



Date: 11 September 2024

To: Chair and Members of the Cabinet

Report Title: St. Leger Homes of Doncaster Limited (SLHD) Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) update for Quarter 1 (Q1) and year ended 30 June 2024 (24/25).

Relevant Cabinet Member(s)	Wards Affected	Key Decision?
Cllr Glyn Jones	All	No

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Detailed in the Management Agreement there is a requirement to provide a quarterly performance report for the Cabinet of the City of Doncaster Council (CDC).
- 1.2. This report provides an opportunity to feedback on performance against :
 - **Appendix A** 2024/25 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs); and
 - **Appendix B** latest 2024/25 benchmarking.
- 1.3. At the end of Quarter 1 2024/25 (30 June 2024), 16 of the 27 KPIs being measured at quarter end were met or were within agreed tolerances of target.

2. EXEMPT REPORT

- 2.1. This report is not exempt.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1. That Cabinet note the progress of SLHD's performance and the contribution SLHD makes to supporting Doncaster Council's (CDC) strategic priorities.

4. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE CITIZENS OF DONCASTER?

- 4.1. As this report includes the progress on the SLHD KPIs, the implications of the contents may ultimately affect the delivery of services to the people of Doncaster.

5. BACKGROUND

- 5.1. The Management Agreement requires that an Annual Development Plan (ADP) and a suite of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are produced in agreement with Doncaster Council (CDC) officers, the Housing Portfolio holder and the Mayor.
- 5.2. The ADP identifies the key deliverables, outcomes, milestones and performance measures. The suite of KPIs is aligned with the ADP and also forms a key role in evidencing that SLHD is delivering VFM.

6. 24/25 QUARTER 1 (Q1) / YEAR ENDED PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

- 6.1. 40 KPIs were agreed with City of Doncaster Council (CDC) at the start of 2024/25, comprising Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) that are required by the Regulator for Social Housing, plus other SLHD operational KPIs. **Appendix A** details each measure.
- 6.2. Of the 40 KPIs, thirteen are measured annually – one energy efficiency KPI and twelve customer satisfaction TSMs undertaken through tenant perception surveys in the year.
- 6.3. The table below summarises the KPIs at the end of Q1, with comparatives from earlier years. At the end of Q1, 16 of the 27 KPIs being measured at quarter end were met or were within agreed tolerances of target.

KPIs	Q1 24/25	Q4 23/24	Q3 23/24	Q2 23/24	Q1 23/24	Q4 22/23	Q3 22/23	Q2 22/23	Q1 22/23
Green (meeting target)	13	9	9	8	4	6	7	5	6
Amber (within tolerance)	3	6	3	3	1	4	1	2	1
Red (not meeting target)	11	6	8	9	9	6	7	8	6
No target (homelessness)	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
Annual	13	1*	2	2	4	1*	2	2	4
Total	40	22	22	22	18	19	19	19	19

* data unavailable

- 6.4. Tolerances which determine the amber status are consistent with CDC measures where possible. Performance data is cumulative year to date (YTD) unless otherwise indicated.
- 6.5. We continue to benchmark our services through Housemark, which provides timely information on how we are performing against other organisations. We continue to compare favourably with our peers and nationally with most indicators above median.

7. KPIs DETAILED COMMENTARY

7.1. KPI 1: Percentage of Current Rent Arrears against Annual rent debit

Profiled Target Q1 24/25

3.05%

Q1 24/25 performance

2.74%

BETTER THAN TARGET – GREEN

	Q1 24/25	Q4 23/24	Q3 23/24	Q2 23/24	Q1 23/24	Q4 22/23	Q3 22/23	Q2 22/23	Q1 22/23
Arrears %	2.74%	2.72%	3.09%	2.92%	2.80%	2.74%	2.98%	2.80%	2.62%
Profiled target %	3.05%	2.75%	3.10%	3.00%	2.85%	2.75%	3.00%	3.00%	2.85%

Rent arrears continue to remain steady after strong year-end performance, with the 1st quarter this year ending at 2.74%, well below target set for the end of this year of 2.95%. However, the impact of the 53 week year for Universal Credit (UC) tenants is likely to build up as the year progresses.

