

# **BOROUGH OF BARROW-IN-FURNESS**

## **HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM**

Meeting: Thursday 25th August, 2016  
at 2.00 p.m. (Committee Room No. 4)

Group Meetings at 1.15 p.m.

### **A G E N D A**

#### **PART ONE**

1. To note any items which the Chairman considers to be of an urgent nature.

2. Admission of Public and Press

To consider whether the public and press should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the agenda.

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations by Members and/or co-optees of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the revised Code of Conduct, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registrable interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Members may however, also decide, in the interests of clarity and transparency, to declare at this point in the meeting, any such disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, as well as any other registrable or other interests.

4. Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting held on 9th June, 2016 (copy attached).

5. Apologies for Absence/Changes in Membership.

#### **FOR DECISION**

##### **STRATEGIC PLANNING**

(D) 6. Review of Council Housing Service

(D) 7. Tenant Involvement Strategy

## **OPERATIONAL**

- (D) 8. Sponsorship of the Housing Annual Garden Competition 2016
- (D) 9. Disabled Adaptations: Cumbria Housing Partners - Contractor Selection Procedure
- (R) 10. Fencing on Council Estates
- (D) 11. Adaptations to Council Property
- (R) 12. Roosegate Estate External Works
- (R) 13. Cumbria Choice: Choice-Based Lettings Scheme - Update

## **FOR INFORMATION**

- 14. Planned Investment and Planned Maintenance

**NOTE:** (D) – Delegated to the Executive Committee  
(R) – Referred to the Council

## **HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM MEMBERS:**

Councillors: K. Hamilton (Chairman)  
D. Barlow  
S. Blezard  
D. Brook  
J. Heath  
A. Johnston  
W. McEwan  
A. Thurlow

Tenant Reps: Mandy Anderson  
Allan McIntosh  
Kath Warne  
Lisa Webb

Substitutes: Theresa Metcalfe  
Steven Lippett

### **For queries regarding this agenda, please contact:**

Keely Fisher  
Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 01229 876313  
Email: [ksfisher@barrowbc.gov.uk](mailto:ksfisher@barrowbc.gov.uk)

Published: 17th August, 2016.

## **HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM**

Meeting: Thursday 9th June, 2016  
at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:- Councillors Hamilton (Chairman), Barlow, Brook, Blezard, Heath, McEwan and Thurlow.

Tenant Representatives:- Ms A. Anderson, Mr A. McIntosh, Mrs T. Metcalfe and Mrs K. Warne.

Officers Present:- Colin Garnett (Assistant Director – Housing) and Sharron Rushton (Democratic Services Officer).

### **38 – The Local Government Act, 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985 and Access to Information (Variation) Order 2006**

Discussion arising hereon it was

RESOLVED:- That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972 the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2 and (Minute Nos. 52, 53, 54) of Part One of Schedule 12A of the said Act.

### **39 – Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14th January, 2016 were taken as read and confirmed.

### **40 – Apologies for Absence/Changes in Membership**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cassidy and Tenant Representative, Lisa Webb.

Councillor Brook had replaced Councillor Cassidy and Theresa Metcalfe had replaced Lisa Webb for this meeting only.

### **41 – Appointment of Representatives to Working Groups etc.**

The Executive Director reported that at the Annual Council meeting on 10th May, 2016 the allocation of seats in respect of Forums, Panels, Working Groups etc. were agreed.

The Housing Management Forum were requested to nominate Members and Tenant Representatives to the Tenant Scrutiny Working Party and the Tenants Complaints Panel for 2016/2017.

The Member representatives by proportionality indicated in the report and three Tenant representatives were required for the Tenant Scrutiny Working Party and one

Member representative by proportionality indicated in the report and two Tenant representatives were required for the Tenants Complaints Panel.

RECOMMENDED:- That the Memberships for 2016/17 be agreed as follows:-

#### Tenant Scrutiny Working Party

Council Representatives (2:1) Councillors Barlow, Heath and McEwan.  
Tenant Representatives – Mr A. McIntosh, Mrs P. Charnley and Ms L. Webb.

#### Tenants Complaints Panel

Council Representatives (1:0) Councillor Hamilton.  
Tenant Representatives – Mrs M. Anderson and Alan McIntosh.

### **42 – Change of Use: Grange and Cartmel Crescent Community Room and Guest Bedroom**

The Assistant Director - Housing requested Members considered the future use of the Grange and Cartmel Community Room and “Guest Bedroom”. They were both situated in a two-storey building, in the middle of Grange and Cartmel Crescent.

This provision stemmed back to when the flats in the area were classed as “sheltered accommodation” for older people and had a resident warden, part of whose duties was to manage the communal room and guest bedroom. It was now many years since the Council moved away from employing resident wardens.

Since then, and particularly over 15 years or so, the Community Centre and guest bedroom had been “managed” by the Residents Association, with the Chair taking the lead role.

This included receiving requests for use of the guest bedroom, keeping a diary and ensuring the facility was fit for use on a day-to-day basis. The same arrangement extended to the community room.

Unfortunately the lead tenant representative from the area was now unable to continue the role she had carried out over many years. It would appear her standing down also meant the last remaining regular weekly event had also stopped. The arrangements for the guest bedroom had also come to an end.

The Centre had become the “preferred” meeting place for many forums and meetings that were tenant orientated over the years. Members agreed the arrangements that operated had been excellent and suggested the Council should write and thank the Association, and in particular the lead individual for all her work over the years.

In view of the current position with the facility it was suggested consideration be given to its future use. In seeking a solution it should be for the building as a whole and should be sympathetic to the adjoining properties.

Suggested future options included:-

1. Leave it as it is? Wait until new Tenant Representatives volunteer to take over the running of the centre.
2. Consider developing the property for residential use?
3. Consider alternative Users
4. Providing direct management by the Housing service?

The longstanding management arrangements for the Centre appeared to have come to a natural end and such was appropriate for the Council to consider its future use.

**RECOMMENDED:-**

1. To agree the traditional use of the guest bedroom be suspended until a decision was made on the future of the building;
2. To agree to consider whether there were any local groups who may consider taking on the responsibility of managing the facility subject to the use being reflective of the area in which it was situated including a dialogue with local residents; and
3. To agree to investigate the option and costs to convert the building into two separate units of living accommodation.

**43 – Housing Related Support: County Council Grant**

The Assistant Director - Housing submitted a report informing Members that following changes to the Supporting People arrangements, the County had offered the Borough Council the opportunity of funding to assist in the provision of Housing related support.

The Borough had a duty to provide a Homeless Service and the Council had a dedicated team who carried out this task. Whilst the principal objective of the team was focused on “prevention” work the Council were required to provide temporary or interim accommodation in some situations.

The Council already had arrangements in place to deliver the type of work to which the Grant applied and so following discussion with the Chair of the Housing Management Forum the Assistant Director – Housing had accepted the offer of Grant. However, it also provided the opportunity to re-consider the way in which such services were delivered.

The purpose of the grant was to assist the Borough provide housing related support linked to temporary accommodation.

In particular the objectives and the outcomes on what the Council had to report were:

- 1) Support those who were homeless or at serious risk of homelessness to have access to appropriate housing related support, to improve independence, personal resilience, health and well being and prevent representation;
- 2) Deliver the housing support linked to temporary accommodation service within the Borough; and
- 3) Provide support to people linked to the following number of units of temporary accommodation at any given time; Generic four units, Domestic Violence two Units.

Other key details attached to the grant were as follows:

- The grant was £34,944 but may vary in following years.
- The period of the arrangement would be four years with options available for either party to terminate giving one month's notice that would then end the arrangement on the following anniversary.
- The Council would be required to report every six months on outcomes.
- There were a number of other requirements such as providing the Councils policies on Equality and Diversity for example which would be matters of routine.

In considering the use of the Grant the Assistant Director - Housing made the following comments:

- Additional support was often essential to enable a person to avoid becoming homeless through to assisting them to look for their own solutions or providing the guidance for managing their home.
- Whilst this funding would be new monies, the Council already delivered to some degree the services to which it referred. One option would therefore be to accept the grant and use it to fund the Councils existing arrangements. However, operational experience indicated demand for such services would increase. The Assistant Director - Housing suggested this additional funding provided an opportunity to increase the Councils ability in terms of preventative work and support to people in temporary housing.
- In considering the matter attention was drawn to the fact that the level of funding was not "guaranteed" for four years. However, by the nature of the services in question, short term funding was often a feature of such grants or it maybe the County Council do not want to commit for longer in the current financial climate.
- With regards funding for Domestic Violence, Members were aware the Council working in collaboration with the Women's Community Matters had recently been successful in obtaining £48k of funding to assist Women's Community Matters to develop the services available for residents of the Borough. The Council had also recently agreed to identify two properties for providing temporary accommodation for victims of Domestic Violence, the residents of which would receive support

from Women's Community Matters. It was suggested that whilst the Borough Council would be the recipient of the Grant, the Council would deliver this element of the Grant in the same way.

- The Council maintained a number of properties, currently 10, for the purpose of providing temporary accommodation. The management of these properties, whilst only a small number, was challenging and time consuming. The Council also placed individuals in bed and breakfast. Arrangements for managing temporary accommodation was the responsibility of the Homeless Team but realistically there was always a challenge between giving time to managing temporary accommodation and dealing with the demand from new cases.

It was suggested that the Grant would provide the opportunity to strengthen the management of temporary accommodation and support afforded to residents in the accommodation.

The Housing Forum does not have involvement in staffing matters but should Members agree the principle of developing the service in the way described then the matter would be progressed through the appropriate channels.

Should the Council agree the acceptance of this grant the Assistant Director - Housing proposed the monies be divided pro rata to the number of units to be supported.

#### RECOMMENDED:-

1. To agree the actions of the Assistant Director - Housing in acceptance of this grant following discussion with the Chairman of the Housing Management Forum;
2. To agree the principle to deliver the support targeted at Domestic Violence through Women's Community Matters subject to satisfactory terms and making a figure of up to £11,648.00 available to deliver that aspect of the Grant; and
3. To agree the principles of using the Grant to increase the support available to residents in the Councils temporary accommodation and work with the Housing Options Team to assist potentially homeless residents avoid homelessness.

#### **44 – Housing Management Performance Report 2015/16**

The Assistant Director - Housing reported on the end of year performance information as shown at **Appendix A** to these Minutes.

The performance indicator report showed Housing Management's overall level of achievement against a set of benchmark targets. The benchmark was the Housemark 'median' cross sector performance scores from 2015/16.

The purpose of the report was to demonstrate the progress against the actions which had been undertaken last year and to refresh the background context which had

impacted upon the results for 2015/16. The report also outlined the Actions for the forthcoming year.

### **Actions for 2016/17**

Action 1:	Continue to concentrate efforts in identifying and supporting vulnerable tenants through the transition to Universal Credit
Action 2:	Reduce risk to HRA income by continuing to improve rent collection
Action 3:	Bed in the new responsive repairs contract to improve the % of repairs completed first time and on time and improve the turnaround of voids
Action 4:	Prepare for the replacement of the Housing Management system which would improve functionality, help officers work more effectively whilst mobile and enable a self-serve facility for those tenants wishing to access the service outside of normal office hours

### **Influences for 2016/17**

#### **Rent Collection**

With a loss of 1% to rent income and more movement from HB to Universal Credit the Council would look at better ways of working and preparing CX to help support changes.

CX would also enable easier and better long term asset management planning.

#### **Voids and Empty Properties**

For the period 1st April, 2015 – 31st March, 2016 rent loss for void properties was almost £150k.

- Two bedroom upper floor flats and certain areas continued to have the highest turnover and were harder to let.

