

Housing Performance Panel

Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting held on Wednesday, 2 March 2022 from 1pm to 4pm via Zoom

Attendees:	<p>Peter Campbell (Head of Housing) – Chair</p> <p>Cllr John Batchelor</p> <p>Brian Burton</p> <p>Les Rolfe</p> <p>Patricia Hall</p> <p>Paul Bowman</p> <p>Elaine Phillips (Mears)</p> <p>Geoff Clark (SCDC – Neighbourhood Services Manager)</p> <p>Eddie Spicer (SCDC – Service Manager Housing Assets)</p> <p>Grace Andrews (SCDC – Data Quality and Improvement Team Leader)</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor (SCDC – Resident Engagement Officer) – Minute taker</p>
Apologies:	<p>Ffion Daniels</p> <p>Jennifer Perry (Resident Involvement Team Leader) – Vice Chair</p>

Item	Subject	Action
1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>Peter Campbell welcomed the panel to the meeting at 1.04pm and asked everyone to re-introduce themselves.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Ffion Daniels and Jennifer Perry.</p>	-
2.	<p>Quorum</p> <p>The meeting was quorate.</p>	-

Item	Subject	Action																				
3.	<p>Minutes of previous meeting – 1 December 2021</p> <p>The Chair referred to the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2021. They were proposed by Geoff Clark and seconded by Les Rolfe as a true reflection of the meeting.</p>	-																				
4.	Matters Arising	-																				
4.1	<p>Mears Group – Review of Quarter 2 Data (Item 5.1)</p> <p>Elaine Phillips confirmed that the correct figures are reflected in the Quarter 3 report included in item 5.1 of the agenda pack.</p>	-																				
4.2.	<p>SCDC – Review of Quarter 2 Performance Data (Item 5.2)</p> <p>Elaine Phillips confirmed that she had provided the correct Response Repairs SMS figures and answers to the questions asked by Paul Bowman, as follows:</p> <p>1. The correct SMS figures, for Quarter 1:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="224 1203 1276 1440"> <thead> <tr> <th>Month</th> <th>Sent</th> <th>Received</th> <th>Response Rate</th> <th>Overall Satisfaction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>April</td> <td>507</td> <td>103</td> <td>20%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>May</td> <td>487</td> <td>86</td> <td>17%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>June</td> <td>592</td> <td>112</td> <td>19%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2. The answers to the questions asked:</p> <p>2.1 In response to Mears sending out email questionnaires:</p> <p>I assume this is in reference to Voice of Customer survey where we currently send out an SMS? We "can" send an email but the response rates are way lower than SMS and traditionally we don't hold many customer email addresses to be able to ask them for feedback. I would be interested to understand their reasoning for wanting an email survey? More than happy to have that conversation with client if that helps?</p>	Month	Sent	Received	Response Rate	Overall Satisfaction	April	507	103	20%	82%	May	487	86	17%	91%	June	592	112	19%	83%	-
Month	Sent	Received	Response Rate	Overall Satisfaction																		
April	507	103	20%	82%																		
May	487	86	17%	91%																		
June	592	112	19%	83%																		

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>2.2 List of Mears SMS satisfaction questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, I was satisfied with the service I received from Mears? 2. Mears made it easy to handle my issue? 3. How likely are you to recommend me as to your friends and family?(Questions are scored 1 – 10 – and scores of 9 & 10 are taken to create satisfaction scores as a percentage of total number of surveys) <p>2.3 In response to what measures they had that there was overall satisfaction by the client: Not sure I understand what this question is asking?</p> <p>2.4 In response to if there had been an improvement between what Mear’s Head Office had expected and what was actually happening at Cottenham: Again, I am not exactly sure what this is referencing? What do they mean by "expected" and "actually happening"?</p> <p>Elaine Phillips advised that their Head of Customer Insight was happy to arrange a meeting if needed.</p>	
4.3	<p>SCDC – Comparison of Quarter 2 Complaints Data (Item 5.3)</p> <p>Grace Andrew’s advised that the definition of complaint as used by both the Local Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman, was reflected below.</p> <p>Local Ombudsman “An expression of dissatisfaction about a council service (whether that service is provided directly by the council or by a contractor or partner) that requires a response.”</p> <p>Housing Ombudsman “A complaint shall be defined as an expression of dissatisfaction, however made , about the standard of service, actions or lack of actions by the organisation, its own staff, or those acting on its behalf, affecting an individual resident or group of residents.”</p>	-