The Income Management and Tenancy Support teams continue to closely monitor arrears cases and provide early support where it's required and carry out enforcement action where tenants fail to engage after all other interventions have been exhausted.

We continue to monitor arrears cases closely to ensure strong performance is maintained.

7.2. KPI 2: Void rent loss (lettable voids)

Target **0.70%**
Q1 24/25 performance **0.82%** **WORSE THAN TARGET – RED**

The KPI of 0.70% equates to approximately 140 lettable void properties.

	Q1	Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1	Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1
	24/25	23/24	23/24	23/24	23/24	22/23	22/23	22/23	22/23
Void rent loss YTD %	0.82%	0.68%	0.68%	0.70%	0.73%	0.67%	0.67%	0.72%	0.76%
Target %	0.70%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Lettable Voids	126	102	108	79	122	127	118	92	133

The number of voids held at the end of June shows an increase at 162 when comparing to year end of 125. The total figure of 162 consists of the following;

- 126 lettable voids;
- 30 acquisitions, of which, eight are properties at St George's Court; and
- six non-lettable voids, comprising Former School Bungalow Branton, (1), The Oval Conisbrough (1), Princess Crescent Edlington (3), Ellers Lane, Auckley (1).

As a result, the YTD KPI shows a decline at 0.82% compared to previous quarter.

An increase in the number of acquisitions and eight of the properties recently purchased at St George's Court have contributed to the increase. The number of voids received which require major work is also showing an increase.

Bi-weekly voids meeting take place with colleagues from HomeChoice and Housing Management. All voids are reviewed and information is shared to ensure properties can be repaired and re-let at the earliest opportunity.

7.3. KPI 3 : Average Days to Re-let Standard Properties

Target **24.0 days**
Q1 24/25 performance **24.2 days** **WITHIN TOLERANCES - AMBER**

	Q1	Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1	Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1
	24/25	23/24	23/24	23/24	23/24	22/23	22/23	22/23	22/23
Re-let days	24.2	24.9	24.6	25.8	25.6	26.7	26.9	29.1	33.6

. Cumulative performance is at 24.2 days, just outside the target of 24 days. For comparison; Q1 performance for 2023/24 was at 25.5 days.

Collaborative working with all teams involved in the key to key process is contributing to the improvement in performance.

7.4. KPI4 : Average number of nights in hotel accommodation

Target **21 days**
Q1 24/25 performance **39 days** **WORSE THAN TARGET – RED**

This is a new KPI for 24/25 replacing the number of placements in hotels at the end of the month.

The average number of nights is high which is skewed by a small number of long-standing cases. For example, the exclusion of the eight cases over 100 nights the average number of nights would reduce the average to 31 nights.

- 21 cases who left stayed over 50 nights.
- 34 cases stayed between 29-49 nights.
- 7 cases stayed between 15-28 nights.
- 25 cases stayed less than 14 nights.

An action plan is in place to reduce TA, including weekly performance clinics chaired by service managers, with an escalation to Head of Service (HOS) to remove any blockages. This will reduce the number of nights as the more challenging cases are placed.

7.5. KPI 5: % of Settled Accommodation at Prevention Stage

Target	30.0%	
Q1 24/25 performance	45.4%	BETTER THAN TARGET – GREEN

This was a new KPI in 2023/24.

The improvement in case management seen since the beginning of the year continued into June resulting in 52% outturn for the month (the highest monthly figure since the KPI started reporting 2023) with a cumulative YTD outrun of 45.4%. Since January 2024 we have achieved 44%.