The number of properties which were accepted on first offer had dropped by 10% since last year.

- Deceased and moves to the private sector continued to be the largest % of all tenancy ends -32%
- 82 voids were on Ormsgill
- 138 were 1 bed flats
- The shortest tenancies were in Abbotsmead and Lower Hindpool flats
- 1 bed flats in Newbarns North took the longest on average to let



Action 1:	Reduce risk to HRA income by continuing to improve rent collection taking account of the 1% reduction in rent income and the uncertainty around the sale of high value properties and the impact that might have on revenue
Action 2:	Reduce Void, Repair and Planned Maintenance expenditure whilst maintaining Decent Home standards to within revenue
Action 3:	Recognise and make the most of the opportunity to improve the way the Council work through the deployment of new CX software. Develop new processes and working practices which would help the Council work more effectively and at a lower cost.

**RECOMMENDED:-**

1. To note the information contained in the report and at **Appendix A** to these Minutes; and
2. To agree Actions 1-4 for 2016/17 as follows:-

Action 1: Continue to concentrate efforts in identifying and supporting vulnerable tenants through the transition to Universal Credit;

Action 2: Reduce risk to HRA income by continuing to improve rent collection;

Action 3: Bed in the new responsive repairs contract to improve the % of repairs completed first time and on time and improve the turnaround of voids; and

Action 4: Prepare for the replacement of the Housing Management system which will improve functionality, help officers work more effectively whilst mobile and enable a self-serve facility for those tenants wishing to access the service outside of normal office hours.

**45 – Void Property Investments: Cumbria Housing Partners Contractor Selection Procedure**

The Assistant Director - Housing updated Members regarding the continued utilisation of the CHP framework as the Councils preferred investment delivery model and to note the evaluation of contractors listed for void improvements on the new 2014 CHP framework.

At the meeting held on 28th August, 2014 Members agreed to the Council's membership of CHP and its commitment to deliver investment in line with other member organisations.

Officers could advise Members that in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing orders, the use of the CHP framework and contract award fell within Officer delegation.

Members were advised that the previous arrangements for void property improvements had been issued to AB Mitchell Developments Ltd (CHP contractor) and Vinci (now Hughes Brothers) on the basis that major void improvements were generally allocated to the CHP contractor to ensure value for money was maximised.

Officers advised that the existing CHP framework recently expired and had been replaced with a new CHP framework that would run until 2018. As part of the Council’s membership of CHP the Council was required to re-evaluate and re-appoint suitably qualified and experienced contractors capable of delivering void investments from 1st April, 2016.

The new OJEU compliant framework was prepared on behalf of CHP by Procure Plus and a partner company called “Realize”. The new framework identified a range of key work streams that were broken down between internal and external housing components and included repairs/improvements to void properties. It also separated out the various services provided by contractors and suppliers.

Officers could advise Members that there were several locally based contractors on the new CHP framework and were, along with other contractors, eligible for selection to undertake void property improvements using one of the following methods;

- a. Direct call off
- b. Mini competition

**Direct call off procedure**

This procedure allowed landlords to directly select a contractor within a particular work stream based on the original OJEU evaluation procedure that took account of the contractor’s cost and quality submissions.

**Mini competition**

This procedure allowed landlords to evaluate contractors using a range of pre determined assessment criterion that may vary from landlord to landlord.

Officers could advise Members that a mini competition was completed in February 2016 using the following assessment criteria:

**1. Written submission**

Contractors were required to answer questions covering the following areas:

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Resident Care	30%
Vulnerable Residents	5%
Delivery	25%
Health and Safety	5%
Social Value	10%

This section of the assessment contributed **75%** to the total mark.

## **2. Pricing document**

Contractors were required to submit rates to carry out the works. It was noted that these rates would be fixed for this particular scheme and would be open for acceptance for 48 months.

This section of the assessment contributed **25%** to the total mark.

## **3. Preferred contractor(s) status pricing document**

Fifteen contractors from the CHP framework were invited to participate in the mini competition for the void property repairs in Barrow.

The results of the void property mini competition were summarised in a report from Procure Plus which confirmed the appointment of local contractor AB Mitchell Developments Limited who was the only contractor to return the tender documentation.

**RECOMMENDED:-** To note the selection criteria adopted by Procure Plus (PP) and the subsequent appointment of AB Mitchell Development Ltd as the Council's preferred contractor to undertake void property improvements via the 2014 CHP Framework.

## **46 – Management of Void Properties 2016/17**

The Assistant Director - Housing's report informed the Forum on the costs incurred to bring void properties up to standard before re-letting during 2015/16. Final accounts were to be completed but it was clear the costs for voids exceeded the budget identified for the purpose and the report sought to provide an explanation for the level of spending that was incurred and the Council's ongoing approach to balancing expenditure whilst delivering an appropriate level of service.

During 2015/16 the number of properties becoming vacant was 267. This level of vacant properties was not exceptional and was less than previous years.

However, the cost of repairs required to bring them up to a "standard" for re-letting had resulted in an overspend on the budget identified for void maintenance.

In proposing an annual HRA budget, a number of considerations were made to suggest a budget figure required, previous spend being one of those considerations. In the case of the void budget the monies identified were insufficient to deal with the level of the repairs required.

The Assistant Director - Housing had looked at the factors which may have led to this level of spend and discussed it with Officers involved in the void process.

In summary the Assistant Director - Housing suggested a number of reasons that had led to the position at the end of year:

1. Officers and this Forum had recognised the “void standard” to which the Council operated needed consideration and the Assistant Director - Housing suggested the Council under-estimated the amount of additional expenditure that maybe required.
2. Whilst the number of voids was not excessive, the number of properties becoming void that were exceptionally poor and required major works was higher than would normally be the case.

As an example of costs incurred against individual properties, there were houses that required in the region of c.£15K per property and many in the c.£5K to £10K range.

In considering what action should be taken to control maintenance costs, the Assistant Director - Housing suggested having regard to the following.

The Council monitored the reason for voids arising which ranged from tenants leaving to go to the private sector, the tenant was deceased or the property was abandoned. In short for many of the reasons the Council’s opportunity to control turnover was limited, with others the Council may have some control.

For instance some voids arose following the transfer of a tenant to an alternative address. In theory when transferring a tenant should leave their existing property in an appropriate standard. However, in practice, a pragmatic approach had to be taken to look at the well being of the tenant. For instance even if a property required work, the Council looked at the tenant’s circumstances and would not for instance stop a transfer, if they were moving because the property was not suitable, because of medical circumstances or to improve their financial position.

The Council do seek to recover the cost of any damage or DIY work when a tenant leaves as a “rechargeable repair”. Whilst the Council do this as a matter of course the recovery of money from a tenant when they had left was difficult.

It was also the case that the housing stock was ageing. Despite the Council’s cyclical maintenance and investment plans, when voids arise it would appear work such as re-plastering was becoming a more common feature. Such work generally only became apparent when a void arose.

A new void standard had now been implemented. The new standard had been welcomed by colleagues involved in the void process. It was apparent at the start of the Scrutiny Process the Council’s previous void standard was a minimal standard and needed to be improved.

Whilst the new standard had increased the costs of preparing a void property for letting, the Assistant Director - Housing suggested the new standard was appropriate and should not be changed to control future expenditure.

Moving forward Officers would be looking to refine how costs were generally accounted for within the Maintenance Budget. At present the Council do charge

works completed such as upgrading a heating system, replacing a bathroom or kitchen, to the appropriate cyclical maintenance budget - not as a void cost.

The Council would be giving further consideration to the appropriateness to charge other costs currently accounted in the void budget to a cyclical maintenance budget, such as when large areas of plastering or redecoration was required.

The Council delivered void maintenance via two contractors: Hughes Bros and AB Mitchell. The Council would be discussing the process of controlling costs with the contractors and Procure Plus to ensure the contract arrangements were managed appropriately to achieve cost efficiencies.

Taking into consideration the ending of contractual arrangements with Vinci and out turns from other planned maintenance work, it would not be possible to cover the overspend from the annual HRA maintenance budget. HRA Reserves would be required to ensure the costs incurred in the Maintenance budget were met within the year.

Once the year end accounts were completed, therefore, the Director of Resources would present the accounts through the Executive Committee and recommend use of the required HRA Reserves.

In summing up, the Assistant Director - Housing suggested having regard to the age of the stock and experience during the last financial year, whilst the number of voids may be broadly similar void costs would be monitored and further consideration would be given to how costs were controlled and accounted for.

#### RECOMMENDED:-

1. To note the information provided in the report;
2. To note the action to be taken to ensure the HRA was balanced at year end; and
3. To note and agree the ongoing development of the Council's void management processes.

#### **47 – Request to Purchase Ad-hoc Land Adjacent to 16 Duddon Drive**

The Assistant Director - Housing's report asked Members to consider a request to purchase Council-owned land adjoining the property owned by the applicants.

Appendix C attached to the report provided images of the land in question.

The Assistant Director - Housing had delegated authority by virtue of Executive Committee 1st October, 2003 to consider and agree where appropriate sales of ad-hoc land adjoining gardens of owner-occupiers living on Council estates. Should the potential purchaser wish to appeal the Assistant Director - Housing's decision, they have the right to do so through this Forum.

It was the Council's practice in the first instance to indicate to any potential purchaser whether the Assistant Director - Housing thought it was appropriate to sell the land, prior to going through the full sale process which included arranging a valuation and the applicant seeking planning permission.

In the case of this application, the Assistant Director - Housing suggested to Members it was inappropriate to sell the land. The land in question was a portion of amenity green land that ran adjacent with the rear garden of 16 Duddon Drive (prospective purchaser) and 1 Severn Road (council owned property).

The Assistant Director - Housing commented specifically regarding two factors considered with this application:

1. It would be detrimental to sell the whole portion to the applicant because half the land was adjacent to the rear garden of the neighbouring property.
2. To sell the section adjoining the applicant's property would leave Barrow Borough Council with the responsibility and maintenance costs for the remaining portion of land. The Assistant Director - Housing had also considered the street scene once a boundary was installed to separate the land. In the future, should both properties approach the Council with a view to purchasing the respective half adjacent to each property this would be an appropriate opportunity to sell the whole portion.

**RECOMMENDED:-** To decline the request to purchase Council owned land adjoining the property because the whole portion should not be sold due to the impact on the rear garden of 1 Severn Road and to sell half would have no benefit to the Housing Service and would alter the street scene.

#### **48 – STAR Survey Key Findings**

The Assistant Director - Housing's report informed the Forum of the key findings following a recent tenant satisfaction survey.

In early 2011, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) signalled the end of the regulatory requirement to carry out the STATUS satisfaction survey on a prescribed basis. Under STATUS, housing providers were required to compulsory survey their tenants at least every three years.

Housemark, a leading provider of performance improvement services, quickly identified that many housing providers wanted to continue to survey tenants and residents on a voluntary basis and sought to provide a flexible survey based upon the main features of STATUS.

A new survey called STAR (Survey of Tenants and Residents) was developed. Despite it no longer being compulsory to survey tenants, the Council could see it as good practice to do so and had chosen to adopt the STAR Survey as the Council's main satisfaction survey.

The Council commissioned BMG to carry out our first STAR Survey in 2012 and the results were positive.

### **Action Taken**

As three years had passed since the Council's first STAR Survey, they took the decision to commission a further survey to obtain a more up to date view of tenant satisfaction with the Council's services.

Following a tender process, BMG Research were selected to undertake the Council's 2015 survey. The Council opted for a sample postal survey which took place between August and November 2015.

