019. For some KPIs, this is a snapshot at the end of the period.
- Targets are for the end of the year performance unless indicated otherwise (ytd = cumulative year to date).
- R/A/G status is against the cumulative year to date (ytd) or year-end target. R/A/G 🔴 🟡 🟢