7.6. KPI 6 : Stage 1 and 2 Complaints relative to the size of the landlord (per 1000 properties)

This was a new KPI in 2023/24 and part of the new Tenant Satisfaction Measures required by the Regulator.

The Housing Ombudsman code quotes: ‘High volumes of complaints must not be seen as a negative, as they can be indicative of a well-publicised and accessible complaints process. Low complaint volumes are potentially a sign that residents are unable to complain.’

It should be noted here that the TSM reports complaints from ‘residents’ who are tenants and leaseholders only. SLHD also measures all complaints received, regardless of who the complainant is. The table below therefore reports both the TSM KPI and the SLHD indicator for all complaints to show the differences and to also indicate how they compare to target.

	KPI target Q1 24/25	TSM Q1 24/25	<u>‘Residents’ only</u>	SLHD Q1 24/25	<u>All complaints</u>
Stage 1 complaints	11.1	14.5	WORSE THAN TARGET	18.4	WORSE THAN TARGET
Stage 2 complaints	0.9	1.7	WORSE THAN TARGET	1.8	WORSE THAN TARGET
Stage 1&2 complaints	12.0	16.2	WORSE THAN TARGET	20.2	WORSE THAN TARGET

For the TSM KPI, a total of 319 complaints were received from residents - 286 Stage 1 and 33 Stage 2. All complaints totalled 403, comprising 367 Stage 1 and 36 Stage 2, and all were received fairly evenly throughout the quarter.

For the KPI target to have been met at the end of Q1, less than 250 complaints should have been received.

There are a number of possible reasons why complaints are high.

- We have increased publicity on how to complain via social media, posters in communal areas and a TV screen in Civic reception;
- Changes in regulation - Housing Ombudsman Code. We log complaints where customers express any dissatisfaction, they do not have to say the word 'complaint';
- We now log member enquiries that express a dissatisfaction or have previously been raised as dissatisfaction, as a Stage 1 complaint.

For Stage 2, we have increased awareness on how to escalate to the next stage if the complainant is not satisfied.

We have had an increase in pre-determination enquiries from the Housing Ombudsman requesting that we investigate a complaint referred to their office from the complainant under our Stage 2 procedures.

As of this month we have engaged with the Tenant Scrutiny Panel to scrutinise complaint responses and whether we are dealing with complaints in accordance with our policy and the Housing Ombudsman's Complaints Code.

The majority of complaints are again due to four main themes, in order; policy, time taken, staffing and service delivery.

7.7. KPI 7 : Complaints responded to within target timescale

	Target	Q1 24/25 Performance	
Stage 1 complaints	92.3%	99.6%	BETTER THAN TARGET
Stage 2 complaints	92.3%	80.0%	WORSE THAN TARGET
Stage 1 & 2 complaints	92.3%	97.8%	BETTER THAN TARGET

For reference, target timescales are full responses within 10 working days for Stage 1 and 20 working days for Stage 2.

At this early stage, strong performance on Stage 1 complaints but below target on Stage 2 matters.

Heads of Service now investigate all Stage 2 complaints which will make the process more efficient. This has enabled efficiencies across the Customer Relations Team and reduced delays in investigating Stage 2 complaints. We are currently in the process of automating our Stage 2 processes to streamline processing and have commenced a review of the information provided to HOS to support their review of the complaint at Stage 2.

7.8. KPI 8: Percentage of tenancies sustained post support

Target 24/25	97.3%	
Q1 24/25 performance	98.9%	BETTER THAN TARGET – GREEN

Tenancies sustained post support continues to perform well above target, achieving 98.9% so far this year against a target of 97.3%.

This is due to 192 support cases being closed six months ago with just two of those tenancies having since ended. Both ended due to being evicted with an average rent arrears of £2,135 between them and both cases failed to engage with Income Management and Tenancy Support staff.

We continue to work closely with support cases to ensure resilience to sustain a tenancy to ensure strong performance is being maintained.