An initial mailing of 1,500 questionnaires and letters were mailed out to tenants across all Council housing estates with two full reminder mailings going out to those customers who did not or could not respond to the initial mailing. Unfortunately the response rate was lower than expected and in order to ensure accuracy with the results, the Council decided to carry out a further mailing to 700 additional tenants. The survey closed in November. In total 483 surveys were completed from the two sets of sample, whether by post or online, representing a response rate of 22%.

In February 2016, BMG Research gave a presentation of their findings to Housing Service staff, Councillors and tenant representatives.

The full report had now been uploaded onto the Barrow Borough Council website and the key findings were featured in the tenants' Spring 2016 edition of the Housing Matters newsletter.

### **Key Findings**

Below were some of the key findings obtained through the survey which had been compared to findings recorded in 2012.

- 90% of tenants were satisfied with the overall services provided. Satisfaction had increased by 3%;
- 91% of tenants were satisfied with the repairs and maintenance service. Satisfaction had increased by 3%;
- 91% of tenants were satisfied with the quality of their home. Satisfaction had increased by 1%;
- 86% of tenants found staff helpful. Satisfaction had increased by 1%;
- 89% of tenants were satisfied with the general condition of their homes. Satisfaction had remained the same.
- 88% of tenants felt they obtained good value for money from their rent. Satisfaction had reduced by 1%;
- 86% of tenants were satisfied with the neighbourhood as a place to live. Satisfaction had increased by 2%;
- 83% of tenants felt that Barrow Borough Council Housing Service kept them informed. Satisfaction had increased by 3%; and
- 80% of tenants thought that their landlord took account of their views. Satisfaction had increased by 1%.

Since the Council's last survey in 2012, the Council had increased satisfaction with many of its services but had also recognised that there were areas where they needed to improve.

- For example, the Council had quite high dissatisfaction levels with the complaints service. Approximately, 15% of tenants made a complaint last year and of those, 39% of tenants were dissatisfied with how their complaint was handled and 40% were dissatisfied with the final outcome of the complaint. Although there had been some improvement in satisfaction in this area, dissatisfaction levels were higher than the Council would like.
- In addition to this, the Council had some higher than expected dissatisfaction scores on local services with 16% being dissatisfied with the appearance of the neighbourhood; 17% dissatisfied with grounds maintenance; 11% dissatisfied with internal cleaning and 17% dissatisfied with external cleaning. Results had improved slightly since 2012 but were still higher than the Council would like.
- Satisfaction with the final outcome of an anti-social behaviour complaint had reduced to 34%, down 18% since 2012.

The Council would therefore be working with tenant representatives and councillors to develop a plan of action, targeted at service improvement areas which had been identified through the STAR survey. This would be reported to Housing Management Forum in due course.

**RECOMMENDED:-** To note the key findings of the STAR Survey and accept the formal report.

#### **49 – Adelphi Court**

The purpose of the Assistant Director - Housing's report was for Members to agree the assignment of a lease for Adelphi Court from Croftlands Housing Trust to the Richmond Fellowship.

The Borough Council agreed a lease with Croftlands Housing Trust to take over the management of Adelphi Court with the prime purpose of providing supported housing for people with mental health problems.

The lease was granted on 4th March, 2015 for a period of five years ending 3rd March, 2020.

One of the conditions of the lease was that Croftlands Housing Trust were not to assign the lease to a third party.

For Members who had been involved, they would be aware that Croftlands Housing Trust had been working alongside Richmond Fellowship for part of the time that negotiations of the lease were taking place. In order to strengthen the work of Croftlands Housing Trust it had now merged with Richmond Fellowship.



For all intents and purposes, the arrangements in place for the management and provision of accommodation at Adelphi Court would continue.

As pointed out, the original lease did not allow for assignment, but the Assistant Director – Housing requested Members to agree on this occasion that the assignment from Croftlands Housing Trust to Richmond Fellowship be agreed to ensure the continuation of this facility for the remainder of the lease period.

RECOMMENDED:- To agree the assignment from Croftlands Housing Trust to the Richmond Fellowship.

## **50 – Planned Investment and Planned Maintenance 2015/16 Year End Expenditure**

The Assistant Director - Housing reported information relating to the Planned Investment and Planned Maintenance Programme for 2015/16. The information is attached at **Appendix B** to these Minutes.

RESOLVED:- To note the information.

## **51 – Retrospective Request for Vehicle Crossing**

The purpose of the Assistant Director - Housing's report was to request whether the Forum considered whether action should be taken to re-instate a green verge outside a property.

RECOMMENDED:- To agree to not to take any action in this instance to reinstate a green verge outside a property.

## **52 – Request for Adaptations to a Council Property**

The purpose of the Assistant Director - Housing's report was to consider a request for adaptations to be carried out to a Council property at an approximate cost of £12,000.

RECOMMENDED:-

1. To agree the request for adaptations to be carried out at an approximate cost of £12,000; and
2. To request Officers review the Disabilities Facilities Grants policy regarding funding for adaptations.

## **53 – Request for Adaptations to a Council Property**

The purpose of the Assistant Director - Housing's report was to consider a request for adaptations to be carried out to a Council property with the costs expected to be in the region of £30,000 - £35,000.

RECOMMENDED:-

1. To agree the request for adaptations to be carried out with the cost expected to be in the region of £30,000 - £35,000; and
2. To request Officers review the Disabilities Facilities Grants policy regarding funding for adaptations.

#### **54 – Request for Adaptations to a Council Property**

The purpose of the Assistant Director - Housing's report was to consider a request for a single storey extension to be carried to a Council property with a cost expected to be in the region of £40,000.

RECOMMENDED:-

1. To agree the request for adaptations to be carried out with the cost expected to be in the region of £40,000; and
2. To request Officers review the Disabilities Facilities Grants policy regarding funding for adaptations.

<b>REFERRED ITEMS</b>
-----------------------

<b>THE FOLLOWING MATTERS ARE REFERRED TO COUNCIL FOR DECISION</b>
---

#### **55 – Policy and Procedures with regard to Vehicle Crossings to Properties on Council Estates**

The purpose of the Assistant Director – Housing's report was to direct the Housing Service on how it should respond when it received requests from residents to create off street parking.

The report clarified the position regarding properties that had been sold through the Right to Buy and which had restrictive covenants regarding in curtilage parking.

The report sought to confirm Council's previous approach to "protect green space" and the procedure to be adopted by Officers to deliver this Policy.

#### **Background**

When many Council estates were constructed limited provision was made for off street parking, or "in curtilage" parking.

Later estates, which included houses and flats did sometimes have parking provision as a feature of the estate design, but such facilities were normally shared parking areas in close proximity of the property.

Members would be aware a feature of many estates also included narrow estate roads and as the number of vehicles on Council estates had increased it had led to

an increase in congestion and the matter was raised as an issue with Housing Officers from time to time.

The Council in recognising the problem some years ago instigated a number of schemes, most notably on parts of North Walney, Vulcan and Roosegate which incorporated the construction of in curtilage parking in the late 1980s early 1990s. These schemes were funded by specific grants being made available by Central Government at the time.

Since then the Housing Service had only completed small scale parking improvements on a one off basis, such as extending existing parking spaces or creating new parking bays. These had generally been funded from the Area Improvement Budget which was directed by the Tenants' Forum.

In response to the problem of parking, some residents had also created in curtilage parking and this had been going on for sometime so in many areas there were examples of off-street parking.

Cumbria County Council was the Highway Authority. Should a resident in the Borough want to create in curtilage parking in most circumstances it would require the Highway Authority's approval to cross the public highway - a Highways Act 1980 Sections 171 and 184 Notice. It may also be necessary for the applicant to seek planning permission and in some instances the previous landlords consent should there be a restrictive covenant on in curtilage parking.

Following discussion with the County Council their correspondence to applicants does now make these requirements clear.

The County Council procedure does also now include checking with the Housing Service when they received an application concerning a property on a Council estate. In many instances the land to be crossed, pavement and grass verge, had been adopted so the Borough Council had more limited powers to refuse such a request, unless the Borough Council was the landowner beneath the Highway.

In approving an application to construct a Domestic Vehicular Crossing (Highways Act 1980 Sections 171 and 184) the County Council would confirm their agreement for a pavement crossing to be created. In doing so they required specific conditions to be fulfilled by the applicant and they also accepted future responsibility for the integrity of the crossing.

It was the case, however, that in some instances the green verges were in the ownership of the Borough Council and/or were not adopted highway. It was also the feature of some estates that green space was incorporated in the design of estate, no doubt as amenity space and which was a feature of the street scene.

As Members would recall, recently when advised of a request to create in curtilage parking, the hardstanding would of involved construction over a wide grassed area which had clearly been incorporated in the estate design. The Assistant Director - Housing declined the request over the Council owned land and following a request to

review the decision through the Councils democratic decision making process, the original decision was endorsed.

This provided a clear Policy statement on which to respond to future requests and was the basis of the Policy and Procedures which were attached as Appendix B to the report which sought to confirm the Policy decision and the basis on which the Procedure would be implemented in the future.

In considering the procedure note the Assistant Director - Housing made the following comments:

- The design of estates did not generally include provision for parking which had caused problems as the level of vehicle ownership had increased;
- Following consideration of the matter referred to above and following discussion with Members the Assistant Director - Housing was clear the decision was influenced by the motive to “protect green space”;
- In the majority of instances the allowing of off street parking does contribute to reducing the parking and congestion problems on estate roads and to potentially improve safety for pedestrians and other car users;
- Whilst the Assistant Director - Housing had not completed an estate by estate survey to identify the congestion on estate roads, he stated there was sufficient anecdotal evidence to suggest it was a feature of many estates and assuming a continued increase in vehicle ownership would be a growing problem;
- From discussion with colleagues, it would also appear the case congestion could be influenced by location, for example near schools or other facilities which could lead to short term peaks and troughs in congestion. In others the level of ownership generally amongst residents was the route cause;
- In some instances applications for crossings were made by residents with a disability and should there be a restriction on approving such crossings it may have a detrimental impact on their potential ability to make access easier to the property;
- There were now materials available that would provide a vehicle crossing without changing the fundamental appearance of the area and allow grass to grow through, hence retaining a green area;
- Many estates did include areas of green space which the Assistant Director - Housing suggested where retained to enhance the appearance of areas;
- Where the Borough Council was the landowner, written permission would be required from Barrow Borough Council Housing Service;
- There were many locations in the Borough with pavement crossings. If adopted Highway the approval process to cross it was with the Highway Authority although more recently the Highway Authority were sharing such applications with the Housing Service. In such instances the Council would have been declining such requests if the crossing also included a green area in the Housing Services ownership and was greater than one medium car length.

The problem was common across the majority of Council estates and realistically the Assistant Director - Housing would suggest the Housing Revenue Account was not sufficiently healthy for Members to consider highway improvements without it being to the detriment of maintaining and improving the fabric and structure of residential property.

In summary, the Assistant Director - Housing suggested the opportunity for the Housing Service to successfully resolve congestion problems was limited. Whilst the Council were not the Highway Authority it had been recognised in the past the Housing Service could help to reduce the problem, but was only able to do so by use of specific grant funding. The Assistant Director - Housing suggested the approach to carrying out further work to improve parking should continue to be delivered through the Area Improvement Budget.

The procedure note sought to acknowledge the problem of congestion on estates and contributed to resolving it whilst also acknowledging the approach “to protect green space” and direct Officers when receiving future request involving Council owned land.

### **Restrictive covenants**

It was also the case in some areas the sale of Council property included restrictive covenants to prevent the construction of garden fences to the front of properties and for parking vehicles within the curtilage without prior approval from the Council.