Item	Subject	Action
4.4	<p>Estate Inspections Report (Item 5.5)</p> <p>Geoff Clark said that he met with the Housing Officers on 9 February 2022 to discuss the issues raised and he would report back under item 5.5.</p>	-
4.5	<p>Compliance Awareness Seminar for Residents Training (Item 6.2)</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor advised that hard copies of the training notes were posted to the delegates on 10 January 2022.</p>	-
5.	<p>Standing Items</p>	-
5.1.	<p>Mears Group – Review of Quarter 3 Data</p> <p>Elaine Phillips, from Mears, presented the Mears Group Quarter 3 Data report and said that the response repairs had decreased due to a shortage in scaffolding and in the sourcing of roof tiles. She said that there could be a further backlog of repairs due to damage caused by the recent storms.</p> <p>Cllr Batchelor asked for comments on the decline of completed relets as it was down to 60% which was not near the 95% target.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips said that there had been a slight dip due to a shortage of staff, however 6 staff had joined the team and they had seen an improvement.</p> <p>The Chair said that the Christmas figures were also reflected in the decrease in relets.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips added that there was a larger volume of relets due to properties being left in a worse condition.</p> <p>Paul Bowman asked how they arrived at that conclusion and was it bad decorating or damage to the properties.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips said that during lockdown, tenants were doing their own DIY or items were being left in properties. She added that the age of the property and the length of tenancy could also be a factor.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Paul Bowman asked how the risk of high relet costs could be reduced.</p> <p>Eddie Spicer said that it was difficult to determine as it was dependent on the state of each property.</p> <p>Geoff Clark said that SCDC determined what work needed to be done, however, all were different. He said that he had conducted some research which he would share with the board.</p>	G Clark
5.2	<p>SCDC – Review of Quarter 3 Performance Data</p> <p>Grace Andrews went through a presentation on the Performance Data for Quarter 3, highlighting the key indicators that had either increased or declined.</p> <p>Cllr Batchelor said that the negative figures that were highlighted in red were always raised in Cabinet. Grace Andrews said she would remove the RAG status from the report.</p> <p>Grace Andrews reported that the average relets and satisfaction in response repairs had reduced.</p> <p>Paul Bowman asked at what point was a repair satisfactorily dealt with.</p> <p>Grace Andrews said that this was collated by Mears, however, there were three core questions which were ranked. She added that SCDC do not conduct a survey.</p> <p>Les Rolfe referred to the Tenant Satisfaction Survey and said that the question about referring family or friends is irrelevant.</p> <p>Patti Hall said that she was involved in the survey project and said that the questions were set by MEL Research.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips said that their system was automated and a SMS was sent once a job had been completed, however only 50% of the jobs had a record of mobile numbers.</p>	G Andrews

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Paul Bowman said that he recently had work done and had received SMSs' for every step of the process, however, he had still not received a satisfaction SMS.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips said she would investigate and advise.</p>	E Phillips
5.3	<p>SCDC – Comparison of Quarter 3 Complaints Data</p> <p>Grace Andrews went through the Complaints and Compliments Data for Quarter 3 and said there had been a decrease in complaints received. She added that although a total of 30 complaints had been received, the backlog was being cleared.</p> <p>Paul Bowman asked if there was evidence that there could be a doubling up between SCDCs and Mears complaints.</p> <p>Grace Andrews said that these were only complaints to SCDC and that there was very little crossover with Mears.</p> <p>Geoff Clark asked if it would be useful for tenant representatives to see the details of the complaints.</p> <p>Les Rolfe said it would be useful.</p> <p>Elaine Phillips said that as soon as her new Compliance Manager was in position, they would have regular meetings to compare data.</p>	<p>G Andrews</p> <p>E Phillips</p>
5.4	<p>Update on the Repairs Contract</p> <p>Eddie Spicer referred to the document in the pack and advised that there was a preferred contractor, however, this was subject to clarification, the Standstill process, Consultation via S20 notices, member approval and the final issue of the offer. He added that the successful candidate would be announced formally by the end of April 2022.</p> <p>The Chair said that this was a robust process which was enhanced by the input from the tenants. He thanked the tenants for their involvement.</p>	-