7.9. KPI 9: Percentage of repairs completed at first visit

Target 24/25	94.0%	
Q1 24/25 performance	94.3%	BETTER THAN TARGET – GREEN

Performance for June was 95.0% an improvement on May's figure of 94.2%, improving the YTD KPI at Q1 to 94.3%.

7.10. KPI 10 : Percentage of Emergency and Non Emergency Repairs completed within target timescales

	Target	Q1 24/25 Performance	
Emergency repairs	95%	63.3%	WORSE THAN TARGET
Non-emergency repairs	85%	77.6%	WORSE THAN TARGET
Emergency & Non-emergency repairs	88%	68.0%	WORSE THAN TARGET

Depending on the nature of the repair, SLHD has two targets for:

- Emergency Repairs – 2 hours and 24 hours; and
- Non-Emergency Repairs – 5 working days and 20 working days.

Month on month performance remains disappointing but stable. Due to demand on the repairs service and the volume of work already in calendars there is very little immediate availability to re-arrange follow on works or appoint works when first contacted. This leads to work often being planned beyond the required completion dates with no possibility of completing within timescale.

Whilst ever our next available appointment date remains further away than required timescales there will not be a dramatic improvement in performance.

7.11. KPI 11 : Gas Servicing - % of dwellings with a valid gas safety certificate

Target	100.00%	
Q1 24/25 performance	99.78%	WITHIN TOLERANCES - AMBER

Currently at 99.78%. There are 42 properties that at the end of June are in stage 4 of the access process and have an LGSR past the anniversary date (as these are all within the no access process, we are compliant with the regulations).

7.12. KPI 12 : Fire - % homes for which all required fire risk assessments have been carried out

Target	100.00%	
Q1 24/25 year end performance	100.00%	MEETING TARGET – GREEN

Performance is at 100%

7.13. KPI 13 : Asbestos - % homes for which all required asbestos management surveys or re-inspections have been carried out

Target	100.00%	
Q1 24/25 year end performance	100.00%	MEETING TARGET – GREEN

Performance is at 100%

7.14. KPI 14 : Legionella - % homes for which all required risk assessments have been carried out

Target	100.00%	
Q1 24/25 year end performance	100.00%	MEETING TARGET – GREEN

Performance is at 100%

7.15. KPI 15 : Lifts - % homes for which all required communal passenger lift safety checks have been carried out.

Target	100.00%	
Q1 24/25 year end performance	100.00%	MEETING TARGET – GREEN

Performance is at 100%

7.16. KPI 16 : Days lost through sickness per FTE (annualised)

Target	10.0 days	
Q1 24/25 Year end performance	10.9 days	WITHIN TOLERANCES - AMBER

The YTD sickness per FTE to 2.5 slightly worse than the target of 2.49. YTD sickness performance is better when compared to the same period in 2023 which was 2.8 days per FTE. The year end KPI projection based on Q1 data is 10.9 days per FTE against a target of 10 days per FTE.

Stress, depression and anxiety remain the highest reason for absence accounting for nearly 30% of all absence. This is followed by Muscoloskeletal (~20%) and infection and virus which now accounts for around 13% of the absence.

7.17. KPI17 : % of Local Revenue and Capital Expenditure

Target	70%	
Q1 24/25 performance	37%	WORSE THAN TARGET – RED

142 suppliers received payment in the month. The YTD KPI is 37% and still well below target. Yorkshire & Humber in month and YTD figures are 54% and 62% respectively.

The main actions to improve this KPI are to source, wherever possible, Doncaster based suppliers, and if not then Yorkshire based. This isn't always possible and for 23/24 and 24/25 YTD the KPI not meeting target is primarily due to one contractor completing the majority of capital works.