In practice, there were now areas of the Borough where the level of owner occupation exceeded the number of properties still in Council ownership.

From observation it was clear that in many areas, which were previously open plan, owners had constructed garden boundaries and created off street parking. This was not something to which the Housing Service had paid particular attention to over the years and in discussion with Housing Officers was not something that was raised as a concern by residents.

In the past, the Housing Service had also changed the appearance of the street scene of estates by providing boundary fencing to the front of properties. An example would be on parts of North Walney, in the Darent Avenue area.

The Assistant Director - Housing therefore suggested because of the time that had elapsed the approach to dealing with such requests should reflect what had happened over time.

Also if the vehicular crossing was on a classified road you would need planning permission before the Highway Authority was able to approve a crossing. If the crossing was within 10 metres of a junction then the application would also be refused (for reasons of safety).

The Assistant Director - Housing suggested going forward the Council do not object to requests to create in curtilage parking street parking, subject to any required crossing of land being progressed in accordance with the procedures agreed.

RECOMMENDED:- That the Executive Committee:-

1. Note the information contained in the report;
2. Confirm that in considering requests for crossing of land the Council's Policy was to "protect green space"; and
3. Agree the Procedure note attached as an appendix to the report on how this Policy should be implemented.

The meeting closed at 3.10 p.m.

## HOUSING MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION: 2014/2015

Performance Indicator	Actual 2012/13	Actual 2013/14	Actual 2014/15	Apr-June 2015	Apr-Sept 2015	Apr-Dec 2015	Apr-Mar 2016	Median
<b>£ Rents Collection</b>								
<b>£ Rent &amp; Service Charges due (exc Void)</b>	9,728,187	10,687,981	11,101,931	2,824,172	5,716,613	8,567,982	£11,408,078	£11,330,627
<b>£ Rent collected (CT)</b>	9,604,739	10,482,254	11,059,494	2,698,430	5,605,767	8,383,633	£11,267,074	£11,276,240
Rent collected as % of rent due (exc ft)	98.73%	98.08%	99.62%	95.55%	98.06%	97.85%	98.76%	99.52%
£ Current Arrears Adjusted (dwellings)	£203,623	£370,804	£395,657	£474,885	£411,847	£452,811	£372,513	£191,488
£ Former Arrears Adjusted (dwellings)	£135,745	£162,969	£192,359	£220,552	£233,206	£252,032	£228,685	£135,968
Write Offs (Gross)	£38,573	£137,688	£130,795	£7,739	£40,059	£48,549	£105,959	£46,456
Tenants evicted for rent arrears	5	15	11	3	9	13	17	8
Current tenants arrears % of rent owed	2.1%	3.5%	3.6%	4.2%	3.6%	4.0%	3.3%	1.7%
Former tenants arrears % of rent owed	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	2.1%	2.2%	2.0%	1.2%
£ Rent arrears Garages	£1,452	£1,763	£2,769	£4,383	£3,839	£10,548	£2,355	£2,769
£ Rent Arrears Shops	£22,146	£15,464	£15,464	£3,536	£2,119	£6,689	£5,028	£2,119
<b>Void management</b>	2686	2677	2648	2647	2643	2640	2637	2643
<b>Tenancy Turnover %</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	7.12%
Total number of re-lets	245	340	324	68	135	208	254	N/A
No. of Terminations	270	344	287	71	135	198	267	N/A
Average relet time for dwellings (inc days spent in MW)	32	35	46	41	43	45	60	30
£ rent loss through vacant dwellings	£111,607	£165,336	£209,014	£34,662	£69,550	£112,144	£149,667	1.21%
£ rent loss due to vacant garages	£2,290	£2,157	£2,501	£363	£642	£944	£1,274	N/A
£ rent loss due to vacant shops	£5,000	£1,022	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	N/A
£ rent loss due to vacant dispersed	NA	NA	£25,358	£9,258	£19,754	£29,214	£34,891	N/A
% properties accepted on first offer	78.4%	76.5%	72.8%	58.6%	62.1%	61.0%	62.2%	
Loss per Void (Rents, Repairs, Arrears)	£ 2,684	£ 1,341	£ 1,512	£ 2,378	£ 2,573	£ 3,240	£2,597	N/A
<b>Maintenance</b>								
<b>No. Repair Orders issued (Tenant Demand)</b>	10,109	10,822	10,282	2,554	5,035	6,390	10,290	
Responsive & Void repairs per property	3.7	4.0	3.9	1.0	1.9	2.4	3.0	3.3
P1 & P2 as a % of total repairs	63.8%	63.0%	58.2%	51.1%	53.1%	57.1%	56.44%*	N/A
% all responsive repairs completed on time	77.1%	71.2%	78.4%	94.0%	91.5%	87.6%	86.6%*	N/A
P1 % emergency repairs completed on time	94.6%	89.0%	96.1%	98.7%	95.5%	97.1%	96.2%*	N/A
P2 % urgent repairs completed on time	77.3%	73.0%	78.4%	97.4%	90.5%	88.4%	86.8%*	N/A
Average end-to-end time for all reactive repairs (days)	19.78	17.46	16.48	7.55	9.24	12.72	15.81*	10.95
Percentage of repairs completed 'Right First Time'	79.79	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96.4%	90.9%
Appointments kept as a percentage of appointments made	61%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	88%	97.3%
Percentage of dwellings with a valid gas safety certificate	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.8%	100%	99.8%
Percentage of homes that fail to meet the Decent Homes Standard	0%	0%	0%	2.8%	2.9%	3.0%	0.5%	0.31%
*Average energy efficiency rating of dwellings (based on RD SAP 9.83)	69.2	69.2	69.2	69.4	69.4	69.4	69.4	67.90%

<b>Homeless</b>	<b>Actual 2012/13</b>	<b>Actual 2013/14</b>	<b>Actual 2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-June 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Sept 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Dec 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Mar 2015/16</b>
Homeless ave. days in temporary dispersed accommodation	57	56	52	44	53	69	70
Homeless ave. days in temporary B&B accommodation	27	35	36	24	20	25	22
Homeless Total Cases Closed	903	1078	755	264	481	722	894
Homeless Advice	408	187	178	64	116	173	227
Homeless Prevention	170	492	321	124	225	337	385
Homeless Applications	147	103	66	11	24	40	60
Homeless Successful Preventions	148	277	174	61	109	161	205
Eligible Homeless (Owed a full duty)	30	19	16	4	7	11	17
<b>Water Charge Collection</b>							
Direct Debit payers	260	758	765	771	784	794	793
Successful applications for Support Tariffs	68	124	510	496	489	511	570
<b>ASB Management</b>							
<b>ASB cases reported</b>	72	58	38	24	48	64	84
Percentage of closed ASB cases that were successfully resolved	99%	96%	100%	50%	80%	46%	78%
<b>Housing Register</b>	<b>Actual 2012/13</b>	<b>Actual 2013/14</b>	<b>Actual 2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-June 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Sept 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Dec 2015/16</b>	<b>Apr-Mar 2015/16</b>
Applicants on housing register							
Active Direct Applicants	1471	1162	1151	1242	1264	930	976
Active Transfer Applicants	346	286	270	273	281	211	223
Cumbria Choice Register	1817	1448	1421	1515	1545	1141	1199
<b>Satisfaction</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-June 2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-Sept 2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-Dec</b>	<b>Apr-Mar</b>
		£					
Percentage of tenants satisfied with the landlord's services overall	88%						90%
Percentage of tenants satisfied with repairs and maintenance	87%						91%
Percentage of tenants satisfied that their views are taken into account	78%						80%
Percentage of tenants satisfied with the quality of the home	90						91%
Percentage of residents satisfied with the neighbourhood as a place to live	84%						86%
Percentage of tenants satisfied that their rent provides value for money	90%						88%
Percentage of tenants satisfied that their service charges provide value for money	81%						83%
<b>Housing Stock</b>							
Houses	1284	1274	1263	1262	1258	1256	1252
Flats	1245	1247	1229	1229	1228	1228	1224
Bungalows	157	157	156	156	156	156	156
<b>Total Dwellings</b>	<b>2687</b>	<b>2678</b>	<b>2648</b>	<b>2647</b>	<b>2643</b>	<b>2640</b>	<b>2632</b>
Total Dispersed /Temporary Dwellings	10	8	10	10	11	11	15
Adelphi Court			12	12	12	12	12
Community Centres	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Leaseholds	204	205	208	208	208	208	208
Garages	486	486	489	489	489	489	489
Shops	20	19	19	19	19	19	19
<b>TOTAL PROPERTIES</b>	<b>3412</b>	<b>3401</b>	<b>3391</b>	<b>3390</b>	<b>3387</b>	<b>3384</b>	<b>3380</b>



<b>Sold Property / Land</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>Apr-June</b>	<b>Apr-Sept</b>	<b>Apr-Dec</b>	<b>Apr-Mar</b>
		£		2014/15	2014/15		2014/15
Houses	252,750	365,040	509,170	1	4	7	11
Flats	42,160	19,320	60,540	0	0	0	0
Bungalows	0	0	28,670	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	3,000	0	0	0	0
<b>TL</b>	<b>294,910</b>	384,360	601,380	49,350	164,780	296,510	£498,310

\* excludes Gas repairs

Relet & Terminations run from 1/4/15 to 31/3/16

## PLANNED INVESTMENTS 2015-16

SCHEME	PROCUREMENT TYPE	AVAILABLE BUDGET	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	ESTIMATED START DATE	ESTIMATED COMPL. DATE	CONTRACTOR	COMMENTS	Leasholders affected?
RE-ROOFING AND POINTING WORKS - ROOSEGATE ESTATE PHASE 2 (2-3 YEARS DELIVERY PLAN)	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£975,000	£551,162	26.5.2015	31.3.2016	DLP Roofing	70% COMPLETE	No
FLAT ROOF IMPROVEMENTS HINDPOOL AND EWAN CLOSE	ESTIMATES	£66,000	£67,385	01/07/2015	31.3.2016	CUMBRIA ROOFING	100% COMPLETE	Yes
RE-POINTING/RENDERING ORMSGILL ESTATE	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£538,000	£158,804	01/08/2015	31.3.2016	DLP Roofing	40% COMPLETE	No
EXTERNAL DOOR REPLACEMENTS - DALTON	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£30,000	£70,931	02/08/2015	31.3.2016	TOP NOTCH	100% COMPLETE	No
WINDOW REPLACEMENTS VARIOUS HOUSING AREAS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£504,000	£507,773	02/08/2015	31.3.2016	TOP NOTCH	100% COMPLETE	No
COMMUNAL ENTRANCE PAINTING - CENTRAL	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£37,000	£55,451	01/11/2015	31.3.2016	GEORGE JONES	100% COMPLETE	Yes
GARAGE IMPROVEMENTS	CUMBRIA ROOFING	£88,000	£78,651	02/08/2015	31.3.2016	CUMBRIA ROOFING	100% COMPLETE	No
REWIRES	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£255,000	£317,909	01/04/2015	31.3.2016	K WILSON	100% COMPLETE	No
BATHROOMS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£180,000	£192,556	01/04/2015	31.3.2016	AB MITCHELL	100% COMPLETE	No
KITCHENS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£125,000	£95,530	01/04/2015	31.3.2016	AB MITCHELL	100% COMPLETE	No
HEATING	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£455,000	£432,380	01/04/2015	31.3.2016	AB MITCHELL	100% COMPLETE	No
PAINTING	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£250,000	£111,741	01/04/2015	31.3.2016	G JONES	100% COMPLETE	Yes

## HOUSING MAINTENANCE COMMITMENTS 2015-16

	Funding Available 2015-16	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	Weekly Available	Gross Comm. as a % funds available
Tenant Demand Repairs	£1,070,200	£1,528,554	£20,581	143%
Voids	£400,355	£721,789	£7,699	180%
Gas Servicing	£195,392	£169,471	£3,758	87%
Decoration Vouchers	£30,000	£29,837	£577	99%
Environmental Impmts	£25,000	£21,819	£481	87%
Disabled Adaptations	£100,000	£126,342	£1,923	126%
Electrical Testing	£81,000	£90,575	£1,558	112%
Door Entry Maintenance	£20,000	£22,260	£385	111%

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(D) Agenda Item 6</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	

**Title: Review of Council Housing Service**

**Summary and Conclusions:**

The purpose of this Report is to agree a review of the Council's Housing Service to have regard to the various challenges being imposed on it by legislative changes.