Item	Subject	Action
5.5	<p>Estate Inspections Report</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor referred to the estate inspection schedule for 2022 included in the pack and advised that it had been sent to Jim Watson to allocate tenant volunteers to inspections. She added that she had updated the website with the details.</p> <p>Geoff Clark advised that the actions worksheet, where all issues raised at estate inspections were recorded, had not been kept up to date by the housing officers and he had had a meeting with them to stress the importance of keeping it up to date. He added that some issues were not always straightforward.</p> <p>Les Rolfe said that the tenants saw issues from a different point of view.</p> <p>Geoff Clark said it was important to keep the tenant volunteers updated and offered his assistance should issues not be resolved.</p> <p>Paul Bowman said that estate inspections were a learning curve for both tenant volunteers as well as housing officers. He suggested including the details of inspections in newsletters.</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor confirmed that all inspections were advertised in newsletters and posted on Facebook ahead of the inspections, and issues raised were also reported.</p>	-
5.6	<p>Update on Tenant Satisfaction Survey Project (STAR)</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor referred to the document included in the pack and said that the survey would be sent out by Friday, 4 March 2022. She said that at the December 2021 HEB meeting the cost of the survey was questioned and that the quote from M E L Research was included for information.</p> <p>Patti Hall said that the project team had gone through the questions and removed those that were not relevant.</p> <p>The Chair said that the advantage of the survey was that it used prescribed wording and allowed comparisons of value.</p>	-

Item	Subject	Action
6.	New Matters	-
6.1	<p>Update on Evaluation of Tenant Engagement Project</p> <p>Bronwen Taylor referred to the Project Initiation document and Project Evaluation form included in the pack and said that they were sent to Brian Burton and Peter Tye, the two tenant volunteers working on this project, on 19 January 2022 for their comments and input. She added that the document had been trialed by the team working on the Tenant Satisfaction Survey project and these documents would be used for all future projects.</p>	-
6.2	<p>Update on Doubling Nature Project</p> <p>Geoff Clark advised that he had a meeting with Margaret Wilson and Les Rolfe on Friday, 25 February 2022, to discuss ideas for this project. He said that they focused mainly on trees, however, also discussed wild-flower areas and allotments. He advised that SCDC were currently conducting a tree audit and surgery, and he would provide a report on the findings as well as feedback on his meeting with the tenant volunteers.</p> <p>Geoff Clark said that Les Rolfe had advised that he could source free trees from the Woodland Trust. He added that Margaret Wilson said she would liaise with media outlets and tenants, and that she had a proposal for the sheltered estate she lived on.</p> <p>Geoff Clark said he would send the completed Project Initiation document to Bronwen Taylor.</p>	-
7.	Any other Business	-
7.1	<p>Data Collection</p> <p>Paul Bowman said if data collection was going to be used to decide if a contractor was performing to standard, then the questions should be meaningful, however, he had noticed that Mears' questions were generic</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>and did not give an option to identify the issue, which could explain why their performance appeared to be poor. He added that there was no opportunity to explain why the service was either good or bad.</p> <p>Eddie Spicer said that he had taken this up with Mears. He asked for the board to provide meaningful suggestions which he would put forward to Mears. He added that they should be comparable to use with national benchmarks.</p> <p>Grace Andrews said there were a set questions on repairs and maintenance in the STAR survey and she would send them to Eddie Spicer.</p> <p>Patti Hall advised that a tenant who was deaf and had Alzheimer's had received 2 letters from Mears saying that they were going to take her to court as they could not get into her house to look at her boiler. She said she spoke to Chris Brown who said that the wardens were supposed to make a note on the system about getting access to the house, however, the warden was not aware of this. She said there were 4 tenants who were deaf who were not reflected with a disability on SCDC's systems.</p> <p>Geoff Clark said that the information would be recorded in the background but that it should also be reflected on the note system on Orchard. He said he would check that this type of information was reflected on the note system.</p> <p>Eddie Spicer said that he was aware of this issue, however, we should have a system in place where the warden of the sheltered estate with a vulnerable resident was contacted and could advise Mears before any legal action was taken.</p>	<p>Board members</p> <p>G Andrews</p> <p>G Clark</p>

Item	Subject	Action
8.	<p>Proposed Meeting Dates</p> <p>The Chair referred to the proposed meeting dates for 2022 / 2023, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2 June 2022 ➤ 8 September 2022 ➤ 1 December 2022 ➤ 2 March 2023 <p>Geoff Clark said that 2 June 2022 was a Bank Holiday. Bronwen Taylor said she would email an alternative date to the board.</p>	B Taylor
9.	<p>Closing</p> <p>There being no further business to discuss, the meeting ended at 2.50pm.</p>	-