7.18. KPI 18 : Number of ASB cases per 1,000 properties, and KPI 18a : Number of ASB cases per 1,000 properties of which involve hate incidents

	YTD Target	Q1 24/25 Performance	
ASB cases per 1,000 properties	17.8	16.1	BETTER THAN TARGET
Cases of which are hate incidents	2.5	0.2	BETTER THAN TARGET

It is pleasing to see fewer reports by comparison in what is traditionally one of the busier periods for reports being made. The cumulative KPI at the end of June 2024 was 16.1/1000, being 321 ASB cases, compared to 370 cases at the same point last year and a KPI 18.6/1000 for June 2023, so we are currently tracking under target for 2024/25 and performing better than last year. There were four hate related incidents in the quarter.

7.19. KPI 19 Number of Tenants or Residents Helped Into Training, Education or Employment

Target	26	
Q1 24/25 performance	29	MEETING TARGET – GREEN

In respect of Q1, we have had a good start to the new financial year with 29 participants in total being helped into work or training which is ahead of target of 26 YTD. Of these, 14 commenced new work with 6 starting External Property Maintenance roles at SLHD, whilst 8 began work elsewhere, including Bon Marche, a Customer Service Role and at an Engineering Company.

The last participant to gain work was a former World of Work EPM operative who has secured a permanent role as a roofing assistant with SLHD.

We continue to see real benefit not just to our tenants through the scheme but for SLHD as we continue to use this platform to grow our future workforce, resulting in a consistent number becoming permanent employees post training.

7.20. KPI 21 : % of properties not meeting the Decent Home Standard

Target	0.00%	
Q1 24/25 performance	5.03%	WORSE THAN TARGET – RED

Overall, the number of properties that failed to meet the Decent Homes Standard has increased during Q1 and stands at 5.03%, which means there are now 1,002 properties compared to 605 at the end of Q4. This is due to the continuation of the stock condition surveying process, that has identified more properties as having a category 1 hazards. It is expected to see a continued increase as further stock condition surveys are completed.

The table summarises numbers at end of Q1 24/25 with comparatives from year end.

	Q4 23/24	Q1 24/25
Core non decent	156	217
Category 1 hazards	449	785
Total non decent	605	1,002
KPI % non decent	3.05%	5.03%

During Q1, category 1 hazards were resolved for 162 properties, this positive outcome was achieved by reallocation of resources.

A further challenge is the number of no access attempts that are being experienced. We are in the process of writing to these tenants to express the need to complete these works.

Progress continues to be made, with repair orders being raised, on receipt of survey data, to address and resolve all outstanding category 1 hazards.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1. None


9. OPTIONS CONSIDERED








9.1. Not applicable

10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION

10.1. Not applicable

11. IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY OUTCOMES

Great 8 Priority	Positive Overall	Mix of Positive & Negative	Trade-offs to consider – Negative overall	Neutral or No implications
 Tackling Climate Change	✓			
Comments: The main related KPI is for energy efficiency of properties and is an annual indicator.				

 Developing the skills to thrive in life and in work		✓		
Comments: SLHD work 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. There is a specific KPI related to this priority and at 23/24 year end exceeded target and is ahead of target at Q1 24/25 as a result of a number of initiatives.				
 Making Doncaster the best place to do business and create good jobs		✓		
Comments: KPIs relate to target spending locally within Doncaster and also within South Yorkshire where possible. Local spend was below target but is being addressed. Residents supported into training education or employment is ahead of target as a result of a number of initiatives.				
 Building opportunities for healthier, happier and longer lives for all		✓		
Comments: All of the KPIs have an influence on opportunities for healthier, happier and longer lives, by maintaining tenancies, providing secure, warm, safe homes, safe neighbourhoods, training and employment targets, and addressing homelessness issues in the borough.				
 Creating safer, stronger, greener and cleaner communities where everyone belongs		✓		
Comments: A number of the KPIs as reported above and at Appendix A have been established to have a positive influence on this priority.				
 Nurturing a child and family-friendly borough	✓			
Comments: A number of the KPIs as reported above and at Appendix A will have a positive influence on this priority.				
 Building Transport and digital connections fit for the future				✓
Comments: Not applicable				
 Promoting the borough and its cultural, sporting, and heritage opportunities				✓
Comments: Not applicable				

Fair & Inclusive		✓		
Comments: SLHD has its own Equality and Diversity strategy and fair and inclusive considerations are implicit in all of the service provided, and therefore KPIs.				