**Recommendations:**

Members are recommended to:

1. Note the information contained in the report.
2. For the Officers to continue to identify the financial impacts on the Council as guidance comes available.
3. A Working Group consisting of your Housing Spokesperson and two other councillors and a tenant representative be formed with the remit of developing a medium term Financial Strategy for the HRA.
4. A sum of £10k be made available to the Working Group to explore the options and benefits of alternative models of ownership and delivery should it be required.

**Background**

In agreeing the Housing Revenue Account for 2016/17, I highlighted a number of factors that would impact financially on the Service. The Budget was presented and agreed on the basis of no growth "in anticipation that we will have to consider and plan for the changes".

The HRA budget was set at £10,304,988, £197k less than we had expected before the 1% rent reduction was imposed. This reduction in income was dealt with by various cost savings measures including savings in establishment costs through voluntary redundancy and adjusting the Maintenance Budget for the year.

The 1% rent reduction will have to be applied each year for the next three years and there are a number of other changes which are likely to have a financial impact.

Unfortunately, I cannot yet establish the impact of other changes, some of which will have direct financial consequences and others that I suspect will have indirect financial impacts.

However, I would suggest the changes taken together necessitates the Council to consider the future delivery of Housing Services going forward and consider whether the Council's HRA will remain viable whilst providing the quality of services required by the Council.

### **Report**

For the purpose of clarity I have listed below the significant changes which will impact on the HRA and our provision of services.

The key changes I would draw to your attention are as follows.

1. 1% rent reduction for next three years. (Welfare Reform and Work act 2015)  
Referred to above the reduction this year was c£197k in cash terms. However, if in following years inflation pushes CPI up to 1.5% the loss will be between £1.9m and £2.6m over the four years. Should inflation remain low, even if the loss of income remains around c£200k, operational changes will be required to deal with this reduction in income.
2. Tenants changing to Universal Credit, being responsible for paying rent themselves will have an impact. It is likely Officers will have to spend more of their time trying to recover rent with a probable increase in arrears reflected by reduction in income, increased cost of bad debt provision.
3. Other changes in benefits including:
  - Freezing working age benefits, tax credits and Local Housing Allowance for four years from 2016/17.
  - Ending automatic entitlement to Housing Benefit for under 21s.
  - Reducing benefit cap to £23k.
  - Housing Benefit to be capped at Local Housing Allowance Levels from April 2017 on all tenancies commencing after 2016.
  - Housing costs to be limited to Shared Room Rate for all single tenants under 35, this is less than our lowest rent.
4. The Levy on High Value Homes. The Government will estimate the value expected from each authority from the sale of high value homes and will require payment of this sum. Details of the mechanism are still awaited.

5. Pay to Stay: Councils must set higher rents for households on higher incomes, earning more than £31k per year. Additional income will be returned to the Treasury. Council will be able to deduct reasonable costs for administration and, in first year only, have to pay “what is collected”, although details still awaited.
6. Fixed term Tenancies: Authorities will be required to grant new tenancies on a fixed term, set between two and 10 years with some variation for families with children under nine. At the end of the term the authority will be required to review and decide whether to offer a new tenancy in the same or a different property.
7. Reduced Succession Rights, for example the successor will get a fixed term tenancy.

These are complex changes and their full effect is difficult to predict. However it is clear that they will have a negative effect on HRA income. There is evidence that some of these changes are already having an impact, for example RTB applications – whilst still at relatively low numbers have increased significantly with virtually all applications being for 2+ bed properties.

Taken together these changes and their likely impact on HRA revenue streams represent a significant challenge for the Housing Service and may put its viability into question in the longer term unless action is taken to reduce HRA costs over the next two/three years.

### **Responding to the Challenges**

In presenting this Report, I do not want to appear “alarmist”, however, the Council does need to plan for these changes. Without doubt there will be an impact on income, managing tenancies will become focused on collecting rent and letting empty property. “Pay to Stay” may lead some tenants to exercise Right to Buy thus reducing the rent base further and most likely consolidating the % of our stock in one-bed flats which generate least income and most expenditure.

You will be aware colleagues are currently progressing the implementation of a new IT system. This will provide an opportunity for Officers to consider our method of delivery with the objective of maintaining and improving services with a regard to doing so more efficiently than now.

There maybe some scope in looking to re-profile our mortgages, c.£21m to reduce the payment profile, but this would also involve consideration of the impact on service delivery and could not be looked at in isolation.

The Housing Service will continue to generate efficiencies and implement savings where opportunities arise. It is clear however that current measures will be insufficient to meet the HRA financial challenges and the Council needs to develop a Business Plan and Financial Strategy for the next three to five years, to provide a sustainable operating cost/structure for the HRA in the longer term.

This will require consideration of options open to the Council for the management and ownership of its stock. It is some years since this Council completed a stock options appraisal but some form of alternative arrangements are still available. Further work would be required to explore whether the Council's stock portfolio would be attractive to other registered landlords but consideration could be given to.

1. Stock Transfer

Agreement of tenants would be required but there are various options available to the Council to consider whether a stock transfer should be considered.

2. External management

To consider whether to tender the services to the market place to provide the same or better service at reduced cost.

Should consideration of the above be progressed, any changes will take sometime to implement and action is required to ensure a workable HRA for the next few years.

To move the matter forward I would ask Members to agree your Housing Spokesperson and two other Councillors to reflect proportionality, together with a Tenant Forum representative meet with Officers to develop a medium term financial strategy for the HRA.

(i) Legal Implications

These will become clearer when detailed guidance is issued, for example, changes to the Tenancy Agreement.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The report highlights factors which will, or are likely to impact on the income to the HRA. It recommends a course of action to prepare for the reduction of income.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no detrimental impact the built environment or public realm.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(D) Agenda Item 7</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Tenant Involvement Strategy</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
The purpose of this report is to share with you the revised Community Involvement Strategy 2016 – 2018.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to note the revised strategy.	

**Report**

The purpose of this report is to share with you the revised Community Involvement Strategy 2016 -2018.

This strategy sets out the commitment of Barrow Borough Council Housing Department to involve customers in developing and improving the services they receive.

The strategy, which is attached at **Appendix A** was drafted by the Community Involvement Manager in consultation with involved tenants, residents, Elected Members and staff, and replaces the previous strategy.

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The recommendation has no financial implications.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no implications.



(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(D) Agenda Item 8</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Sponsorship of the Housing Annual Garden Competition 2016</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
<p>The purpose of this report is to provide Members with information the Housing Service has been approached by Crookland's Garden Centre at Dalton expressing an interest in being the overall sponsor for this years Annual Garden Competition.</p>	
<p>Members will be aware the Housing Annual Garden Competition is a successful event which has been running for many years. The competition covers all our Council estate within the borough and in recent years we have rolled it out to include all the primary schools in the area.</p>	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. note information within the report; and</li><li>2. agree the Housing Service work with Crooklands Garden Centre to sponsor the event and assist with judging of this year's entries.</li></ol>	

**Report**

The Housing Service have organised the Council's annual garden competition for nearly 30 years. The competition is a huge success and definitely helps encourage residents to maintain their gardens to a good standard which impacts on the overall appearance of estates. The presentation awards ceremony is always well attended by tenants, residents and local primary school children.

However over recent years due to the financial climate it has proved extremely difficult to attract sponsorship from local businesses to assist with purchasing prizes, trophies and financing the presentation event. A considerable amount of Officer's time is spent contacting local businesses to try and encourage sponsorship and also organising the event and taking time to carryout the judging across the Borough.

This year the Housing Service has been approached by the owner of Crookland's Garden Centre, Dalton expressing an interest in sponsoring all of the prizes for this year's event and also taking on the role of judging all the garden entries. Attracting an overall sponsor would save a lot of officers' time in trying to secure sponsorship and also assistance with the judging by a local garden centre would give an added professional approach to the competition.

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The recommendation has no financial implications.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no implications.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(D) Agenda Item 9</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Disabled Adaptations: Cumbria Housing Partners- Contractor Selection Procedure</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
The purpose of this report is to note the appointment of suitably qualified and experienced contractor from the 2014 Cumbria Housing Partner's (CHP) framework to undertake adaptations to the Council's social housing stock.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to note the selection criteria adopted by Procure Plus and the subsequent appointment of Top Notch Contractors as the Council's preferred contractor to undertake disabled adaptations via the 2014 CHP framework.	

### **Background**

The purpose of this report is to update members regarding the continuing utilisation of the Cumbria Housing Partner's (CHP) framework as our preferred investment delivery model and note the evaluation of contractors listed for disabled adaptations on the new 2014 CHP framework.

At the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2014, Members agreed to the Council's membership of CHP and its commitment to deliver investments in line with other member organisations.

Officers can advise Members that the contract award falls within delegation requirements and that the tendering procedure exempt from the Council's Standing Orders is as outlined in S.16.

### **Report**

Officers advise that the existing CHP framework recently expired and has been replaced with new CHP framework that runs until 2018. As part of our membership of CHP the Council is required to re-evaluate and re-appoint suitably qualified and experienced contractor capable of delivering disabled adaptations from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016.

The new OJEU compliant framework has been prepared on behalf of CHP by Procure Plus and a partner company called "Realize". The new framework identifies a range of key work streams that are broken down between internal and external housing components and includes disabled adaptations. It also separates out the various services provided by contractors and suppliers.

Officers can advise Members that there are several locally based contractors on the new CHP framework and are, along with other contractors, eligible for selection to undertake disabled adaptations using one of the following methods;

- a. Direct call off
- b. Mini competition

### **Direct call off procedure**

This procedure allows landlords to directly select a contractor within a particular work stream based on the original OJEU evaluation procedure that takes account of the contractor's cost and quality submissions.

### **Mini competition**

This procedure allows landlords to evaluate contractors using a range of pre determined assessment criterion that may vary from landlord to landlord.

Officers can advise members that a mini competition was completed in July 2016 using the following assessment criteria:

#### **1. Written submission**

Contractors will be required to answer questions covering the following areas:

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Customer Satisfaction	20%
Equality and Diversity	5%
Service Delivery	20%
Health, Safety and Environmental	6%
Local and Social Skills Benefits	9%

This section of the assessment will contribute **60%** to the total mark.

#### **2. Pricing document**

Contractors will be required to submit rates to carry out the works. Please note these rates will be fixed for this particular scheme and will be open for acceptance for 48 months.

This section of the assessment will contribute **40%** to the total mark.

### 3. Preferred contractor(s) status Pricing document

Seven contractors from the CHP framework were invited to participate in the mini competition for the disabled adaptations in Barrow.

The results of the disabled adaptation mini competition are summarised in the report from Procure Plus - a copy of which has been placed in the Members' Room and is available on request from the Maintenance and Asset Manager.

The report confirms the appointment of contractor Top Notch who provided the most competitively advantageous tender based on the mini competition scoring criteria. A summary of the results is given below:

Company	Cost	Cost Score %	Written Score	Total
Contractor 6	£ 9,270.32	39	47	87
Contractor 4	£ 9,108.22	40	41	81
Contractor 3	£ 11,561.37	32	48	79
Contractor 7	£ 12,575.83	29	46	75
Contractor 2	£ 11,847.15	31	44	75
Contractor 1	£ 14,211.40	26	47	72
Contractor 5	£ 15,609.60	23	43	66

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

An agreed budget is included in the Maintenance Budget to complete this work.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no detrimental impact the built environment or public realm.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

## Background Papers

Procure Plus report dated August 2015 ref "MC0112 Tender Report". A copy of this report has been placed in the Members' Room and is available on request from the Maintenance and Asset Manager

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(R) Agenda Item 10</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Fencing on Council Estates</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
The purpose of this Report is to confirm the Council's approach to providing fencing on Council estates	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to agree the draft Policy and Procedures attached at <b>Appendix B.</b>	

**Background**

The purpose of this Report is to confirm the Council's Policy and procedures for the provision of fencing on Council estates. Its aim is to clarify the approach of Officers in developing future plans for investment for fencing and how Officers respond to requests from residents that arise. The Report is based on practice that has developed over time and has been influenced by various ad hoc discussions and decisions of the HMF.

**Current Practice**

- Resources available: The Council sets an annual HRA budget which includes monies specifically for the maintenance of the housing stock. The Maintenance budget includes an identified sum for fencing as it does for all aspects of expenditure from this budget. The position is, therefore, on an annual basis the Council determines the resources and priority it affords to completing fencing works whilst having regard to other competing maintenance priorities. We continue to follow the principle that all properties should meet the Decent Homes Standard and, as such, fencing generally is a lower priority than keeping property "wind, water tight and with modern facilities".
- Making best use of resources: The preferred approach to investment in fencing has been to target schemes on a geographical basis to maximise the improved visual aspect new fencing provides for individual residents and the wider community. For example, over the recent past the Forum has prioritised new fencing on the flats in Ormsgill, rear fencing at Vulcan and Roosegate estates, fencing at Roosegate flats to complement the external works now completed



and to continue on Roosegate to complete end of garden fencing to again complement the ongoing external works on the estate.

- Fencing to individual properties: only a limited service is provided as follows:
  - Ad hoc fencing at the discretion of the Tenancy Services team. This is normally only considered when a property borders a highway and fencing has been provided previously.
  - Void property again ad hoc and at the discretion of the tenancy Services Team when the absence of fencing is a detriment to the re-letting process.

In the above circumstances the Housing Officer would have regard to the location and standard of fencing at adjoining properties.

- In partnership with Community Payback fencing to individual gardens for tenants assessed as vulnerable, the service funds supervision through the tenants' area improvement budget, with material costs being met from the general Maintenance budget.

### **Standards for fencing**

Over a number of years we have specified "green powder coated" metal fencing, for area based schemes the height of which is determined by location. Such fencing is generally well received and there appears little objection to such fencing when consultation is carried out prior to work commencing.

The advantage of metal fencing is that it is maintenance free with a long life.

For individual gardens, such as one-offs as described above, the more common material is timber, at a height which reflects the surrounding area.

### **Requests for fencing areas for the 'first time'**

From time to time we receive requests for fencing in areas which have not previously been fenced - normally on areas which were originally designed as open plan.

Our general approach is only to provide fencing at locations which have historically had fencing. This has been complicated to some degree because of the mix of owner occupied and tenanted property on estates. So for instance many estates which were open plan now have fencing which has been constructed by owners. Our approach has been not to look to challenge such fencing. However, should a request be made by a "tenant" our approach would be to not agree fencing as it was not previously a feature of the property. This is based on the principle that to carryout such work on ad hoc properties could not be replicated elsewhere because of the extent of open plan and therefore the costs involved weighed against other maintenance priorities.

Generally on areas which predominantly consist of flats, even if a tenant offered to pay for the fencing we would not allow the provision of new fencing where it has not existed previously.

### **General comments**

The text provides an overview of our approach for fencing. We have not carried out a recent detailed survey of fencing across the stock and would suggest it is probably not worth the expense to do so. With regards deciding on areas to target work in a planned manner, such priorities are determined by the Tenants' Forum, discussion with Housing Officers and formalised through the Housing Management Forum. More recently it has also been influenced by other external works, such as the re-rendering of properties, to add value to such schemes. I have no reason to suggest we should change this approach.

What has added complexity to the completion of planned fencing, and sometimes fencing to individual properties, has been caused by the mixed tenure nature of estates. It is not our practice to provide fencing to owner occupied properties unless the owner pays their proportion of the cost of such work, which generally does not happen. This can detract from the overall image of some planned schemes, but could only be overcome if it was agreed to complete such work for the sake of creating a uniform appearance in such areas.

The Tenants' Forum has an annual budget of £25k to spend on small environmental schemes which they identify. Such schemes should be for the benefit of the "community" rather than an "individual" and could include fencing.

### **Summary**

I would suggest from anecdotal evidence the provision of fencing is valued by tenants. It also serves a vital purpose ranging from the marking of boundaries, from a safety and crime prevention perspective through to enhancing the environmental appearance of an area.

When considering service standards, we do have regard to the evidence we gather from the STAR survey, the most recent being 2015. Unfortunately "fencing" is not a sub question on the survey but perhaps when a future survey is completed we could explore whether it could be included. However, it is clear from the survey that the majority of tenants are very or fairly satisfied with the quality of their home (91%). The repairs service is identified as one of the "key drivers" of satisfaction and, as such, it is appropriate to ensure the Council's approach to fencing is defined by policy and appropriate procedures are in place.

Draft Policy and Procedures are attached at **Appendix B**.

#### (i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The recommendation has no financial implications.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no implications.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(D) Agenda Item 11</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Adaptations to Council Property</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
To note the costs of completing the above works.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. note the increase in cost to complete the work at this property; and</li><li>2. note and agree Officers do not delay unnecessarily the progress of adaptations should the budget of £100k be exceeded and note the action they will take to deal with any potential overspends.</li></ol>	

**Report**

At your meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016 the Forum considered an adaptation for an existing tenant who required the provision of ground floor facilities.

Unfortunately their existing home was a mid terrace house and to adapt the property to reflect their needs would not have been ideal.

It was agreed to offer the family the opportunity to move to an alternative property nearby which was an end terrace and, as such, provided more opportunity to complete a satisfactory adaptation.

The family have now moved into the property.

At the time of the decision it was estimated the cost of the adaptation would be in the region of £40k.

However, following detailed specifications being drafted, and four contractors being asked to submit prices for the work, they have now been received and range from between c£47k to c£53k.

Officers are currently considering the most appropriate submission to accept.

As you are aware there have been a few large adaptations this year which when completed may put strain on the adaptations budget. Generally all adaptation requests are scrutinised and only completed when appropriate. Adaptations are demand led so the number and costs can vary. Officers will continue to progress such requests but I would suggest should not delay progressing an adaptation if we start to exceed the original budget of £100k.

Should the expenditure exceed this, however, officers will look to fund the difference from underspend within the Maintenance budget or consider seeking additional funding when the likely expenditure for the year becomes known.

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The report suggests flexibility being adopted should the previously agreed budget for adaptations looks likely to be exceeded.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no, minor or significant implications.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(R) Agenda Item 12</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Roosegate Estate External Works</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
The purpose of this report is to suggest additional funding be provided to continue the Roosegate Refurbishment Scheme to the end of the financial year, on the basis that the final phase will commence in April, 2017.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to agree:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. the final phase to refurbish 35 properties on Roosegate be agreed for the year 2017/18; and</li><li>2. reserves are made available to ensure continuation of the scheme between December 2016 and April 2017 if needs arise.</li></ol>	

### **Report**

As you will be aware, external repairs and improvements have been carried out on the Roosegate estate for the last two years. It was recognised when we commenced work on the estate that it would take a number of years to complete. The Council's preferred CHP contractor is presently in the process of completing Phase 3 of the estate.

In the current year we have agreed a timetable with the contractor to complete works by the end of the calendar year.

There will remain however 35 properties that require the same works during the next financial year 2017/18.

I would like to work towards ensuring there is no time gap between completing this year's work and commencing the final phase in April, 2017 and request Members agree one of the following two options:

Option 1: Slow down the current year's programme to allow the contractor to remain on site between December 2016 and April 2017.

Option 2: Provide an additional £170,000 funding from Reserves to complete approximately 10 additional properties between December 2016 and April 2017.

In order to minimise disruption to tenants on the Roosegate estate, officers suggest Members agree to Option 2 above and agree to the release monies from reserves if needs arise.

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The report looks to identify new funding could be made available to ensure continuation of the delivery of works between when the current phase is scheduled to be completed and the start of the next financial year by use of Reserves, if required.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no implications.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

Nil

<b>HOUSING MANAGEMENT FORUM</b>	<b>(R) Agenda Item 13</b>
<b>Date of Meeting: 25th August, 2016</b>	
<b>Reporting Officer: Colin Garnett, Assistant Director - Housing</b>	
<b>Title: Cumbria Choice: Choice-Based Lettings Scheme - Update</b>	
<b>Summary and Conclusions:</b>	
The purpose of this report is to provide you with an update on the Review of the Cumbria-wide Choice Based Lettings Scheme – Cumbria Choice.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
Members are asked to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. note the content of the report; and</li><li>2. agree the final draft of the Review of the Allocation Policy which forms the operating basis for Cumbria Choice.</li></ol>	

**Report**

The purpose of this report is to provide you with an update on the progress of the Review of the Cumbria-wide Choice Based Lettings (CBL) Policy.

As you will be aware the Cumbria Choice County-wide CBL Scheme has been in operation since April 2011. The partnership agreed a full review would take place of the CBL policy within the first 12 months of implementation which was completed and a further review has been carried out in 2016.

The Project Board commissioned Housing Quality Network (HQN) Equality & Diversity consultant Chris Root to carry out a detailed equality impact assessment of the Cumbria-wide CBL Policy which involved:

- A review of the existing CBL Equality Impact Assessment
- Analysis of CBL application form and CBL Policy review with outcomes reported to the Project Board to feed into and form an integral part of the policy review
- A new reviewed Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) of the CBL Policy



The Project Board organised a Policy Review meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2016 which was attended by all partners and representatives from the Tenants' Panel. The work carried out by HQN was fed into the Review to ensure any amendments reflected issues identified and to ensure the policy takes due regard to accessibility for all groups.

The draft review policy has been out to a four-week public consultation which closed on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2016. During this period letters were sent out to all Stakeholders advising on how to access the online consultation. The proposed changes were highlighted in a summary on the Cumbria Choice and the Housing Service's websites.

The Housing Service's website has a section entitled 'How to Apply for Council Accommodation' which has up to date information on the Project which includes a copy of the draft review policy. A Summary of Changes to Bands in Choice-Based Allocations Policy is attached at **Appendix C**.

(i) Legal Implications

The recommendation has no legal implications.

(ii) Risk Assessment

The recommendation has no implications.

(iii) Financial Implications

The recommendation has no financial implications.

(iv) Health and Safety Implications

The recommendation has no implications.

(v) Equality and Diversity

The recommendation has no detrimental impact on service users showing any of the protected characteristics under current Equalities legislation.

(vi) Health and Well-being Implications

The recommendation has no adverse effect on the Health and Wellbeing of users of this service.