12. Legal Implications [Officer Initials: SRF Date: 20.08.24]

12.1. There are no specific legal implications arising from this report. Advice can be provided on any matters arising at the meeting.

13. Financial Implications [Officer Initials: JC Date: 23.08.24]

13.1. In 2024/25 SLHD will receive management fees of £43.3m from CDC. This is made up of £40.5m from the Housing Revenue Account and £2.8m from the General Fund to pay for the General Fund services managed by SLHD.

14. Human Resources Implications [Officer Initials: AC Date: 29.08.24]

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

15. Technology Implications [Officer Initials: ET Date: 19/08/24]

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

RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

16. IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY OUTCOMES

Specific risks and assumptions are included in the body of this report.

17. CONSULTATION

Not applicable

18. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

19. GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

See below

ADP	Annual Development Plan
ASB	Anti- Social Behaviour
DC	Doncaster Council
DHP	Discretionary Housing Payment
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
EPM	External Property Maintenance
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
HOS	Heads of Service

KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MSK	Musculo-Skeletal
SLHD	St Leger Homes of Doncaster
STAR	Survey of Tenants and Residents
STF	Sustainable Tenancy Fund
SWEP	Severe Weather Emergency Protocol
TSM	Tenant Satisfaction Measure
WOW	World of Work
YTD	Year to date
PRS	Private Rented Sector

REPORT AUTHOR & CONTRIBUTORS

Report Author

Nigel Feirn,
Head of Finance and Business Assurance, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster
01302 737485
Nigel.Feirn@stlegerhomes.co.uk

Chris Margrave
Chief Executive Officer, St. Leger Homes of Doncaster
01302 862700
Chris.margrave@stlegerhomes.co.uk

Appendix A SLHD Key Performance Indicator Summary Q1 24/25

Appendix B Benchmarking KPIs - Housemark monthly pulse survey – June 2024 (**in month** performance)

St. Leger Homes Key Performance Indicator Summary Q1 2024/25 – MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY KPIS