Background Papers

A copy of the final draft can be viewed online  
([www.barrowbc.gov.uk/residents/council-housing/council-accommodation](http://www.barrowbc.gov.uk/residents/council-housing/council-accommodation))

## Barrow Borough Council - Housing Department

# COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY 2016 - 2018



### 1. Introduction

This Community Involvement Strategy sets out the commitment of Barrow Borough Council's Housing Department to involve customers in developing and improving the services they receive.

The vision of the Housing Department is to *"Provide well-maintained homes and estates where people choose to live"*.

This Strategy sets out how the Housing Department intend to achieve this vision by delivering a number of Strategic Aims.

### 2. Background

This Strategy has been developed to provide a framework for delivering priorities for the Housing Department, in order to be as effective as possible in involving customers in the delivery and improvement of its housing services.

The Strategy has been developed using a partnership between Housing staff and a focus group of customers and represents the views of that partnership. The focus group was made up from a diverse range of customers and included tenants, residents and leaseholders. The customers who took part in the focus group were all current representatives through Tenants' and Residents' Association's or Street Voice.

### 3. Definitions

"Customer" has been defined as being "anyone who accesses our services". This will include tenants, leaseholders, applicants, service users, clients and residents living in the areas in which the Housing Department is operating.

"Involvement" has been defined as "any way in which customers can actively share their views, opinions, experiences and priorities to influence decision making and service delivery within the Housing Department".

### 4. Purpose & Benefits

Customer Involvement has the potential to deliver a number of benefits to the Housing Department which are summarised below:

- Continuous improvement;
- Enhanced customer satisfaction;
- Greater transparency and accountability;
- Shared local knowledge;
- Greater ability to meet the needs of customers;
- More successful and sustainable communities;
- Customers with improved skills, knowledge and prospects;
- Greater customer confidence with our service delivery.

In 2012 the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) became the social housing regulator. The regulatory framework is set around a number of standards and the principle of co-regulation, encouraging providers to undertake robust self-regulation which incorporates effective tenant involvement.

One of the regulatory standards is the Tenant Involvement and Empowerment Standard. This standard has three strands which are shown below:

**i) Customer service, choice and complaints**

*Registered providers shall:*

- (a) provide choices, information and communication that is appropriate to the diverse needs of their tenants in the delivery of all standards*
- (b) have an approach to complaints that is clear, simple and accessible that ensures that complaints are resolved promptly, politely and fairly.*

**ii) Involvement and empowerment**

*Registered providers shall ensure that tenants are given a wide range of opportunities to influence and be involved in:*

- (a) the formulation of their landlord's housing related policies and strategic priorities*
- (b) the making of decisions about how housing related services are delivered, including the setting of service standards*
- (c) the scrutiny of their landlord's performance and the making of recommendations to their landlord about how performance might be improved*
- (d) the management of their homes, where applicable*
- (e) the management of repair and maintenance services, such as commissioning and undertaking a range of repair tasks, as agreed with landlords, and the sharing in savings made, and*
- (f) agreeing local offers for service delivery.*

**iii) Understanding and responding to the diverse needs of tenants**

*Registered providers shall:*

- (a) treat all tenants with fairness and respect*
- (b) demonstrate that they understand the different needs of their tenants, including in relation to the equality strands and tenants with additional support needs.*

This Strategy has been developed to reflect the current standards, and the Housing Department's approach to involvement will continue to be reviewed against the HCA requirements and guidelines.

## 5. Strategic Aims

Barrow Borough Council Housing Department recognises the importance of customer involvement, whether by formal or informal means. The Department continues to develop a culture that embraces customer challenge and actively seeks opportunities to increase customer influence within all aspects of its operation.

The aims of the Community Involvement Strategy are:

- AIM ONE** Provide a range of involvement opportunities to give customers a choice to become involved in a way and at a level that is comfortable for them.
- AIM TWO** Provide a range of methods to keep customers informed about decisions, plans and changes that affect them, and opportunities for them to shape services.
- AIM THREE** Maximise the potential for customers to influence services by involving them meaningfully in all areas and stages of decision making.
- AIM FOUR** Build customer and community capacity to influence service delivery.
- AIM FIVE** Achieve high levels of customer satisfaction and deliver value for money.

## 6. Existing Involvement Structure

Barrow Borough Council Housing Department currently offers a number of ways in which customers can become involved. The different activities and levels have been categorised and are summarised below:

### (a) Information

- Newsletter to all tenants
- Annual performance report
- Website
- Leaflets, posters, flyers
- Letters, policies and procedures.

### (b) Consultation and Involvement

- Service specific and STAR surveys.
- Comments, complaints and compliments.
- Estate walkabouts.
- Focus groups.

### (c) Influence

- Tenant Forum
- Housing Management Forum
- Tenant and Resident Groups
- Service specific decisions – contractor selection, procurement
- Tenant Inspectors
- Scrutiny Panel.
- Complaints Panel.

## 7. Priorities for Action

This section evaluates the Housing Department's position under each of the strategic aims and identifies the priorities for action required to deliver that aim.

AIMS	Where we are	Our Priorities
<b>AIM ONE</b> <b>Provide a range of involvement opportunities to give customers a choice to become involved in a way and at a level that is comfortable for them.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers have a choice of how they can get involved in a number of ways and levels, which are set out in section 6, above.</li> <li>• The Housing Department provides a wide range of support to enable all customers to participate in involvement, examples of which include, travel and childcare expenses, translation of documents and documents/leaflets/newsletters in large print.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use profile data to identify which groups are under-represented and target involvement activities accordingly.</li> <li>• Explore further opportunities for involving customers in a variety of ways including through use of electronic media.</li> <li>• Ensure that the range and nature of involvement opportunities offered makes involvement accessible and meaningful to the full range of customers.</li> </ul>
<b>AIM TWO</b> <b>Provide a range of methods to keep customers informed about decisions, plans and changes that affect them, and opportunities for them to shape services.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual performance reports are distributed to all tenants.</li> <li>• Key information affecting customers is publicised in our newsletters and on our website.</li> <li>• Involvement opportunities are promoted through our newsletter, website, leaflets/posters/flyers and through our TRA's.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver information on involvement opportunities to new tenants during the post tenancy visit which is carried out six weeks after moving in.</li> <li>• Display minutes of recent meetings of the all Forums in the reception area.</li> <li>• Review the presentation of the published menu of involvement opportunities which appears in the Newsletter.</li> </ul>
<b>AIM THREE</b> <b>Maximise the potential for customers to influence services by involving them meaningfully in all areas and stages of decision making.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers are involved throughout major procurement decisions for services affecting them, including the major repairs contract.</li> <li>• Customer facing policies and strategies are developed in conjunction with the Tenant Forum.</li> <li>• Feedback about services is gathered using surveys and used to shape those services in the future.</li> <li>• Customer feedback is obtained on repairs, which is used to address poor performance by specific contractors.</li> <li>• Communities and potential customers are engaged in the development and delivery of projects.</li> <li>• Customers influence governance through the Housing Management Forum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance scrutiny arrangements to review services and make reasonable recommendations for improvements.</li> <li>• Continue to publish a menu of opportunities for involvement in the newsletter.</li> <li>• All tenants are consulted on work carried out on their homes and particularly major works.</li> </ul>
<b>AIM FOUR</b> <b>Build customer and community capacity to influence service delivery.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training is provided to customers to allow them to be involved more effectively.</li> <li>• Estate walkabouts allow customers to identify improvements to neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Specific customer groups influence service delivery.</li> <li>• Local events arranged by tenant groups allow staff to engage with the community at different levels and exchange feedback and information on an informal basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide key skills to tenants who participate in the Tenants' Forum process.</li> <li>• Evaluate the effectiveness of training annually.</li> <li>• Use events more effectively to obtain feedback on services.</li> <li>• Consult and agree with customers local standards, where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>AIM FIVE</b> <b>Achieve high levels of customer satisfaction and deliver value for money.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAR Surveys are used to measure the level of satisfaction with involvement.</li> <li>• Involvement surveys are used to identify which methods of involvement are of interest to customers and where improvements can be made.</li> <li>• Partnership arrangements are used to share the cost of staging involvement opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark costs and performance in Customer Involvement against others in the sector to identify areas of potential improvement.</li> <li>• Formulate action plans to address any weaknesses identified through Impact Assessments, STAR surveys or other customer feedback.</li> </ul>

## **8. Service Standards**

The organisation has set challenging service standards following a consultation with customers. The following are those relating to Customer Involvement:

- We will consult on the drawing up and review of all policies and strategies.
- We will consult tenants in the development of improvement programmes.
- We will aim to ensure that our involvement profile is representative of our diverse customer base and target groups, where appropriate.
- We will clearly communicate the outcomes of involvement activities, so that customers are aware of how they have influenced service improvements.
- We will provide opportunities to develop their skills, knowledge and confidence.
- We will encourage customer involvement by supporting our Tenant and Resident Groups/Street Voices and by providing a budget for involvement activities.
- We will evaluate the impact of customer involvement with customers on an annual basis, publish the results in the Annual Report.

## **9. Performance Indicators**

The Housing Departments customer involvement performance will be measured against the following performance indicators.

- Number of formally involved customers.
- Last STAR (2015) result for keeping tenants informed was 83%. Our target is 84%.
- We hold regular meetings before every Housing Management Forum and an interim meeting in between.

## **10. Monitoring and Review**

The Strategy Action Plan sets out in detail how each of our priorities identified in section 6 above will be completed.

The Strategy Action Plan, Performance Indicators and Value for Money of the service will be monitored at least every six months by the Tenants' Forum.

The Community Involvement Strategy will be reviewed every two years by the Community Involvement Manager, other colleagues and representative customers.



## **Barrow Borough Council – Housing Department**

### **Policy and Procedures**

## **POLICY ON THE PROVISION OF FENCING**

### **1. SCOPE**

- 1.1 This Policy provides a statement on the approach to providing fencing on Council estates.
- 1.2 This Policy seeks to ensure investment in fencing contributes to a key objective of the Housing Service to provide “well maintained homes and estates where people choose to live”.

### **2. POLICY OBJECTIVE**

- 2.1 The Policy will ensure an appropriate priority is afforded to the investment in fencing having regard to competing objectives such as to keep all properties decent, and “wind and water tight with modern facilities”.
- 2.2 To ensure there is a structured approach to considering how monies for fencing are prioritised for planned maintenance and how fencing for individual properties will be considered.
- 2.3 To ensure it is clear how request for fencing of individual gardens will be considered.

### **3. RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS**

- 3.3 Housing officers, Housing Maintenance Team and Community Involvement Manager.

### **4. POLICY ARRANGEMENTS**

- 4.1 On an annual basis the HMF will consider and agree the amount of monies in the Maintenance budget targeted at fencing provision.
- 4.2 The preferred approach to fencing will be to deliver it on a planned basis.
- 4.3 “One-off” fencing requests will be completed following consideration by the Maintenance and/or Tenancy Services team and will be to repair or renew damaged fencing adjoining a highway, where the absence of such poses a risk, or on vacant property where not to do so would hamper the re-letting of the property.
- 4.4 When the option is available the Council will work in partnership with Community Payback by referring vulnerable tenants and funding the cost of Supervision and materials.
- 4.5 Fencing will not be provided in normal circumstance on a one off basis for individual tenants other than the above instances.

- 4.6 No fencing will be carried out on owner occupied property unless they pay the cost of such fencing.
- 4.7 New fencing will not be provided other than through a planned scheme where it has not been a feature of the property previously for example on open plan estates.