Appendix A

KPI	TSM	Indicator	23/24 Outturn	24/25 Q1	24/25 Q2	24/25 Q3	24/25 Q4	Target Q1	Target Year end	DoT
1		Percentage of current rent arrears against annual debit %	2.72%	2.74%				3.05%	2.95%	↓
2		Void rent loss (lettable voids) %	0.68%	0.82%				0.70%	0.70%	↓
3		Average Days to Re-let Standard Properties ytd (days)	24.9	24.2				24.0	24.0	↑
4		Average no. of nights in hotel accommodation (nights)	n/a	39.1				21.0	21.0	n/a
5		% of settled accommodation at Prevention stage (New)	32.0%	45.4%				30.0%	30.0%	↑
6a	CH01a	Number of stage 1 complaints per 1,000 properties (New)	50.7	14.5				11.3	47.0	↓
6b	CH01b	Number of stage 2 complaints per 1,000 properties (New)	3.1	1.7				0.7	3.0	↓
6	CH01	Number of stage 1 and 2 complaints per 1,000 properties (New)	53.8	16.2				12.0	50.0	↓
7a	CH02a	% of Stage 1 Complaints responded to within timescale (New)	91.9%	99.6%				92.3%	92.3%	↑
7b	CH02b	% of Stage 2 Complaints responded to within timescale (New)	86.9%	80.0%				92.3%	92.3%	↓
7	CH02	% of Complaints responded to within timescale (New)	89.3%	97.8%				92.3%	92.3%	↑
8		Number of tenancies sustained post support	99.3%	98.9%				97.3%	97.3%	↓
9		Number of repairs first visit complete	95.1%	94.3%				94.0%	94.0%	↓
10a	RP02a	% of emergency responsive repairs completed within timescale.	81.5%	63.3%				95.0%	95.0%	↓
10b	RP02b	% of non-emergency responsive repairs completed target timescale.	62.8%	77.5%				85.0%	85.0%	↑
10	RP02	% of non-emergency & emergency responsive within timescale.	69.5%	68.0%				88.0%	88.0%	↓
11	BS01	Gas: % of properties with a valid gas servicing certificate	100.00%	99.8%				100.0%	100.0%	↓
12	BS02	Fire: % homes all risk assessments have been carried out (New)	100.00%	100.00%				100.0%	100.0%	↔
13	BS03	Asbestos: % homes surveys or re-inspections completed (New)	100.00%	100.00%				100.0%	100.0%	↔
14	BS04	Legionella: % homes where all assessments completed (New)	100.00%	100.00%				100.0%	100.0%	↔
15	BS05	Lifts: % homes all communal lifts safety checks completed (New)	100.00%	100.00%				100.0%	100.0%	↔
16		Days lost through sickness per FTE (annualised)	11.2	10.9				10.0	10.0	↑
17		Percentage of Local Expenditure % Revenue and Capital	39.7%	36.7%				70.0%	70.0%	↓
18	NM01a	No. of ASB Cases per 1,000 properties	62.2	16.1				17.8	60.0	↓
18a	NM01b	No. of ASB Cases that involve hate crimes per 1,000 properties	0.7	0.2				2.5	10.0	↑
19		Number of residents in training, education or employment	108	29				26	97	↑
21	RP01	Percentage of homes not maintaining decent standard %	3.05%	5.03%				0%	0%	↓

1. Direction of travel (DoT) is against performance in the previous quarter. ↑ = Improving, ↔ = No Change, ↓ = Declining

2. Targets are for the end of the year performance unless indicated otherwise (ytd = cumulative year to date)

3. Key Meeting/better than target Within tolerance of target Not meeting/worse than target

Month	Housemark pulse survey benchmarking - IN MONTH performance	Q1	Median	Q3	SLHD	quartile	Accepted polarity
Jun-24	Voluntary staff turnover (%)	0.45%	0.85%	1.34%	0.37%	Q1	Lower is better
Jun-24	Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	30.8	44.7	69.0	22.9	Q1	Lower is better
Jun-24	Responsive repairs completed per 1,000 properties	277.5	230.3	196.2	257.7	Q2	Higher is better
Jun-24	'True' current tenant arrears (%)	2.07%	2.80%	3.82%	2.74%	Q2	Lower is better
Jun-24	Stage 1 and Stage 2 complaints resolved within timescale (%)	100.0%	93.5%	74.8%	94.7%	Q2	Higher is better
Jun-24	Dwellings vacant but available to let (%)	0.23%	0.56%	0.99%	0.74%	Q3	Lower is better
Jun-24	Formal Stage 1 and Stage 2 complaints received per 1,000 properties	2.80	4.68	6.76	6.60	Q3	Lower is better
Jun-24	New ASB cases reported per 1,000 properties	1.83	3.25	5.94	5.40	Q3	Lower is better
Jun-24	Homes with a valid gas safety certificate (%)	100.00%	99.98%	99.83%	99.70%	Q4	Higher is better
Jun-24	Responsive repairs completed within target timescale (%)	92.3%	83.3%	74.6%	68.5%	Q4	Higher is better
Jun-24	Working days lost to sickness absence (%)	2.6%	3.5%	4.4%	4.8%	Q4	Lower is better
Jun-24	Domestic properties with EICR certificates up to five years old (%)	99.83%	99.19%	95.92%	91.83%	Q4	Higher is better