## PROCEDURES FOR THE DELIVERY OF FENCING:

### 5. GENERAL APPROACH

- 5.1 It is the case that the amount of money available for fencing will be less than probably required to ensure all properties are well fenced.
- 5.2 It is important that Officers when in receipt of requests do not commit/or give reason for a resident to think we can carryout their fencing request until they have considered the guidance set down in the Policy and this procedure note.
- 5.3 Much of the guidance in the Policy is self explanatory and this note serves to provide additional practical advice on its implementation. For ease of understanding it is presented on the basis of “planned” works and “ad hoc” fencing.

### 6. PLANNED WORKS

The term Planned refers to fencing being proposed as an area based initiative, such as the recent fencing of bin store areas at Ormsgill. Whilst such work will benefit individual tenants, it will also have the objective of improving the appearance of the area generally.

#### 6.1 *Targeting Areas*

- 6.1.1 The identification of areas to be targeted in this way will be via the Tenants Forum and Housing Management Forum.
- 6.1.2 It will not be possible to provide fencing across the stock universally in the short term and will have to be delivered over time based on resources available.
- 6.1.3 In considering areas to be targeted consideration will be given to the following:
- Will the provision of new fencing add further value to other planned works being completed?
  - Will new fencing seek to resolve other environmental problems in the area?
  - Will it help deter anti social behaviour in the area?
  - Will new fencing help maintain communal areas, particularly around flats?



**6.2** Requests for such fencing could come from any stakeholder. When it is clear existing priorities are nearing completion the Tenancy Services Team will prompt consideration of new priorities, initially through the Tenants Forum. Tenancy Services Officers will as part of their role raise possible areas for attention through Team meetings.

**6.3. *Delivering a Scheme***

6.3.1 The Tenancy Services Team will be responsible for instructing the Maintenance Team to identify schemes including properties to be included, where it is provided and to what standard, as directed by the Policy.

6.3.2 Depending on the size and extent of the particular scheme it is envisaged a small delivery team of Officers will meet to ensure it is delivered appropriately, including Maintenance Rep, Housing Officer/Senior Housing Officer and Community Involvement Manager.

6.3.3 The Community Involvement Manager will manage and carryout the necessary consultation on a scheme basis to consult with residents in the area, including owners where appropriate. This should be completed when there is a realistic plan to deliver the scheme in a prescribed time scale. Feedback from consultation should be shared with Officers on the “delivery Team”.

**6.4 *In completing area based schemes Officers should consider:***

- if any additional environmental works should be completed in conjunction with the fencing, eg renewing paths;
- if drying posts, wheelie bin restraints should be provided; and
- if the design of the fencing will meet the objectives agreed a by the Tenants’ Forum and Housing Management Forum in prioritising the scheme.

**6.5** The Officer for the area will be the responsible Officer to ensure communication is ongoing between residents and other members of the team as required, but in particular to resolve tenant-focused problems.

**6.6** The Maintenance Team is responsible for dealing with technical issues and to ensure communication is shared in delivering the scheme with all technical colleagues.

**6.7 *Review of the Scheme***

Following completion of the practical works on site, a satisfaction survey should be completed. The Community Involvement Manager will be responsible for carrying out the survey and feedback to the Tenancy Team and Maintenance Team.

## **7. INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS FOR FENCING**

To clarify this relates to fencing which is primarily provided for the benefit of “one” resident. Sometimes one resident may raise a request for fencing in a communal area, in which case see below.

### **7.1 General Approach**

7.1.1 The preferred approach is to complete fencing as part of area based planned scheme. However there may be circumstances when consideration should be given to tenant requests or instances identified by the Tenancy Services Team as follows:

7.1.2 For Housing to directly complete the work at a location where the fence provides a boundary between the property and highway it maybe appropriate to do the work. The Housing Officer should consider the following factors:

- There is existing fencing which is damaged - it should not be about providing fencing at a location where it did not already exist.
- Consideration for replacement/repair is required because it adjoins a highway with no other boundary eg grass verge.
- What is the general condition of the fencing on adjoining properties?
- What is the risk to the resident if it was not replaced, do they have children, is it close to a road, what is the distance between the fence line and road?

7.1.3 The matter should be discussed with the Senior for the area or Operations Manager/Assistant Operations Manager suggesting what action is most appropriate.

7.1.4 Should replacement fencing be agreed it should in the style adopted for Payback Scheme.

7.1.5 As a general principle when agreeing such works it is important that consideration is given to why it is different to other fencing requests. Could the action be realistically delivered consistently across the stock?

### **7.2 Two Other Possible Options to Provide Fencing from a Tenant Request**

7.2.1 A referral from an Occupational Therapist, which will be covered by the Policy and Procedures on adaptations.

7.2.2 The work could be completed through the Community Payback scheme as follows:

- The Community Involvement Manager will be responsible for managing the delivery arrangements between the Council and the Community Payback managers, receiving requests, determining whether a referral should be made and making the referral.
- Tenants can be referred to Community Payback if they are assessed as “vulnerable” by virtue of age, do not have the means to provide themselves or have a disability.
- The standard of fencing will be c. 1m high timber fencing and posts.
- Responsibility for delivery on site, including all Health and safety matters will be for Community Payback.

- The Community Involvement Manager will carry out a satisfaction exercise on the completion of each fencing project.
- The Housing Service will fund the cost of the Supervisor from the Tenant Compact Budget and material cost from the Maintenance budget.
- On an annual basis, normally during the autumn the Community Involvement Manager will provide a report to Tenants' Forum to summarise activity which will include a costing exercise to ensure the cost of the fencing remains good value to the Council.

### **7.3 Communication**

- 7.3.1 It is important when approached by a resident we respond and advise what action can be taken.
- 7.3.2 The "Golden" rule is the Officer considering the request should feedback to the tenant and keep them informed of progress.

## **8. DAMAGE TO FENCING IN COMMUNAL AREAS**

- 8.1 Many flats have communal areas with perimeter fencing. Many have been upgraded.
- 8.2 Should damage be reported it is in the Council's interest to protect the work previously carried out.
- 8.3 Such requests should be referred to the Housing Maintenance Team to consider the feasibility of a repair being completed or whether it will need to be considered as a future planned scheme.

## **9. FENCING COMPLETED IN CONJUNCTION WITH PRIVATE PROPERTY.**

- 9.1 As part of a scheme to deliver fencing we offer the owner an opportunity to have the work carried out to their property, but only on payment of the cost of such work.
- 9.2 Should instances arise where fencing is required which has a common boundary with a private property, a mutually agreeable solution will be negotiated on a case by case basis and influenced by the conveyance document at point of sale.
- 9.3 Should an owner approach for a contribution towards the cost of new fencing it would not be our practice to do so. However if the neighbouring tenant is eligible under the Community Payback Scheme, it would not be unreasonable to progress through that option subject to the owner paying an appropriate proportion of the material costs.

## **10. HELPFUL TIPS WHEN DEALING WITH FENCING REQUESTS**

- 10.1 Providing fencing must be considered alongside other repair requests.
- 10.2 The Responsible Officer should ensure the tenant gets feedback on their request.
- 10.2 It is most unlikely we will choose to provide new fencing where it does not exist.

## Cumbria Choice Based Lettings Allocations Policy Summary of Changes to Bands

<b>Band A Urgent housing need</b>	<p>Additional criteria added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A bereaved spouse or civil partner of those serving in the regular forces and are no longer entitled to reside in Ministry of Defence accommodation.</li> </ul> <p>Changes to the excessive overcrowding assessment.</p>
<b>Band B High housing need</b>	Changes to the move on from supported housing assessment.
<b>Band C Medium housing need</b>	<p>Additional criteria added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Armed forces that are currently in service or have been in service within the last 5 years for a minimum of a 3 year period will be placed in Band C (reasonable preference), subject to housing need assessment qualification.</li> </ul> <p>Definition of employment criteria expanded.</p>
<b>Band D Low housing need</b>	No change
<b>Band E Reduced priority</b>	Changes to reduced preference due to current or former housing related debts assessment.
<b>Local Connection</b>	<p>Additional criteria added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently serving in the regular armed forces or has served in the armed forces in the five years preceding application.</li> <li>Currently in the armed forces or are an existing or former member of reserve forces and suffering from a serious injury, illness or disability.</li> <li>Bereaved spouse or civil partner of those serving in the regular forces and are no longer entitled to reside in Ministry of Defence accommodation.</li> <li>Need to live in the locality either because they are ill and/or need support from a relative who lives in the locality, or because they need to give support to a relative who is ill and/or needs support who lives in the locality. Proof of illness and/or need of support will be required from a medical doctor or relevant statutory support agency.</li> <li>On advice from an appropriate professional it is clear that they need to live in the locality due to reported domestic violence, harassment and/or hate crime at a previous locality and moving to the locality will reduce risk of harm and enable support, employment and/or education needs to be met.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are special circumstances which are considered to give rise to a local connection with the Local Authority area or specified town/village. For example this would include ex-servicemen and serving members of the armed forces posted to the Local Authority area.</li> </ul> <p>Definition of employment criteria expanded.</p>

### Other changes

In addition to the above there are some changes to clarify the Policy and take into account current legislation and regulations.

The full text of the Allocation Policy detailing the proposed amendments is available from the website or can be obtained by contacting one of the partners.

AGENDA ITEM 14

SCHEME	PROCUREMENT TYPE	AVAILABLE BUDGET	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	ESTIMATED START DATE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE	CONTRACTOR	COMMENTS	Leasholders affected?
RE-ROOFING AND POINTING WORKS ROOSEGATE ESTATE PHASE 3 (2-3 YEARS DELIVERY PLAN)	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£1,319,625	£ 254,700	1.5.2016	20.12.2016	DLP Roofing	30% COMPLETE	No
RE-POINTING/RENDERING ORMSGILL ESTATE (PHASE 2)	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£250,000	£ 90,493	01/08/2016	20.12.2016	DLP Roofing	30% COMPLETE	No
WINDOW & DOOR REPLACEMENTS VARIOUS HOUSING AREAS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£400,000	£ 317,000	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	TOP NOTCH	75% COMPLETE	No
COMMUNAL ENTRANCE PAINTING - CENTRAL	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£10,000	£ -	01/10/2016	31.3.2017	GEORGE JONES	0% COMPLETE	Yes
GARAGE IMPROVEMENTS	CUMBRIA ROOFING	£75,000	£ -	01/10/2016	31.3.2017	CUMBRIA ROOFING	0% COMPLETE	No
REWIRES	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£355,300	£ 100,021	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	K WILSON	25% COMPLETE	No
BATHROOMS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£149,400	£ 44,229	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	AB MITCHELL	20% COMPLETE	No
KITCHENS	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£125,000	£ 63,147	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	AB MITCHELL	40% COMPLETE	No
HEATING	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£455,000	£ 138,090	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	AB MITCHELL	30% COMPLETE	No
PAINTING	CUMBRIA HOUSING PARTNERS	£150,000	£ 18,337	01/04/2016	31.3.2017	G JONES	20% COMPLETE	Yes

HOUSING MAINTENANCE COMMITMENTS 2015-16

	Funding Available 2015-16	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	Weekly Available	Gross Comm. as a % funds available
Tenant Demand Repairs	£ 1,070,200	£ 265,334	£ 20,581	25%
Voids	£ 503,044	£ 264,430	£ 9,674	53%
Gas Servicing	£ 195,392	£ 81,864	£ 3,758	42%
Decoration Vouchers	£ 30,000	£ 7,616	£ 577	25%
Environmental Impmts	£ 25,000	£ 9,511	£ 481	38%
Disabled Adaptations	£ 100,000	£ 58,566	£ 1,923	59%
Electrical Testing	£ 81,000	£ 20,110	£ 1,558	25%
Door Entry Maintenance	£ 20,000	£ 11,062	£ 385	55%